

**MINUTES OF THE WESTBRIDGE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL  
AND HALSWELL RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE  
COMBINED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING  
HELD AT HALSWELL RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE, CHRISTCHURCH  
Monday & Tuesday, 2 & 3 November 2015**

**PRESENT:**

Lois Chick (Chairperson), Simon Buckland, Manu Sione, John Langley,  
David Ivory for 2 November only, Sonja Macfarlane,  
Barbara Hannant (Acting Principal, Westbridge), Jon Purdue (Staff Representative),  
A. .... (Board Secretary)

**GUESTS:**

Alan Direen, (Chairman, Board of Trustees for Kingslea School),  
Solomon (AP Halswell Residential College)

**APOLOGIES:**

Janine Harrington (Principal, Halswell), David Ivory on 3 November

---

**1. Welcome**

**2. Karakia**

Sonja Macfarlane led karakia.

**3. Conflict of Interest Declarations**

No further declarations.

**4. Confirmation of the Agenda**

Day 1: 2 November – update on leadership will be given later in the morning.

Day 2: 3 November – Solomon will join the Board for the charter review at 11:30 am.

## 5. One School Ethos

No decisions around adopting a one school ethos have been made. The discussions are investigative only. Refer also to discussion notes of the 2 November 2015 meeting with the Ministry.

***Alan Direen joined the meeting 9:30-10:30 am to share learnings from Kingslea School.***

Kingslea School is a school of national significance and demonstrating a pattern of successful ERO reports that successfully operates with one executive principal over four sites. For further information see the Kingslea School Website. <http://www.kingslea.school.nz/te-maioha.html>

Alan Direen highlighted the following:

- Kingslea started from a position of poor infrastructure, low funds and without an official principal. The addition of each new site brought opportunities for enhanced efficiencies.
- The standard of the Board has increased and reflects a range of perspectives and professional experience which are valuable assets for governance.
- In addition to being under one Board, the four sites share
  - a single administrative accounting officer, who travels across all four sites and works with one financial service [Solutions and Services].
  - one mobile executive principal who visits each site once a fortnight for 2 or 3 days and works on site with the associate principal and staff as well as liaising directly with the MoE.
- Each site has its own associate principal who is responsible for the day to day operation of that site.
- Financial implications include
  - higher costs on travel.
  - lower costs on administration [being careful not to create another level of administration].
  - increases or decreases in asset costs. [However there are opportunities to use assets].
- Kingslea experienced increased opportunities for recruitment/retention of staff, professional development and excellence in service delivery.
  - Once a year staff from the four sites come together for a camp.
  - The executive principal seeks PD opportunities internationally to identify innovations that can be incorporated in NZ.

- The school has international relationships with schools running similar programmes in Canada, UK and New South Wales.
- An area for further development is to grow PD opportunities between NZ schools that have similar programmes.
- Development of business connections has enabled the school to create pathways for enterprise and employment. E.g. For two years running, student-created companies have been shortlisted for Governor General awards.
- Each site has retained its unique character and curricula reflect what can be offered within the given facilities. I.e. Te Maioha which is a farm based site provides instruction in a farm based context.
- The use of IT facilitates sharing of information and administration via the cloud. This access is a critical factor in facilitating the work of one school over four sites.

The following questions were raised.

*What level of flexibility have you had in terms of working with the Ministry?*

The Ministry is interested in innovative ideas. Having the right person in the role of executive principal is vital to effect change. Our executive principal lobbies for the school at higher levels across ministries [MSD, MoH, MoE]. Sometimes key people in Wellington take the lead, e.g. a move to transitional schools which is a work in progress. It is important that school staff and the Ministry both share the vision and can embrace change.

*What barriers have you faced?*

Ourselves. We started out, in my opinion, as a dysfunctional organisation both at Board and staffing levels, and have spent 5-6 years tidying this up with resulting changes in both aspects. ERO has recognised our improvements.

*What benefits have you seen?*

Better recruitment of qualified experienced staff. As the school reputation grew, our recruitment and retention of staff has grown and we get several applicants for each advertised vacancy. The focus on change in our service delivery identified staff who wanted to be a part of the change.



We run within budget now. As sites were added we have had opportunity to solidify the financial base using funding that comes with creating a new school and ability to defer purchases that could be provided another way. We raise funds for small items such as playground equipment, books, and IT resources via an outside provider. We took a risk on hiring consultants as we moved towards excellence in service delivery and have received some repayment for these costs.

Community Support. The school has a well-appointed lobby group in *The Friends of Kingslea* which compensates for the lack of alumni and parent associations. This group has opened up opportunities for liaising with the wider community. The school actively promotes transparency and no longer 'hides' within the community.

Stronger delivery of education. Our students want to be at school and we have seen a decrease in absconding particularly at our Burwood site. We have moved away from a model of primary education for our poor readers, and are working towards taking these students from "school to life". This is still a work in progress.

*Is this model something the two schools could take on?*

Maybe two sites is not the end. You might consider having three or four sites, as long as it is within economies of scale. The sector is changing, and the model developed will need to be responsive to changes in CYFs, Youth Justice, etc. The Board has to work hard towards its vision.

*Is there competition between school sites? How do you capture the teacher voice across the four sites?*

We do not have enough feedback from each site to answer these questions yet. It is an area we are working on.

*How do you deal with serious staff misconduct?*

We have made mistakes, but the key to getting it right is at the appointment stage. The executive principal has knowledge of each site and seeks advice from the unions and NZSTA. Sometimes issues go into mediation. Our students deserve the very best from staff and staff misconduct needs to be resolved quickly.



*Do you get cross-pollination of ideas across sites?*

Due to geographical distances between sites this does not happen a lot. The APs work together approximately six times a year. Individual staff visit different sites. The Board visits each site. We are currently in discussion with the MoE for increases in travel funding.

David Ivory thanked Alan Direen for his presentation and Alan Direen left the meeting.

## **6. Sabbatical Update**

The Board granted Solomon a Term 2 sabbatical in the UK to look at student engagement in several special schools similar to ours.

***Solomon joined the meeting at 10:30 am to present his learnings.***

Solomon thanked the Board for the opportunity to take a sabbatical as well as for the Board's support of Janine Harrington during this time.

He noted that inclusion is not working well in the UK and an increased number of students are seeking special education. A spirit of competition between special schools has produced a range of options and gives parents more choice.

Take the report as read.

Solomon tabled a summary document and highlighted the following:

- Learning only occurs when students are engaged. That said there are degrees of engagement, from high commitment to the task, to ritual compliance.
- Students cannot be forced to engage and teachers face challenges in knowing how to design learning experiences for reluctant students who may passively retreat or choose open rebellion. The latter disrupts learning for the whole class.
- There are a number of strategies i.e. having clear expectations, providing novelty and variety, using strengths based approaches, giving choices etc. that teachers can use to encourage engagement.

The following questions were raised;

*How do you measure engagement?*

There is no one tool. One way to is to measure engagement using behaviour rubrics. Students who enjoy learning do not leave the room. They demonstrate interest through asking questions. They produce work that exceeds the stated expectations. Assessing student engagement also requires a good knowledge of the student so that we have a baseline from which to measure.

*How would students identify an engaged teacher?*

I think they would see the passion in a teacher. Students identify teachers who create a sense of community and who value relationships. An engaged teacher is always extending areas of teaching and finds creative ways to teach. Teachers who work with this cohort require a high calibre of training. We need to think of ways to share expertise across RSSs.

*If you were running PD to target students and teacher engagement, what would you change from what is currently happening at the two RSSs?*

I wouldn't start with what to change. I would prefer to tap into the strengths of teachers and resources that we currently have.

*What stood out as the exemplar school in the schools you visited?*

No one school stood out. There was competition for enrolment between schools which increased options open to parents. Individualised programmes featured in all. One school had no sanctions, preferring instead to offer a range of programmes that students could try. If students chose not to be part of a programme, they were given a space to sit until they wanted to go back into the programme. There is also recognition of sensory needs and schools had varying ways of fitting out sensory rooms to cater to these needs. Several schools had strong outdoor programmes.

*What are key things in service delivery that excite students?*

Students need to feel connected to where they are. My work in *Check and Connect* showed me two reasons students do not engage: the work is too hard, and not liking the teacher. Assigning mentors to such students provided a way to 'hear their side of the story'. Students who felt listened to, returned to classes.



The Board asked Solomon to create a two page summary to identify

- how his observations in the UK affirm the current practice at HRC as a national provider, and
- two or three suggestions for new initiatives the school could consider.

Action: Solomon to follow up.

The following points were noted in a discussion around engagement.

- It would be interesting to compare how engagement looks for students at HRC/WRS with how engagement looks for students of similar needs who are in mainstream education.
- An indication of student engagement could be included as a charter target. The Ministry is developing a tool for assessment/engagement to capture learning of students whose gains are limited to gains within one curriculum level. It may be helpful to wait until this is released.
- The best way to ensure engagement is to employ the right people.

Solomon directed the Board to the questionnaire on pages 12-19 of the report. Individual teams were asked to complete this questionnaire during Term 3 PD. The responses were differentiated but overall the results indicated that student engagement is actively promoted at HRC.

The Board noted that it would be good to capture the student voice and parent voice and suggested that the *Partners for Change Outcomes Tool*, might be useful. It was acknowledged that measuring student/parent satisfaction with schools is a complex process.

The Board identified a project for Term 1, 2016, in which both RSSs together develop a summary of evidence-based learnings that enhance engagement, to share with the wider community. The summary would include indigenous and international learnings, and be delivered by HRC/WRS colleagues who could confirm practices in place at the school. This project is consistent with the charter vision to promote RSS.

Action: In 2016, the Board to follow up on the idea for both RSSs to develop a summary of evidence-based learning that enhance engagement, for presentation to a wider community audience.

Barbara Hannant noted that Westbridge teachers have a clear picture of what engagement looks like.



Action: Solomon to liaise with Barbara Hannant to discuss the Westbridge picture of engagement.

Solomon challenged the Board to consider how to attract highly skilled and qualified staff to work with the complex learning needs of the cohort at HRC/WRS. The Board acknowledged that recruitment and retention of highly skilled staff is a concern that the Board shares although this is not to say that the schools are not currently well staffed. The shift to inclusion has meant that more teachers are staying in mainstream schools, and teacher training no longer focuses on special needs training. Residential staff also need terms and conditions that will encourage skilled people to apply. All staff need certainty from the Ministry that RSSs have a future in the suite of interventions for this cohort of students.

Lois Chick thanked Solomon for his presentation and he left the meeting.

Action: In her next newsletter to the schools, Lois Chick to notify staff that the MoE is committed to ensuring the future of RSSs.

## **7. Discussion of issues raised by Alan Direen and Solomon**

A robust discussion around the one school ethos ended with a suggestion, a resolution and an affirmation.

It was suggested that the way forward may be to identify a smaller group of 5-6 people to develop three models and identify anticipated benefits of each. Group membership to comprise an external consultant, a representative from MoE, a Board member, and a staff member from Westbridge who has a historical knowledge about Westbridge Residential School.

Action: Barbara Hannant to identify a Westbridge staff member who has historical knowledge of the school, to serve on a smaller group tasked with identifying three models for the schools going forward including anticipated benefits of each model.

*John Langley moved that the Board resolve to develop with Ministry of Education support, a framework for a one school/two campus model. Seconded Sonja Macfarlane. Carried.*

The Board affirmed Barbara Hannant's role as Acting Principal and encouraged her to understand that her voice on the Board is vital.

## **8. Update on Leadership**

**The Board moved into committee to discuss employment concerns.**

The Board moved out of committee.

In a discussion around safety risks incurred when staff bring their own children to school, the Board noted that it is responsible for the safety of all people on site. In most circumstances children should not be with their parent(s) on the school site. The Board acknowledged that emergencies occur and such cases should be dealt with on an individual basis and require permission from the principal.

*John Langley moved that as a general principle, staff should not bring their children to the school for any extended length of time when they are working, and in the event of an emergency situation arising, staff should first obtain the principal's permission. Seconded Simon Buckland. Carried.*

## **9. Hautū Cultural Self Review Tool**

Sonja Macfarlane presented an overview of the Hautū tool [designed to improve the outcomes for Māori] and highlighted its use at both governance and operational levels.

The Board discussed whether to concentrate its strategic planning on all four areas [Accountability, Leadership, Representation, and Employer Role] at once or to select one area at a time and move through each slowly. The Board agreed to start evidence gathering across the four areas.

The first stage of evidence gathering should include feedback from each school's Māori caucus.

The Board noted that the review could be incorporated into the Annual Plans e.g. Term 1, 2016 start the review of the four areas by consulting with staff, communities, etc. The process could take more than a year.

Action: Both principals to report findings on the evidence gathered using the Hautū Cultural Self Review Tool, to the Board at the end of Term 1, 2016.



## 10. Philosophy of Care

The Board discussed the model developed at Cholmondeley and agreed in principle with the concept, but suggested that the development of a statement around the philosophy of care should be made with staff input. The final document should integrate with the Code of Conduct and be included in the charter. It is also important to capture the student voice.

Action: As part of January PD, each principal to lead staff in developing "philosophy of care" statements.

Action: Each principal to ensure student voice has been captured in the "philosophy of care" statements.

Action: Once each principal has captured staff and student voice, Curriculum and Delivery Sub-committee to integrate the two models.

***Lois Chick welcomed Solomon to the meeting and informed him of his official appointment to the role of Acting Principal to 22 November 2015.***

Action: Lois Chick to email HRC staff and announce the Board's decision on Solomon's appointment.

## 11. Charter Review

### ***Assessment Data, Westbridge***

Take it as read.

Barbara Hannant reported that the targets next year will be quite different as the current targets were difficult to measure and report to. In the future, targets should also be aligned with OTJs [overall teacher judgments]. She noted that the majority of students are making accelerated gains and that the staff were looking closely at those who were not making gains. The narrative outlines steps being taken for those students. Westbridge plans to focus on reading next year and to investigate MoE led PD to build teacher capacity.

Barbara Hannant explained how data is collected. She added that although Kerry Mitchell's report highlighted under-use of eTAP for data collection, eTAP was not designed for cumulative data collection where student cohorts are on staggered intakes and exits, and have tenures that go across different academic years. Excel data collection is labour intensive, but more responsive



to dynamic goal setting, and suitable for the small sample sizes in this cohort. Halswell has developed a 'cumulative data page' as part of the IEP review document which may be helpful. Both schools could share learnings around how each uses eTAP and how to improve data collection.

The Board discussed the need to collect data on student achievements that are not specifically aligned with National Standards, but nevertheless represent social and behavioural achievements as observed in parent feedback. RSSs are in a unique position, and finding a way to collect this data will ensure that RSSs can articulate the breadth of student achievement through RSS intervention. This is an area where the schools could take a leadership role in special education.

Action: Curriculum and Delivery Sub-committee to investigate ways of collecting data on student achievement not specifically integrated with National Standards but observed in parent feedback.

### ***Assessment Data, Halswell***

Take it as read.

Solomon agreed that the use of National Standards in target setting does not capture student achievement at Halswell and supported the need for further investigation into reporting on gains students make. The issue may be resolved in part, through the work currently being completed by the MoE [Sally Jackson's work around capturing student achievement where students do not progress through curriculum levels].

The Board noted the difference between goal achievement in the day school and residential contexts. During the discussion around this difference, the following factors were identified.

- The nature of the goals - The day school focus is academic, whilst the residences focus on life skills. The latter are often easier to break down into achievable steps.
- History of failure - Special education students have a history of academic failure and need highly skilled instruction. Recruitment of trained staff is a constant challenge.
- Sample size - It is difficult to draw accurate conclusions where the sample size is so small.

- Student/teacher relationship – Frequent turnover of staff in the day school may have compromised consistency of the student/teacher relationship. It is anticipated that staffing in 2016 will be more stable.
- Quality of baseline data – When students have not attended school for significant lengths of time, there is a dearth of baseline academic data. This makes the initial setting of realistic academic goals more challenging.

The Board revisited its earlier discussion around recruitment/retention of trained staff and noted that given the MoE assurances around the future of RSSs, it may be necessary to develop incentives that would attract RTLBs or SENCOs into RSS classrooms. Another possibility is to liaise with tertiary providers of RTLB training and ask them to include one year of teaching in an RSS as part of the training. The Board should formalise its concerns around recruitment and retention of trained staff and take these to the MoE. On-the-job training is not enough going forward and special education training should be a condition of employment. Where suitable applicants are not trained, but would agree to pursue training, the Board would contribute an agreed amount toward training fees.

*Sonja Macfarlane moved that the Board make it a condition of employment that applicants to RSSs' teaching positions are special needs trained or agree to pursue special needs training. Seconded John Langley. Carried.*

### **Strategic Planning**

The charters are due 1<sup>st</sup> March of each academic year and the Board noted that charter reviews should begin in October next year.

Action: Lois Chick to present proposed 2016 dates for 6-weekly Board meetings beginning in February, including a strategy day in November, and ensuring that the work on the charter begins in October.

The Board identified guidelines for the 2016 charter:

- The beginning section which was aligned between the two schools last year will not change much and can basically roll over, except where updates are indicated.
- The Board agreed that the schools should not incorporate the ERO draft indicator statements in the 2016 charter.
- The action points for 2015 need to be reviewed. Identify action points that need to be carried over or dropped for other reasons.

- The key changes will occur in the schools' annual plans. These should include the proposed implementation of initiatives around student engagement, philosophy of care, Hautū, and moving towards a one school ethos. Details around the latter may become more specific post the 21 December 2016 meeting with the MoE.
- Follow layouts similar to last year. Note: targets at WRS should include both academic and social goals.

Action: Both Principals to present draft 2016 charters at the December meeting in preparation for Board approval of the final charters mid-February 2016.

Action: Board to incorporate ERO indicator statements into the 2017 charter.

## 12. Principals' Reports

### ***Halswell Residential College***

Take it as read.

Requests for Board decisions were highlighted.

### ***New Terms and Conditions for non PSA Staff***

*Simon Buckland moved that the new terms and conditions to non PSA staff on IEAs be offered in February 2016. Seconded Manu Sione. Carried.*

### ***Housing of female students at HRC in 2016 during the refurbishments***

*John Langley moved that Option 1 [temporarily repurpose the current College office block back to residential use for one year] be approved. Seconded Sonja Macfarlane. Carried.*

The Board raised the following:

- Geographical information around student enrolments should be continued.

Action: Both principals to include a geographical breakdown of student enrolment with each report to the Board.



- What does "repayment of the extra income received" [conclusion of the Financials – as at September 2015] refer to?

This refers to the interim funding that came to Halswell instead of Westbridge. This money was accrued through the year as income in the Halswell budget and will be repaid in October with the October "drop".

*Lois Chick moved the approval of the Halswell Residential College Principal's Report including the financials for the period ending September 2015. Seconded Sonja Macfarlane. Carried.*

*Lois Chick thanked Solomon for his attendance, and he left the meeting.*

### ***Westbridge Residential School***

Take it as read.

Barbara Hannant asked the Board to approve the SNUP upgrade that will include wireless upgrades in the school/gym. Otherwise WRS would be liable for the full amount of the upgrade which is \$38,729.81. By signing up now the Board contribution would be \$7,745.96.

During the discussion of this request, Manu Sione noted that this would usually be completed via the Property Sub-committee and he intends to reconvene meetings of that sub-committee now that there is more clarity around property concerns.

Action: Manu Sione to schedule a Property Sub-committee meeting, prior to the next Board meeting and in time to submit the minutes for inclusion in the Board papers [30 November].

*Jon Purdue moved that the Board approve the SNUP upgrade. Seconded Manu Sione. Carried.*

Barbara Hannant informed the Board that none of the policies have been signed, some are in draft, and some need review. During the discussion of this information the Board indicated that \_\_\_\_\_ is currently working on the alignment of the policies across the two schools. This is a work in progress and signing off policies now would be premature. In the meantime Barbara has answered queries relating to the state of policies by explaining the review process initiated by the Board this year.

The appraisal process needs to be reviewed and Westbridge is making the best of the situation.

Barbara Hannant's appraisal is being completed by her RTLB cluster manager and practice advisor and she has submitted her 2015 electronic portfolio. The appraisal team has indicated that the appraisal will be signed off shortly.

The Board raised the following:

- Achievement template - The comparison of achievement data across the two schools would be easier if both schools used the same template.

Barbara Hannant explained that given the nature of the Westbridge target/goals, reporting of them using the template agreed on by the Curriculum and Delivery Sub-committee was difficult.

- Student photos – The Board had been informed that Westbridge could not produce a photo newsletter because photographing students was not allowed, yet the WRS website includes student photos.

Barbara Hannant explained that Westbridge has only recently sought parent/caregiver permission to photograph students and will only use photos of those students for whom permission is granted. Producing a newsletter at this stage is a low priority given the other more urgent tasks but may be possible in 2016.

- Moving to the collective – How is this progressing?

Jon is liaising with [PSA] and may need additional administrative help. Changes to the roster system present the greatest challenge. Jon Purdue volunteered to support Westbridge and will attend the Tuesday, 10 November meeting with F.

During the discussion it was noted that the changeover may require HR support, as job descriptions etc are also affected. The Board should have some questions about anticipated HR support, ready for the 21 December Meeting.

Action: Jon Purdue to liaise with prior to the Tuesday, 10 November meeting to confirm understandings around the situation at Westbridge.

Action: Jon Purdue to go to Westbridge for the meeting with [redacted], 1:00 pm, Tuesday, 10 November.

Action: Barbara Hannant to hire temporary administrative staff to assist [redacted] to complete tasks related to moving WRS staff to the collective.

Action: Barbara Hannant to identify questions regarding HR concerns [job descriptions, appraisals, rosters etc] that will fall out of the changeover to the collective and to bring these questions to the 21 December meeting with the MoE.

- Double-sided format – The Board requested that the report be double-sided to save paper.

Barbara Hannant explained that the report is printed at Halswell for inclusion with the Board papers.

Action: [redacted] to ensure double-sided printing is used where possible.

### **The Board moved into committee to discuss personnel.**

The Board moved out of committee.

*Simon Buckland moved the approval of the Westbridge Residential School Principal's Report including the financials for the period ending September 2015, as well as all the accompanying recommendations that came from the in- committee meeting of the Audit and Risk Sub-committee, 28 October 2015. Seconded John Langley. Carried.*

## **13. Sub-committee Updates**

### **a. Audit and Risk Sub-committee**

#### **24 September 2015 Meeting**

Take the report as read.

*Simon Buckland moved that the Board approve the August 2015 financials for Halswell and Westbridge. Seconded Manu Sione. Carried.*



***Simon Buckland tabled the minutes of the 28 October 2015 Meeting.***

The in-committee section of this meeting was covered in the Principal's Report under Personnel.

The Board acknowledged the work that Barbara Hannant, Janine Harrington and the Audit and Risk Sub-committee have taken on in tidying up complex situations regarding personnel.

**b. Property Sub-committee**

Take it as read.

Manu Sione highlighted key learnings from the property progress at Halswell that could be used at Westbridge going forward:

- WRS needs a 10-20 year vision.
- WRS needs to have a dedicated resource team and a contact person with the right skill sets to lead the team. This person should be on site and able to manage the property developments at the school.
- The school's relationship with the MoE is crucial.
- The school needs a strong focused project lead. The current firm *Watershed* is not delivering this level of leadership.
- The property plan should be based on the notional roll [32] approved and reconfirmed at the 2 November meeting by the MoE.

*Manu Sione moved that the Property Sub-committee push forward and resurrect the property plan [based on a notional roll of 32] as quickly as possible, to investigate whether to stay with Watershed, and to identify who manages John Karl. Seconded Jon Purdue. Carried.*

Action: Manu Sione to investigate whether the Property Sub-committee can identify and select the best project lead for property development at WRS and to phone the MoE to identify John Karl's manager.

Action: Barbara Hannant to locate the break clause in the contracts with *Leading Edge* and *Watershed*.

**c. Curriculum and Delivery Sub-committee**

Take it as read.

#### **14. Additional Administration**

##### **a. Correspondence**

*The Board moved into committee to discuss the in-committee correspondence tabled by Lois Chick.*

The Board moved out of committee.

*John Langley moved the receipt of inward and outwards correspondence. Seconded Jon Purdue. Carried.*

##### **b. Minutes of 14 September 2015 Meeting**

*Manu Sione moved that the minutes of the meeting dated 14 September 2015 be confirmed as a true and correct record. Seconded John Langley. Carried.*

##### **c. Closing Karakia**

Sonja Macfarlane led the closing karakia and day two of the meeting ended at 3:10 pm.

---

**LOIS CHICK  
CHAIRPERSON,  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

---

**SOLOMON  
ACTING PRINCIPAL,  
HALSWELL RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE**

---

 **BARBARA HANNANT  
ACTING PRINCIPAL,  
WESTBRIDGE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL**

**MINUTES OF THE WESTBRIDGE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL  
AND HALSWELL RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE  
COMBINED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING  
HELD AT HALSWELL RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE, CHRISTCHURCH  
Tuesday, 7 April 2015**

**PRESENT:**

Lois Chick (Chairperson), Simon Buckland, David Ivory,  
John Langley (until 1:00 PM), Manu Sione, Myra Mains (Principal, Westbridge),  
Janine Harrington (Principal, Halswell), Jon Purdue (Staff Representative),  
, (Board Secretary)

**APOLOGIES:**

Sonja Macfarlane

**GUESTS:**

John Karl (MOE), Kris Morris-Vette (Watershed), Clive Jarman (Pacific Environments),  
) via video conference 10:30–11:15 AM  
, 11:30–12:00 PM  
(HRC Student Advocates) 12:30–1:30 PM

---

**1. Welcome**

The Board expressed condolences to

**2. Karakia**

Manu Sione led karakia.

**3. Conflict of Interest Declarations**

No further declarations.

**4. Confirmation of the Agenda**

Move items 1e – g [relating to 2 March 2015 meeting minutes] to the end of the meeting. Additional items: storage of sub-committee papers and engagement with Salisbury School.



## 5. **Audit and Risk Sub-committee Update Part 1**

The minutes of the Audit and Risk Sub-committee meeting 19 March 2015 were tabled.

### **Westbridge Residential School Schedule of Delegations**

The following points were noted:

- Page 1 – the date of adoption should be 7 April 2015, rather than 2 March 2015.
- Page 7 – point 4 refers to sub-delegations the principal assigns to permanent staff members.
- Permanent staff members who have been delegated to approve purchases of goods and services up to the value of \$200 need to be aware of the annual budget.
- Page 8 – the "Memorandum of Delegation" outlines sub-delegations the principal assigns to specific permanent staff positions and as such does not represent a delegation between the Board and a staff member. The inclusion of this page follows the NZSTA guidelines. Signing by individual staff members serves as a timely reminder to be proactive in knowing the parameters of the delegation assigned. The Board does not need to review this page on a yearly basis, however the principal reaffirms or amends sub-delegations at the beginning of each year.

*Simon Buckland moved that the Board approve [subject to amendment of the date to 7 April 2015] the Westbridge Residential School schedule of delegations until the March 2016 Board meeting. Seconded Manu Sione. Carried.*

Action:                      to amend the date and provide hard copy of the schedule of delegations for signing.

### **Halswell Residential College Financials**

Janine Harrington highlighted the following points pertaining to the financial report for the month ending 28 February 2015:

- Changes have been made to the 2015 budget to reflect a budget deficit from \$250k to \$800,805.
- The ORS funding drop was delayed which lowers the anticipated income. However money received through ORS is always underestimated as it is contingent on specific students and amounts are never certain.
- The College is awaiting formal notification of reimbursement from the MOE [anticipated to be in excess of \$200k] for payment on outstanding invoices for post earthquake activities.

- Overall the College is running slightly behind budget but the financial situation at Halswell will need close monitoring.

Questions raised:

1. What does the 'Annual Marine Survey' refer to?

This refers to work on the boiler in the laundry.

2. How many students are ORS funded?

Currently there are four or five ORS funded students.

3. Given the precarious financial position at HRC, why does *Solutions and Services* state "that the College's financial position remains sound as at the end of February 2015." [report page 1]?

This statement reflects use of a standard template but needs greater specificity of language in the case of Halswell Residential College.

Action: Janine Harrington to take feedback to *Solutions and Services* and to ask them to clarify the thinking behind the statement "that the College's financial position remains sound as at the end of February 2015."

4. What is the reason for the \$800k deficit in 2015?

The funding model is 10 years old. Funding is based on the notional roll of 32 students and our current enrolment is 21 students. The main draw on funding is for residential staffing which includes nine permanent appointments. Teacher salaries are drawn from a separate source. The girls' villa is expensive to run [\$400k for a maximum of five students] but its inclusion supports the strategic plan to be co-educational. Running 24/7 and maintaining the Tikanga model are additional expenses.

5. Are there learnings that Halswell could take from the Westbridge context?

Two differences between the Halswell and Westbridge contexts include the use of the collective and the expectations for night staff.

The Board discussed these differences but came to no conclusion as to the impact the different contexts have on the overall budgets. The Board noted that investigation of costings around the different contexts will be an ongoing task for Audit and Risk. Comparisons completed to date indicate that the two schools are running in a similar manner with respect to costs against property, curriculum, and administration. These costs will be tracked over time and data generated will ultimately inform funding requirements going forward.

The Board acknowledged that the financial report presented is robust and reflects honest figures required for the running a high quality school.

*Simon Buckland moved that the Board approve the Halswell financials for the month of February. Seconded Lois Chick. Carried.*

#### **Westbridge Residential School Financials**

Variances are explained in the Audit and Risk Sub-committee minutes 19 March 2015.

Myra Mains highlighted the following points pertaining to the financial report for the month ending 28 February 2015:

- The projected deficit reflects costs due to payments for the historical claim around the sleepover clause, administration costs relating to this claim, and property improvements.
- The overspending on Health and Safety is due to recent issues with pests and vermin.
- Extra costs on Health and Safety are anticipated due to the need to cut down pine trees, identified as a safety hazard.
- Expenditure is running within budget.

Questions raised:

1. What is the staff turnover and how many people apply for each position as they become available? Have there been any significant issues in retaining and recruiting staff with these rates of pay?

There have not been any significant issues.



The following points were noted during the discussion around staff retention and current rates of pay:

- There is always a dearth of suitably trained and experienced staff.
- The terms and conditions of employment do have impacts on the quality and suitability of staffing.
- The cost associated with non-teaching staff at both schools is comparable, but further investigation will reveal whether rates of pay, terms and conditions, and responsibilities are comparable.

2. What does CES refer to?

CES is an acronym for "Centre for Extra Support" and refers to a separate contract with the MOE under which Westbridge operated as a day school. This is no longer the case and the figures will drop out in future reports.

3. Are there any issues around paying CES money back to the Ministry?

Westbridge is not required to pay this money back. However, there may be an issue around money which is sitting in reserves from the "Futures West" project. This project has been disbanded.

Action: Myra Mains to clarify the status of money relating to "Futures West".

*Simon Buckland moved that the Board approve the Westbridge financials for the month of February. Seconded John Langley. Carried.*

**Westbridge 2012 and 2013 Audit Reports**

The Annual Reports and Financial Statements prepared by RSM Hayes Audit were not signed off. They reflect what is known.

*Myra Mains moved that the Board approve the Westbridge 2012 and 2013 Audit Reports and Financial Statements. Seconded Simon Buckland. Carried.*

**Westbridge Personnel Requests**

**The Board moved into committee to discuss the personnel requests.**

On moving out of committee the Board requested that Myra Mains inform the staff involved of the outcome.

Action: Myra Mains to follow up with staff involved, regarding the outcome of requests for leave.

### **Risk Assessment Tool**

The risk assessment document for Halswell Residential College includes additional narrative under each descriptor heading.

The Board acknowledged the work presented by each principal in the development of these reports. In future reports, names should not be included, even where they are used in positive contexts such as mitigating factors.

Action: Both principals to ensure that names are not used in future risk assessment reports.

In the discussion around the use of this tool, the following points were noted:

- The tool provides a process by which principals report risks.
- Principals use professional judgment in identifying risks and indicator colours, and inform the Board when and why changes occur.
- The risk analysis document could eventually replace some aspects formerly addressed in the Audit and Risk, and Curriculum Sub-committee reports. This would reduce the workload on principals.
- Principals are expected to analyse risks on a monthly basis but would not necessarily need to report back to the Board on a monthly basis.
- The Board takes responsibility to clarify the reports presented.
- There are some risks [eg transitions and funding] that are common to both schools and the Board will need to be proactive around these risks.

*Lois Chick moved that principals include an assessment of risks with the principals' notes every second Board meeting. Seconded Manu Sione. Carried.*

Action: Both principals to include an updated assessment of risk in their notes for the June 2015 meeting.

## **6. Property Sub-committee Update**

### **Westbridge**

Manu Sione reported that the minutes of the Property Sub-committee meeting 24 March 2015 were not yet ready for distribution.

Two options, showing changes to the site plan proposed by *Pacific Environments* after consultation with staff at Westbridge Residential School, were tabled via powerpoint. Option 1 shows significant changes to the administration block [repurposing the existing classroom block for administration]. Option 2 shows the changes relating to the location of the classroom block. The Westbridge property team chose Option 2 with some further changes suggested and the sub-committee endorsed this decision.

Manu Sione introduced the video conference attendees, Kris Morris-Vette (*Watershed*), Clive Jarman (*Pacific Environments*), and Erica Wade (*Westbridge Property Committee*). It was noted that the drawings presented indicate the footprint allocations only.

The following questions were raised:

1. Will the design team seek staff input into the final configuration of the spaces?

Yes, consultation with the end user is a standard part of the process. The documents tabled set the direction for future development and represent the beginning of the journey.

2. Given the bi-cultural needs, has the team sought input from the local iwi with respect to the wharenuī?

100 square metres has been allocated for the wharenuī. Orientation and configuration will be decided at a later date.

3. Two issues identified in the Halswell Residential College property improvements are around identifying suitable locations for monitoring students at night and safe rooms. Have these issues been considered in the development of property at Westbridge?

Learnings from the Halswell process is something that the staff at Westbridge should discuss with Halswell staff prior to consultation with the architects.

4. Why is the footprint of the administration block in Option 2 bigger than that of the classroom space?



The footprint of the classroom space is based on a formula identified by the MOE. The administration block locates in an existing building. It would be smaller if it was a new building.

5. What other contexts could the increased space in the administration block be used for?

This will be addressed at the details phase of the design process. The increased size provides opportunities to create spaces for meeting with stakeholders, meeting with small student groups, additional staff facilities etc.

6. Is the projected classroom space based on a roll of 40 students?

This size allocated is for 40 students.

7. Will the boiler capacity and location be suitable?

Relocation of the boiler would be too costly. Noise is not a concern. The capacity should be sufficient for the increase in roll, but if it is not, the issue is fixable and can be sorted by a mechanical engineer during the next stage of development.

8. Have the changes identified at the 24 March 2015 meeting been incorporated into the drawings?

These changes were made. The garages have been moved, and the classrooms are located between the two play areas. The provision of shade cloth for the pool is a detail and not applicable at this point in the process.

9. What is the process from here?

John Karl summarised the process for the Business Case. Westbridge is next in line for talks with Deloitte and , will visit the school to gather additional information as required. The existing draft Business Case needs to be redone due to the change in money being spent. Most of the ground work has been completed. The intended timeframe for completion is 30 June 2015. After this, John Karl will take the Business Case to Treasury and it is anticipated that a decision can be made by the end of 2015.

10. What is the overall timeframe to complete buildings if approvals are signed off according to plan?

The building work should be completed in 18 months.

11. If the Deloitte Business Case for submission at the end of June is approved, when does the design process begin?

The design process begins as soon as funding approval is given. John Karl could request that continued development be funded out of 5YA. There is some risk associated with this as funding needs are prioritised.

12. Is 5YA funding sufficient for the detailed design process?

We need to know the budget first. Generally 15% of the budget is allocated to cover the fees for both the design process and obtaining consents. 85% is allocated for construction. Design work can be completed to a certain point and then go on hold, whilst further approvals are obtained.

It was also noted that the issues around the consent for the gym are near resolution. Manu Sione thanked the team for attending this meeting.

In the discussion around funding the design process, the following points were raised:

- The risks that John Karl alluded to around using 5YA funding need to be considered.
- The Board should be prepared to report on the value added through the use of RSS interventions.
- While there is some ambiguity around the roll at Westbridge [32 or 40] the Board would be better placed to base estimates on costs for 40 as this was the original driver for development.

*John Langley moved that the Board accept Option 2 as the conceptual footprint for Westbridge property development. Seconded Manu Sione. Carried.*

The Board discussed the question of approving 15% of the total build out of 5YA funding for detailed design development and decided that more information is required before a decision could be made. It was also noted during the discussion that *Pacific Environments* has not reported back to the Board on work completed so far.

Action: Manu Sione to clarify the risks involved in using 5YA funding with John Karl and Kris Morris-Vette.

Action: Manu Sione to ask *Pacific Environments* for a written report on their delivery of services to date.

Lois Chick thanked Manu Sione for the preparation and work that was foundational to this presentation.

### **Halswell**

\_\_\_\_\_ spoke around the property upgrades at Halswell and highlighted the following:

- There is a new team in Christchurch working around the rebuild of schools, however property management at Halswell is already well supported and there are fortnightly updates with *The Building Intelligence Group* and *Baldasso Cortese*.
- Approval for the wharenuī [128 square metres] has been signed off and this space can be called a whare. The original request was for 300 square metres, but compromises can be made through using the gym more creatively.
- The Ministry has appointed Margaret Waller as Delivery Manager. She is amenable to designing spaces around needs rather than formulae provided the design stays within the budget.
- Changes to the hostel regulations will have some impact on the design and Christchurch City Council will be informed throughout the process.
- Building demolition is aimed to start December 2015 with building to occur over the school year in stages. The anticipated completion date is January 2017.
- The Halswell team will share its learnings with John Karl.

## **7. Curriculum and Delivery Sub-committee Update**

### ***Principals' appraisals***

Paul Kennedy will complete principals' appraisals and has scheduled an initial meeting with Myra Mains and Lois Chick on 8 April 2015.

### ***Reporting student achievement template***

The principals will refine the reporting template to accommodate the needs of both schools.



### ***Programmes for Māori and Pasifika students***

It was noted that both schools have progressed well in work with Māori students. More work is needed around supporting Pasifika students. The sub-committee will be using reflective questions to guide future planning for Māori and Pasifika students. These questions have been included in the Board notes.

### ***Transitions***

The draft letter presented serves as a starting point for conversations with the Ministry around transition. The intention of the letter is to clarify responsibilities for transition. It was suggested that the tone of the draft letter could be more forceful.

During the discussion around transitions the Board noted that the effectiveness of RSSs is undermined through ineffective transition. Challenges faced by RSSs include lack of parental engagement with the process, the impossibility of changing everything that highly complex students present, and capturing the learning that occurs in 'non-academic' areas such as improved living skills. Foundational to a good transition is that the student is in a 'better space'. Students leaving RSSs need to be monitored for at least a year in order to measure the success of the RSS placement.

IWS and RSSs need to agree on what effective transition looks like in practice and clearly define responsibilities and roles of each partner in the IWS/RSS relationship. The current transition models which are different for each school need clarification. If IWS is responsible for transition, its role may be compromised where one school takes on more of the transition process than that outlined in the agreement. On the other hand, if transition cannot be delivered effectively by IWS alone, the success of RSS as an intervention strategy is compromised.

Transition needs to be discussed further with the MOE and IWS. This discussion should focus on 'relationships and change'. The current model is not working for RSSs and the schools need to know what can be changed. One possible option is that both schools could share one transition team.

Action: Board members to email suggested amendments to the draft letter on transitions, to John Langley.

Student Advocates at Halswell Residential College, [redacted] and [redacted] joined the Board for lunch. The advocates are volunteers who work across the three villas and interact with students in a variety of ways. They meet with the principal on a monthly basis and email urgent concerns between meetings. Their work enables the College to capture student voice and gain a sense of student wellbeing. Students benefit from being able to share concerns with someone outside the College staff.

## **8. Audit and Risk Sub-committee Update Part 2**

### **Board Core Roles**

The second row of the table presented [secretarial roles] has already been approved. The principle behind the development of this table was to facilitate efficiency in invoicing.

*Simon Buckland moved that the Board approve the Board Core Roles and associated costs for 2015. Seconded Manu Sione. Carried.*

### **Principals' Appraisals**

*Simon Buckland moved that the Board accept Paul Kennedy's costs for completing the principals' appraisals this year. Seconded David Ivory. Carried.*

David Ivory suggested that the Board become more intentional in its thinking as a good employer. The Board could nurture its principals through proactive conversations that focus on positive recognition of each principal's work, especially where work was particularly demanding or was beyond the normal scope of duty. The Board agreed to trial this concept and discussed potential risks around these conversations especially in the unique situation where one Board supports two principals. Further discussion was around whether these conversations should include the staff representative. As the staff representative changes over time, this decision would be better reached on a case by case basis with the principals.

Action: David Ivory to draft narrative guidelines outlining how proactive conversations between the Board and principals would progress.

### **Sleepover Clause Update**

The process is going smoothly. Dennis Finn is working with Myra Mains to meet sign off on the agreement with existing staff.



## 9. Principals' Reports

### ***Westbridge Residential School***

Take it as read.

Myra Mains highlighted concerns around the low number of enrolments.

Comments and questions raised:

1. In future reports include the full name and roles of individuals named in the report.
2. Graphs should be large enough to be easily read. **Note:** This comment applies to all graphs presented in Board notes/and or papers.
3. The Physical Intervention Summary has some inaccuracies. Under the data for Term 4, 2014, the total number of residential students should be the number of students on the school roll.
4. The Board acknowledged the good evidence around accelerated learning.
5. How does the evidence around accelerated learning show that Westbridge is offering a service beyond what would be achieved in a mainstream school?

While these students are capable learners, their behaviours are a barrier to learning in mainstream schools. They are on highly structured behavioural programmes and have to meet strict criteria with respect to behavioural and social goals. The Board noted that this information could be presented in addition to academic achievement. The inclusion of this information presents a more holistic picture of student achievement and gives a clearer picture of the value Westbridge adds to student education. The behavioural and social goals could also be included in the 2016 Charter.

6. When Westbridge cuts down the pine trees, the wood could be used to make breadboards to be used as gifts for stakeholders.
7. Does the Board need to be aware of any significant risk regarding the sexual incident?

No.



8. How do you want to progress the checklist for the ERO review? Has ERO identified a review date?

ERO has not identified the review date. Myra Mains will look at Halswell's self-audit checklist and other pre-visit ERO documentation. It was noted that Westbridge should also highlight the transition issues with ERO.

The Board meeting date in June may need to change to accommodate ERO's request to meet with the full Board.

Action: Myra Mains to identify who is on the ERO team, confirm a review date preferably between 8 and 11 June, identify a date when ERO can expect documentation from Westbridge and inform the Board of the scheduled plan for documentation.

Action: Myra Mains to circulate draft ERO documents to the Board via email or courier if there are several attachments, preferably aiming for the May meeting but at the least to allow the Board one week to read the documents.

Action: Lois Chick to inform the Board of changes in meeting dates that may occur as a result of the ERO review at Westbridge and/or the projected strategic meeting with MOE and IWS.

*Myra Mains moved the approval of the Westbridge Residential School Principal's Report. Seconded David Ivory. Carried.*

### **Halswell Residential College**

Take it as read.

Janine Harrington drew the Board's attention to the minutes from the Student Council monthly meetings and highlighted how this process provides another means of capturing the student voice.

### **The Board moved into committee to discuss personnel.**

On moving out of committee the Board requested that Janine Harrington inform the staff involved of the outcome.

Action: Janine Harrington to follow up appointments with staff involved.

Comments and questions raised:

1. What is the College doing to manage the number of sexual incidents around this one student?

We are working with IWS, who will provide an expert to train staff on how to set a behaviour regime in place as well as how to communicate with this student. The student appears to be functioning at 17 years of age and is being assessed by a speech language therapist to confirm his level of functioning. We will follow up with IWS once this assessment is completed, as his enrolment goals may need to be amended. We are confident that we can continue to work with IWS around this student.

9(2)(a) - possible identifying information

2. How does the presence of this student affect the other students?

The other students appear to have accepted this student and look after him.

3. Is it possible to future proof by lodging a special request with the PSA for appropriate allowances to cover this aspect of the work?

We do not know how long this particular student will be enrolled at the College, however a request could be lodged with the PSA at the upcoming meeting for principals regarding the new PSA collective.

Action: Janine Harrington to lodge a special request with the PSA around provision of allowances at the upcoming principals' meeting.

4. The detail around the reporting of 'low level' sexual incidents is sufficient for the Board. While the incidents do not come under the reportable events in the school policy, the frequency of 'low level' incidents in this case indicate a trend that should be monitored.

5. Is there extra resourcing available for this student through IWS?

Yes. The College has asked for a full time teacher assistant who can take sole responsibility for this student.

6. Does the student who was involved in incident 3 under the "Self-Harm" category present a suicide risk?

Our on-site psychologist is quite confident that this student is not at risk of suicide.

7. Please provide further details around the status of the co-ed enrolment that was identified as a risk in the risk analysis.

The Ministry declined our application and said they would get back to us at a later date.

In discussion around this question, the Board noted that it has not yet received a copy of the Ministry's response to the objections raised by Salisbury. In addition, it has not received feedback to its request for additional funding to cover the extra costs incurred around enrolling a limited number of girls. The Board needs to discuss this with the MOE.

8. The Board commented on the quality and usefulness of the newsletter and queried whether Westbridge could create a comparable product.

The majority of Westbridge students are CYFS students and the school does not have permission to publish full face photographs which makes production of an external newsletter challenging.

9. What is the status of the draft annual report and did Christchurch City Council reimburse the College for rate payments?

The draft annual report is a work in process. The College did receive reimbursements for rates paid over the previous six years.

10. The Board discussed ways of increasing stakeholder goodwill by offering the school grounds for intergenerational community events such as Christmas caroling.



*Janine Harrington moved the approval of the Halswell Residential College Principal's Report. Seconded Myra Mains. Carried.*

## **10. Additional Administration**

### **Correspondence**

*Lois Chick moved the receipt of the inward public correspondence and approval of the outward correspondence. Seconded Simon Buckland. Carried.*

**The Board moved into committee to discuss correspondence relating to personnel.**

On moving out of committee the Board identified the need for further information around staffing at both schools.

Action: Janine Harrington to give Simon Buckland a copy of the work completed around staffing that she has prepared for NZSTA.

Action: Myra Mains to ask \_\_\_\_\_ to give Simon Buckland a copy of the organisational chart [excluding teachers], roles, and salaries for non-teaching staff at Westbridge.

### **Proposed meeting with Peter Hughes**

No response to a request for a meeting with Peter Hughes has been received yet. This meeting, when scheduled, will be attended by two or three members of the Board. Manu Sione volunteered to attend.

Action: Janine Harrington to follow up with Peter Hughes' secretary.

### **Proposed meeting with MOE and IWS**

The following items were identified as topics for consideration at the proposed meeting with David Wales, Brian Coffey and David Pluck:

- Update on current thinking.
- Identification of the material issues RSSs are facing in the current situation.
- Presentation and discussion of the transition paper developed by the Curriculum and Delivery Sub-committee.
- Status of the funding model.
- Co-education at HRC.
- Provision of separate funding for the girls at HRC.

- Feedback around the MOE responses [copy of the briefing paper to the Minister] to the Salisbury objections.
- Confirmation of roll at Westbridge.
- Enrolment procedures and lack of information.
- Update on actions identified in previous minutes from the July 2014 meeting.
- Consideration of the evidence around good intervention, ie number of students, ages of students etc.

Action: Lois Chick to schedule a meeting with David Wales, Brian Coffey and David Pluck.

Action: Lois Chick to draw up an agenda and circulate to the Board for feedback prior to sending it to David Wales, Brian Coffey and David Pluck.

### ***Exit Interview***

Jon Purdue tabled a draft *exit interview* for staff leaving the two schools.

The Board requested that the word "excellence" be replaced with the words "quality learning" and that typos are corrected [unnecessary question mark, spelling of manager]. The Board agreed to trial the interview and asked each principal to develop a process for completing the exit interviews and provide feedback on data collected, to the Board on a quarterly basis.

Action: Jon Purdue to amend the exit interview by replacing the word "excellence" in the last statement with "quality learning" and ensure typos are corrected.

Action: Both principals to report back to the Board on data gathered via exit interviews, on a quarterly basis.

### ***Minutes of the Previous Meeting***

Matters arising out of previous minutes have been addressed.

*Lois Chick moved that the minutes of the meeting dated 2 March 2015 be confirmed as a true and correct record. Seconded David Ivory. Carried.*

### ***Sub-committee Minutes***

The Board discussed the need for a mechanism for storage of papers [digital/hardcopy] generated through sub-committee work. As sub-committee minutes feed into the Board minutes, it was decided that the sub-committee minutes should be stored where they can be accessed by both schools.

Action: Sub-committee Chairs to email signed copies of sub-committee minutes to the Board Secretary.

Action : to save sub-committee minutes to the 'cloud'.

The meeting finished at 3:40 PM.

---

**LOIS CHICK  
CHAIRPERSON,  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

---

**JANINE HARRINGTON  
PRINCIPAL,  
HALSWELL RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE**

---

**MYRA MAINS  
PRINCIPAL,  
WESTBRIDGE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL**



