

FUTURE SCHOOLING PROVISION FOR NORTH PORIRUA, AOTEA

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT REPORT

22 SEPTEMBER 2017



PREPARED FOR: MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

PREPARED BY: DR GABRIELLE WALL, D & G CONSULTING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive summary..... | 3 |
| Introduction | 6 |
| Engagement process | 8 |
| Objective | 8 |
| Scope..... | 8 |
| Stakeholders | 8 |
| Engagement methodology and participants | 9 |
| Phase One | 9 |
| Phase Two | 10 |
| Findings | 13 |
| Phase One | 13 |
| Phase Two | 16 |
| Methodology and limitations..... | 20 |
| Conclusion | 23 |
| Appendix A. Demographic breakdown for connections with schooling | 24 |

FUTURE SCHOOLING PROVISION FOR NORTH PORIRUA, AOTEA

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The North Porirua area schooling network currently consists of 11 schools: one secondary (Year 9-13), one contributing primary (Year 1-6) and nine full primary (Year 1-8). While there is growth across much of North Porirua, the southern area of North Porirua in particular is experiencing significant population growth due to the Aotea block development.

The Ministry contracted an independent facilitator to carry out a community engagement process in North Porirua, and this document reports on the findings from the engagement process. The process first involved collecting opinions from stakeholders about two preliminary options as well as any additional 'write-in' solutions. After reviewing and analysing all feedback, a second phase of stakeholder feedback commenced, involving an online survey with revised options for additional schooling provision.

109 feedback forms were returned during the first engagement phase, and 607 usable responses were received during the second engagement phase. Stakeholder groups that provided feedback included parents, students, school staff and principals, boards of trustees, and members of the wider North Porirua community.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following themes emerged as important to the majority of participants across stakeholder groups:

- **Community identity**, where children have a local primary school option in their local neighbourhood, ideally one that is in walking or scootering distance. Additionally, where the community can build a relationship with a local school, including use of certain resources. Participants pointed out that establishing more roading and walkways could assist with this.
- **Reduce growing roll pressures of primary schools:** While participants had multiple views on the best means to do so, all participants wanted the solution to help reduce the roll pressures facing North Porirua schools.
- **Long-term planning:** Participants recognised the increasing populations and limited capacity of North Porirua schools, and wanted to make sure whatever course of action is ultimately determined will be a long-term solution, properly accounting for the growth trends of the area.

- **Safe, age-appropriate learning environments for Year 7 - 8 students:** Some participants expressed concerns about younger students being negatively pressured or influenced by older students in a Year 7 – 13 setting. Additionally, there was a strong desire to maintain leadership development opportunities for 7-8 year students, particularly through mentoring of younger students.

FIRST PHASE OF ENGAGEMENT

- **Option 1** (changing Aotea College to Years 7 – 13, and changing some or all primary schools to Years 1 - 6) was opposed by the majority of participants. The key reason this option was disliked was because participants did not want Year 7-8 students being in the same environment as older students, due to a perceived risk that they could be exposed to negative influences, substances or behaviour.
- **Option 2** (creating a new primary school or satellite campus for Papakowhai in Aotea) received mixed but positive overall feedback. Participants generally viewed this as a potential solution that addresses the long-term needs of the area, and that is in line with the themes listed above. Many participants, however, expressed the need for further details about the different possibilities within this option before fully endorsing it.
- **Enforcing zoning:** Many participants listed stricter enforcement of zoning as a write-in option, believing doing so would solve the growing roll pressures facing many North Porirua schools. It was conveyed as part of the second phase of engagement that while this would address capacity issues for some schools in the short term, a longer-term solution would be needed in conjunction with improved management of out-of-zone numbers.
- **Middle school:** A number of participants raised the possibility of creating a Year 7 - 10 middle school (though some who raised the idea did not actually endorse it), citing its effectiveness in other parts of New Zealand and overseas. Participants listed different structures for this provision option, and a middle schooling option was included in the four options tested in the second phase of the engagement.

SECOND PHASE OF ENGAGEMENT

Respondents were asked to indicate their degree of preference for four main options for provision, which were selected based on the feedback received in phase one:

Option 1: Change the year levels of Aotea College to Year 7 - 13 and establish a new Year 1 - 6 primary school. For this option to be viable, a number of schools would need to agree to change their provision to Year 1 – 6.

Option 2: Establish a new Year 1 - 8 primary school, and change enrolment zones to create a zone for the new school.

Option 3: Establish a second campus of Papakowhai School and change enrolment zones to create a zone for Papakowhai that included the second campus and its surrounding areas.

Option 4: Change the year levels of Aotea College to Years 7 – 13, and create a Year 7 – 10 middle school campus and a Year 11 – 13 senior secondary campus on the current Aotea College site. A number of primary schools would change to Year 1 - 6.

Option 2 received the highest average rating of the four options, while Options 1 and 4 had the lowest average ratings. There were statistically significant differences in response depending on respondent type for three of the four options, with parents and community members rating Option 2 higher than other groups, while students rated it lower. Board members rated Option 3 significantly lower than other groups, while former students rated Option 4 significantly lower than other groups. Option 2 was rated lower by those affiliated with Aotea College than by those affiliated with other schools. Option 3 was rated significantly lower by respondents from Rangikura School, and significantly higher by respondents from Paremata School.

Respondents were then asked to rank nine sub-options for provision, which specified extra details for the three of the four main options, such as geographic location or divisions of students among different campuses. The two highest ranked options were a new Year 1 – 8 primary school located on a new site in the south of the Aotea development, and a new Year 1 – 8 primary school located on/near the Aotea College site. The two location options for a geographically organised second campus of Papakowhai School were the next two most preferred options. The variations of Option 1 and 4 were the least preferred options.

Students ranked both the new primary sub-options and the two age-grouped second campus options lower than the other respondent groups. Respondents affiliated with Aotea College and Rangikura School ranked both the new primary sub-options lower than the other respondent groups. In contrast, Rangikura ranked the middle schooling option significantly higher than respondents affiliated with other schools.

Respondents were able to submit further comments as the final question of the survey. Three emails were received relating to the survey which were analysed alongside the other comments. Many of the themes present in the first phase of engagement were also present in the survey comment analysis, with respondents expressing a strong desire to retain Year 7 – 8 students in the primary network and emphasising the importance of geographically convenient primary schooling.

INTRODUCTION

The North Porirua area schooling network currently consists of 11 schools, as shown in Table 1 below: one secondary (Year 9-13), one contributing primary (Year 1-6) and nine full primary (Year 1-8).

TABLE 1. NORTHERN PORIRUA SCHOOLING NETWORK

| School name | Type |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Aotea College | Secondary (Year 9 – 13) |
| St. Theresa's School | Contributing (Year 1 – 6) |
| Adventure School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |
| Discovery School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |
| Paremata School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |
| Papakowhai School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |
| Pauatahanui School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |
| Plimmerton School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |
| Postgate School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |
| Pukerua Bay School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |
| Rangikura School | Full primary (Year 1 – 8) |

While there is growth across much of North Porirua, the southern area of North Porirua in particular is experiencing significant population growth due to the Aotea block development. Population projections for school-aged children and young people indicate that growth due to this development will continue through to approximately 2025, and that primary-aged student numbers will exceed the capacity available in some of the North Porirua primary schools in the short term.

There is sufficient secondary capacity at Aotea College, which is currently undergoing a redevelopment and the design allows for expanded capacity in the future. Population growth from the Aotea block development is disproportionately impacting nearby schools, particularly Papakowhai School.

Papakowhai School

Papakowhai School is facing the most significant pressure to its roll, since it is currently the most convenient primary school for residents of the Aotea area, both due to its proximity and due to the lack of roading infrastructure easily connecting Aotea to other primary schools in the area. All options for additional schooling provision being considered would relieve the pressure on Papakowhai, as they would provide a more convenient option for residents of Aotea, and / or would remove Year 7 – 8 students from the school.

Rangikura School

Rangikura School has seen significant roll increases in recent years. The lack of a geographic enrolment zone has contributed to a roll that includes a significant number of students who live outside the school's catchment. In March 2017, 189 of its 407 students resided out of the school's catchment. Over 90% of these students lived outside the immediate North Porirua area, and so an enrolment scheme has the short-term potential to reduce pressure on Rangikura School's capacity and on capacity within the North Porirua area. Rangikura School is currently in the process of developing an enrolment scheme which will enable greater control of enrolments. The zone includes the area of the Aotea block currently under development, and so students enrolling in Rangikura from within this area will continue to have an ongoing impact on the school roll.

While some of the ongoing projected growth in North Porirua can be accommodated with existing or increased capacity in the current North Porirua primary schools, the existing schools with capacity to grow are not well geographically located to provide convenient geographic access for families residing in the Aotea block development.

This engagement process sought to engage with the North Porirua community to understand both their short and longer term aspirations for education provision. The outcomes of this engagement process will inform the Minister's decision on additional schooling provision for North Porirua, as well as informing the development of an area strategy plan that will outline an approach to proactively and sustainably managing capacity across the North Porirua area in the medium – long term.

ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the engagement process was to obtain representative participation across stakeholder groups. This was achieved through proactively identifying and communicating with stakeholders regarding engagement opportunities, and by providing two phases of engagement to increase participation and provide additional information as requested by various stakeholders.

SCOPE

The Ministry of Education initially contracted an independent consultant to develop and facilitate an engagement process that would engage the wider community on their aspirations for future education provision in the North Porirua area. This phase involved a series of face-to-face and public meetings at which information about the network and population projections were shared. Feedback was also sought on three possible options for additional schooling provision.

After feedback forms were returned from the first phase, the Ministry of Education then contracted a further independent consultant to analyse submissions received in the first phase. As a result of this analysis, further options were raised which required testing with the community, and a second phase of engagement was carried out. This consisted of an online survey that requested feedback on a set of four revised options for additional schooling provision.

STAKEHOLDERS

The different stakeholder groups that were targeted through the engagement process were:

- Students
- Parents
- School staff and principals
- School boards of trustees
- Iwi
- Members of the wider North Porirua community

ENGAGEMENT METHODOLOGY AND PARTICIPANTS

PHASE ONE

PROVISION OPTIONS

In phase one of the engagement, stakeholders were provided with forms that asked for their opinions on three options for schooling provision:

Option 1: Strengthen provision at Aotea College, by changing some or all of the northern area primary schools to Year 1-6 and creating Year 7-13 provision at Aotea College.

Option 2: Provision for Year 1-8, either by creating a new primary school or by creating a second campus of Papakowhai School to meet growth in the Aotea Block. This could be located either:

- On a new site in the south of the Aotea Development, or
- At or near Aotea College

Option 3: Other options the community may identify in response to this initial feedback round.

PARTICIPANTS

In the first phase of the engagement, 109 total feedback forms were received from a variety of stakeholder groups across North Porirua, as shown in Table 2 below. Participants were asked to provide feedback on two options for schooling provision, and were also able to propose additional options for consideration (framed as Option 3). A number of participants also used the form to ask for additional information on the network, or on one or more of the specific options.

TABLE 2. PHASE ONE PARTICIPATION

| Stakeholder Group | Response Count | Submission Details |
|-------------------|----------------|---|
| Board of Trustees | 8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rangikura individual board member responses (6)• Papakowhai & Aotea College collective responses (2) |
| Schools | 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discovery, Paremata, Plimmerton & Pukerua Bay collective responses (4) |
| Staff | 22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rangikura individual responses (21)• Aotea College collective responses (1) |
| Students | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rangikura individual responses (13)• Paremata & Aotea College collective responses (2)• Unattributed response (1) |
| Parents | 51 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Individual responses (51) |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| Community | 8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual responses (6) • Aotea Residents' Association & Aotea College collective responses (2) |
|-----------|---|---|

PHASE TWO

PROVISION OPTIONS

The feedback and new ideas generated through the first phase of the engagement were collated into an online survey, which was then distributed for completion. The analysis of phase one responses (detailed in the subsequent section) made it possible to identify which options and ideas had a wider base of support.

In the second phase of the engagement, respondents were first asked to indicate their degree of preference for four main options for provision, which were selected based on the feedback received in phase one and on follow-up research to determine different suggested options' feasibility. These options were:

Option 1: Change the year levels of Aotea College to Year 7 - 13 and establish a new Year 1 - 6 primary school. For this option to be viable, a number of schools would need to agree to change their provision to Year 1 – 6.

Option 2: Establish a new Year 1 - 8 primary school, and change enrolment zones to create a zone for the new school.

Option 3: Establish a second campus of Papakowhai School and change enrolment zones to create a zone for Papakowhai that included the second campus and its surrounding areas.

Option 4: Change the year levels of Aotea College to Years 7 – 13, and create a Year 7 – 10 middle school campus and a Year 11 – 13 senior secondary campus on the current Aotea College site. A number of primary schools would change to Year 1 - 6.

Respondents were then asked to rank nine sub-options for provision (detailed in the following section), which specified extra details for three of the four main options, such as geographic location or divisions of students among different campuses. This second component was important, as in the first phase some respondents expressed support for certain provision options, but strong opposition to the same option if it were executed in certain ways, such as at a specific location.

RESPONDENTS

There were 607 usable responses to the survey (for data cleaning methodology, refer to the methodology and limitations section of this report beginning on page 20). The introduction to the survey provided a summary of the first phase of the engagement and outlined the four main options being presented for feedback.

Respondents were then asked to indicate their connection with schooling in the North Porirua area, as shown in Tables 3 and 4. Respondents were able to select all options which applied to them, hence there being a larger number of responses than the total number of individuals who completed the survey.

TABLE 3. PHASE TWO PARTICIPATION

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Parent / Caregiver | 67.7% | 411 |
| Education-related employee | 13.3% | 81 |
| Student in North Porirua area | 20.3% | 123 |
| Former North Porirua area student | 8.9% | 54 |
| Board of Trustees member or former member | 2.5% | 15 |
| Community member | 15.3% | 93 |
| Other (please specify) | 1.8% | 11 |

The largest group of respondents selected parent as an option, with student the next most commonly selected option (see Appendix A for full breakdown of all respondent groups). Of those who selected parent, parents at Discovery School submitted the highest number of responses (72, 17.5% of parent responses), followed by parents of children at an ECE provider in North Porirua (68; 16.5% of parent responses). Adventure School was also highly represented in parent responses (65; 15.8% of parent responses).

Employees at Aotea College and a school outside the North Porirua area were the most commonly selected options for education-related employees, with each receiving 15 (18.5%) responses, followed by employees at Papakowhai School (14; 17.3%). The overwhelming majority of student responses were from students at Aotea College (122; 99.2%), with former students also identifying strongly with Aotea College (25; 46.3%).

Responses for each of the five school-affiliated response options (parent, employee, student, former student and board of trustees member) were aggregated to obtain the frequency of affiliation with each of the 11 schools in the North Porirua network, as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4. PHASE TWO PARTICIPATION BY SCHOOL AFFILIATION

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Adventure School | 11.5% | 83 |
| Aotea College | 29.1% | 210 |
| Discovery School | 13.7% | 99 |
| Papakowhai School | 12.6% | 91 |
| Paremata School | 7.2% | 52 |
| Pauatahanui School | 1.2% | 9 |
| Plimmerton School | 10.5% | 76 |
| Postgate School | 2.9% | 21 |
| Pukerua Bay School | 2.1% | 15 |
| Rangikura School | 5.0% | 36 |
| St Theresa's School, Plimmerton | 4.0% | 29 |

The largest group of respondents was associated with Aotea College, in part due to the large number of Aotea College students who responded to the survey. This was followed by Discovery, Papakowhai and Adventure Schools.

FINDINGS

PHASE ONE

The three strongest themes that emerged during the first phase of engagement were the universal understanding of the growth in rolls and pressure on capacity, the importance of local schools for strengthening local communities, and the desire to keep existing primary schools operating in their current form (Year 1 – 8 full primaries).

Most participants believed some new schooling provision located within Aotea would address all three of these themes, though they expressed a variety of opinions for the specific form of this provision. Within the theme of local schools and community, many participants spoke of the importance of a provision option that allows the children of the Aotea block to walk or bike to school, without crossing any major roads.

Many participants also believed stricter enforcement of zoning (and creating a zone for Rangikura School), increasing the capacity of existing schools, and creating more roadways linking areas in North Porirua (particularly Aotea) would help alleviate roll pressures. Some believed these actions would be sufficient as long-term solutions, while others thought they should occur in conjunction with some form of new schooling provision.

Table 5 below provides a brief analysis of each stakeholder group's overall impressions, and lists additional options submitted by multiple participants within that stakeholder group.

TABLE 5. STAKEHOLDER GROUPS' OVERALL IMPRESSIONS IN PHASE ONE

| Group | Overall Impression | Write-in Options |
|-------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Board of Trustees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to support either option, at least as presented, with such limited information provided. Predominantly in favour of enforcing zoning, believing it would do much to ease roll pressures. | Zoning Year 7-10 school |
| School | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adamantly opposed to Option 1, split interest in Option 2. They believe it is imperative that primary schools retain their Year 7-8 students. They also believe zoning enforcement is important, even if not sufficient for the long-term needs. They believe the Aotea community should have its own primary school. | Zoning Year 7-10 school |

| Group | Overall Impression | Write-in Options |
|----------|--|--|
| Staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not want the solution to affect the culture of their school. • They firmly believe Year 7-8 students should be at primary school, for the benefit of the younger children, the school, and the older students themselves. • They are strongly opposed to Option 1. Some like Option two, but there is some scepticism. Most believe zoning would be the best solution. • They're confident that Rangikura School's roll pressures aren't due to Aotea children, but due to East Porirua students choosing Rangikura, leaving other East Porirua schools with surplus capacity. | <p>Zoning</p> <p>Increase existing schools' capacity</p> |
| Students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not like either option. They are very happy with their current set ups and don't want that disrupted. • If Option 1 were chosen, students strongly believe that the Year 7 - 8 students would be pressured by the older children to do drugs, and that the Year 5 - 6 students would lose invaluable mentors. • They are also concerned about the environment, and the pollution a new school would cause to the soil and water. • Most want solutions involving rezoning and increasing the capacity of existing schools. | <p>Zoning</p> <p>Increase existing schools' capacity, and create two-storey classrooms</p> |
| Parents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adamantly opposed to option 1. Nearly all want their Year 7-8 students to stay part of primary school, and firmly believe children at this age are not ready to interact with teenagers. • Like smaller schools/classrooms more than large ones. • Parents understand Aotea's population is growing massively, so understand the provision of a new school as a long-term solution that would ease other schools' roll pressures. • Parents inside Aotea want their own school, and parents outside Aotea want their schools | <p>Zoning</p> <p>Year 7-10 school</p> <p>Year 7-8 school</p> |

| Group | Overall Impression | Write-in Options |
|-----------|---|-----------------------|
| | unaffected, which they see happening through Option 2. | |
| Community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favour of Option 2 (new school). The community cares most about having a local school that they can access via active transport, and can build a local community around. | Zoning 7-10 School |

Option 1, creating year 7 - 13 provision at Aotea College and changing primary schools to year 1 - 6, was generally opposed by all stakeholder groups. The stated rationale for rejecting this option was participants' belief that Year 7-8 students should remain at full primary schools, away from older students, and where they can continue to experience leadership opportunities and provide role models or mentors for younger students. The following quotes illustrate the majority view of Option 1:

“Year 7 and 8 students can be easily bullied and taken advantage of for older secondary school students. This option seems to place cost ahead of student welfare.”

“Denies students leadership opportunities and pastoral support that Full Primary Schools provide at the crucially important developmental years of 7 & 8. This is an important issue – it is a key reason we chose a Full Primary School for our children.”

“Papakowhai School has an excellent record of producing school leaders. This stems from the development of leadership skills at year 7 and 8 through the Whanau Leaders and other programmes. I don't think it would be as useful at a year 6 level.”

Option 2, creating either a new primary school or a second campus of Papakowhai School that is situated in Aotea, received a more positive response from participants. More participants signalled their support for a new school compared to a second campus of Papakowhai School, though many participants indicated that they believed both options were worth exploring further. Additionally, some participants wanted more information about the implications of this option before indicating supporting (or otherwise). The following quotes illustrate most participants' view of Option 2:

“It caters for future development as opposed to looking at the here and now situation.”

“Builds a stronger sense of community – children who have grown up on the same street will go to the same school.”

“Satellite and new school are not the same option... Option 2 should really be split into two options. How would the satellite schools function?... If we made new school, would zoning be enforced?”

“I feel [a new primary school] addresses all the existing issues around capacity at existing schools, while providing Aotea families with a local school option.”

While most respondents wished for Year 7 - 8 students to remain part of primary schools, there were a number of participants wishing to explore the option of a new Year 7 - 10 middle school. Some of the stakeholders who proposed the idea ultimately did not endorse it as their preferred option, but thought it warranted consideration. The following quotes illustrate such participants' thoughts about a middle school option:

“Keeps primary school rolls and property requirements manageable whilst giving the region’s education a new and exciting look that may stop some of the flight into town. It will also be an opportunity to focus on middle schooling, which has seen both Hamilton/Auckland get middle schooling provision.”

“Groups kids of a similar age, which is often too old for primary school but too young for secondary. Would be less disruptive to the college, but also provide a smooth feeder. May disrupt Primary schools still (pulling 7/8 years), and doesn't solve problem of Aotea not having a local primary school. Also causes more transitions.”

PHASE TWO

Following analysis of the feedback received, the second phase of the engagement provided information (where possible) in response to participant queries, and requested feedback on four main options for additional schooling provision. Survey respondents were initially asked to indicate their connections with schooling in North Porirua, and were then asked to indicate their degree of preference for the four main options. Respondents rated each option independently on a scale of 1 - 10, with 10 being strongly in favour of the option, and 1 being strongly opposed to the option. Table 6 below shows the overall results.

TABLE 6. PREFERRED MAIN OPTION

| Answer Options | Average rating | Standard deviation |
|--|----------------|--------------------|
| Option 1: Change the year levels of Aotea College to Year 7 - 13 and establish a new Year 1 - 6 primary school. For this option to be viable, a number of schools would need to agree to change their provision to Year 1 – 6. | 3.28 | 2.82 |
| Option 2: Establish a new Year 1 - 8 primary school, and change enrolment zones to create a zone for the new school. | 7.67 | 3.07 |
| Option 3: Establish a second campus of Papakowhai School and change enrolment zones to create a zone for Papakowhai that included the second campus and its surrounding areas. | 5.19 | 2.87 |
| Option 4: Change the year levels of Aotea College to Years 7 – 13, and create a Year 7 – 10 middle school campus and a Year 11 – 13 senior secondary campus on the current Aotea College site. A number of primary schools would change to Year 1 - 6. | 3.68 | 3.08 |

Table 6 shows that Option 2 had the highest average rating of the four options, with 57% of respondents scoring the option a 9 or 10. Options 1 and 4 had the lowest average ratings, at 3.28 and 3.68 respectively.

There were statistically significant differences in response depending on respondent type for three of the four options, with Option 1 the only option with no significant differences. Parents and community members rated Option 2 significantly higher than other groups, while students rated it significantly lower ($F(5, 580) = 19.73, p < .05$). Board members rated Option 3 significantly lower than other groups, while former students rated Option 4 significantly lower than other groups ($F(5, 571) = 4.37, p < .05$; $F(5, 581) = 2.49, p < .05$).

Ratings by school affiliation were also compared, and statistically significant differences were identified for Options 2 and 3. Option 2 was rated significantly lower by those affiliated with Aotea College than by those affiliated with other schools ($F(10, 484) = 9.36, p < .05$). However, this is likely because students rated this option lower than other demographic groups, and the majority of Aotea College responses were from students. Option 3 was rated significantly lower by respondents from Rangikura School, and significantly higher by respondents from Paremata School ($F(10, 479) = 2.38, p < .05$).

These four main options were then broken into nine more detailed sub-options, which survey respondents were asked to rank in preferential order, with their first choice receiving a ranking of '1', their second choice '2' and so on. By asking these first two questions sequentially, respondents were able to prioritise their choices for the more specific forms of each provision without diluting their ranking for the main options. As Option 4 did not have additional sub-options, the main option was repeated in this list so that preferences for the options could be easily compared.

As shown in Table 7, the two highest ranked options (a lower value indicates a higher ranking) were the two options relating to a new Year 1 – 8 primary school. The Aotea development location received higher ranking (and therefore a smaller average value) than the Aotea College location (2.59 cf. 2.94). 68% of respondents ranked a Year 1 – 8 school located in the Aotea development as their first or second preferred option, and 61% of respondents ranked a Year 1 – 8 school on/near Aotea College in their top two options. Only 5% of respondents ranked these options as one of their two least preferred options.

The two options for a geographically organised second campus of Papakowhai School were the next two most preferred options. The variations of Option 1 and 4 were the least preferred options.

TABLE 7. PREFERRED SUB- OPTION

| Answer Options | Average ranking | Standard deviation |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|
| Change Aotea College to Year 7 - 13 and establish a Year 1 - 6 primary school located on/near Aotea College site | 6.41 | 2.71 |
| Change Aotea College to Year 7 - 13 and establish a Year 1 - 6 primary school located in the south of the Aotea development | 6.15 | 2.26 |
| Establish a new Year 1 – 8 primary school located on/near Aotea College site | 2.94 | 2.13 |
| Establish a new Year 1 – 8 primary school located on a new site in the south of the Aotea development | 2.59 | 2.16 |
| Establish a second campus of Papakowhai School on/near Aotea College site, and organise students geographically (e.g. both campuses offer Year 1 – 8) | 4.52 | 1.87 |
| Establish a second campus of Papakowhai School on/near Aotea College site, and organise students by age (e.g. Year 1 – 4 junior campus and Year 5 – 8 senior campus) | 5.41 | 1.82 |
| Establish a second campus of Papakowhai School on a new site in the south of the Aotea development, and organise students geographically (e.g. both campuses offer Year 1 – 8) | 4.59 | 1.95 |
| Establish a second campus of Papakowhai School on a new site in the south of the Aotea development, and organise students by age (e.g. Year 1 – 4 junior campus and Year 5 – 8 senior campus) | 5.62 | 2.19 |
| Change Aotea College to Year 7 - 13 and establish a Year 7 - 10 middle school campus and a Year 11 - 13 senior secondary campus on the current Aotea College site | 6.29 | 2.89 |

There were significant differences in response based on respondent type for the two new primary sub-options, and the age-grouped second campus sub-options. Students ranked both the new primary sub-options lower than the other respondent groups (Aotea College: $F(5, 481) = 7.91, p < .05$; Aotea development: $F(5, 482) = 3.61, p < .05$). They also ranked both the age-grouped second campus options lower than other groups (Aotea College: $F(5, 444) = 2.38, p < .05$; Aotea development: $F(5, 454) = 4.52, p < .05$).

Rankings differed by school affiliation for the two new primary sub-options and the middle schooling option. Respondents affiliated with Aotea College and Rangikura School ranked both the new primary sub-options lower than the other respondent groups (Aotea College: $F(10, 391) = 5.75, p < .05$; Aotea development: $F(10, 391) = 4.62, p < .05$). In contrast, Rangikura ranked the middle schooling option significantly higher than respondents affiliated with other schools ($F(10, 410) = 2.47, p < .05$).

Respondents were able to submit further comments in the survey form. Three emails were received relating to the survey which were analysed alongside the other comments. Many of the

themes present in the first phase of engagement were also present in the survey comment analysis, with respondents expressing a strong desire to retain Year 7 – 8 students in the primary network:

“Really feel the existing schools stay year 1 to 8”

“Strong preference to not change existing year 1-8 schools, changing to year 1-6 would be very disruptive.”

“Year 7-8 should stay with primary, this is when students can develop leadership skills and have nice working relationships with the junior school. Attaching them to a secondary school means they are exposed to more adult behaviours and themes earlier. Don't get opportunities for leadership which come naturally between 10-13 years. I've seen all options in my ten years teaching and feel full primary is the best option.”

Alternatively, some respondents expressed this as a strong desire to keep Year 7 – 8s out of the secondary network. Representative comments of this viewpoint are:

“I think building a new school from yr 1-8 in Aotea is a long term solution that is needed within the community that doesn't disturb a child's ability to a full primary school education nurturing both relationships between younger and older students and vice versa that promotes healthy leadership and also supports younger children in fostering their connections with older children and the community. I strongly oppose starting children at the college earlier or a middle school which is untested in New Zealand on it's merits and pitfalls to our children.”

“We should keep Aotea College as year 9 to 13 school as many year 7 and 8 will learn early and get involved in drugs and alcohol at a young age and it will not be fair on the year 7 and 8.”

“I believe that yr 1-8 and 9-13 students should be separate, younger students tend to be disruptive to the learning environment and as a senior student it would possibly impact my studies.”

This is consistent with overall ratings and rankings of the new primary school options and second campus options.

Other themes which arose through the comment analysis were a desire to know a definite location in the south of the Aotea development, and to develop solutions for addressing capacity pressures for other schools in the North Porirua network. This included ensuring that any additional schooling provision did not adversely affect the rolls of existing schools. Some respondents submitted additional options, such as an intermediate school or directing additional students into the East Porirua network where there is surplus capacity.

METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

PHASE 1: FACE-TO-FACE ENGAGEMENT

Participants in the first phase were presented with information and data on the engagement process, the current schooling network and future population projections. They were then provided with a form requesting feedback on two specified options, and the ability to submit further options.

This first phase of this engagement involved an array of stakeholders and produced data that properly informed the second phase of the engagement. However, there were several limitations to the first phase that should be noted. First, many participants believed there was insufficient information provided about each provision option to make an informed decision. For example, participants wanted to know what the enrolment zone would be for each proposed option and build site, and how the options would affect rolls at existing schools.

Participants wanted to better understand how Option 1 would work given Aotea College's planned renovations. Some participants felt the new school and satellite proposals in Option 2 should have been split into two separate options, with more details about the satellite/second campus provided. As a result, some participants showed opposition to certain options in whole or in part due to the lack of details provided.

Second, there was an inconsistency in how stakeholders returned feedback forms, with some returning one form per stakeholder group, and others returning one form for each individual within a stakeholder group. For example, of the eight forms completed by board members, for instance, one was submitted by the entire board of Aotea College, another by the entire board of Papakowhai School, and the other six were submitted by individual members of the board of Rangikura School.

As a result, Rangikura School is significantly overrepresented in many stakeholder groups, including board, students and staff. Because of this inconsistency, results from the first phase are presented as trends rather than in discrete, quantitative findings.

Finally, the results do not necessarily reflect the views of all stakeholder groups from all schools, as many did not submit feedback forms. While 11 schools in North Porirua were targeted, feedback was received from fewer than five schools for most stakeholder categories, as outlined in Table 3 previously. No responses were received from two schools, St. Theresa's and Postgate Schools, and the vast majority of responses across stakeholder groups were submitted by one school, Rangikura School.

Although these limitations are important to note, there was enough commonality of opinions among participants across different schools to conclude the results were valid, and to inform the second phase of the engagement, which was much more representative in receiving wider participation across stakeholder groups from all relevant schools.

PHASE 2: ENGAGEMENT VIA ONLINE SURVEY

There were additional options raised in the first round of engagement in response to Option 3. The viable options raised in the first round were compiled into an online survey which was distributed among stakeholder groups. Because the survey was distributed via stakeholders' contact lists (such as a school principal distributing it to parents and staff), it was impractical to create personalised links for each respondent. This gave rise to the possibility that the same individual could complete the survey multiple times in an attempt to skew the results in favour of their preferred option.

Once the survey closed, a process of data cleansing was undertaken. Firstly, all responses which did not express a preference on at least one of the main or sub-options were eliminated. Typically, this involves responses to the initial connections question (or questions), but no completion of the preferences questions. This reduced the dataset from 775 to 638 responses.

Following this, a series of analyses were carried out to identify duplicate responses based on data identifiers and response patterns. A further 31 responses were removed as a result of these analyses, reducing the final dataset to 607 responses. Five further suspicious responses were identified but these were retained within the dataset. Analysis of the data both including and excluding these five responses demonstrated that the effect on the overall results was negligible.

Unlike frequency counts, in which the same respondent can be counted as affiliated with more than one demographic group or school community, analysis of variance (the statistical technique used for comparing differences between groups) does not permit the same individual to be part of more than one group unless their results are duplicated and then coded to both groups. Therefore, each individual result was recoded to give a single demographic membership, as well as a single school affiliation.

For demographic groupings, these were prioritised in the following order: board member, former student, student, education-related employee, parent, and community member. For school affiliation, affiliation was prioritised in favour of the affiliation with the lowest number of responses. For example, a response affiliating with Pauatahanui School and Aotea College would be coded as affiliating with Pauatahanui, which had the lower number of responses of the two schools.

Survey respondents were provided with two sources of information about the four main options being tested in the survey. The first of these was a written update on the Ministry website explaining the four options, and the second was in the introduction to the survey itself. There was a discrepancy in the wording of Option 1 between the web update and the online survey, with the web update accurately specifying that the option would require a number of schools to change to Years 1 – 6, and the survey introduction specifying that existing primary schools would remain Year 1 – 8. This was raised via email and in the survey by one respondent. An analysis of comments on survey responses identified one further comment relating to the discrepancy.

Given the value placed in both phases of the engagement on Year 7 – 8s being part of the primary sector rather than the secondary sector, it is possible to make inferences about how this discrepancy may have affected the ratings received for Option 1. If we assume that all

respondents interpreted the question in line with the web update (a number of schools change to Years 1 – 6), then we could expect the average ratings for this option to be low, which is the case.

If we assume that all respondents interpreted the question in line with the survey (existing schools remain Year 1 – 8), then we could expect the average ratings to be artificially higher than the alternative. Given that this was the lowest rated option overall, and that it is the less preferred of the two wording options that is the accurate one, we can conclude that any confusion caused by this discrepancy does not cause an overall lack of validity in the opposition expressed to this option.

ENGAGEMENT PARTICIPANTS

Many of the children who will experience education provision in the North Porirua area are not yet in the education system, may not yet be living in the North Porirua area, or may not yet be born. The current engagement process is therefore using the views of the current community to inform decisions for a future community who may have different aspirations.

The engagement attempted to address this by maintaining a focus on longer-term solutions, and envisioning structural options to address capacity requirements of the future community following the development of the Aotea block and ongoing population growth in other parts of North Porirua.

CONCLUSION

The engagement process identified the North Porirua community's preferences for growing capacity in the primary network. These preferences can be summarised as:

- The community is opposed to a provision option that removes Year 7-8 students from primary schools and places them in environments with Year 9-13 students. The community believes this would both expose these students prematurely to certain influences, and deprive them of the developmental and leadership opportunities they currently receive at primary school.
- Primary schools should ideally be located so that they are geographically convenient for students to access through active transport or at a minimum distance via car.
- The preferred option is a new Year 1 – 8 full primary school. While the slight preference was that this should be at a location in the south of the Aotea development, the main impetus for this appeared to be a preference for primary-aged students to be physically separate from secondary-aged students
- It is important that attention is also paid to addressing capacity requirements in the North Porirua network which will not be addressed through an additional Year 1 – 8 primary school. In addition to capacity pressures, this includes ensuring that additional schooling provision is planned, phased, and zoned in such a way that it does not compromise the rolls of existing schools.

APPENDIX A. DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN FOR CONNECTIONS WITH SCHOOLING

For each of the following options, respondents were able to select all options that applied to them, and so percentages exceed 100.

TABLE 8. PARENT DEMOGRAPHICS

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Parent of child(ren) at Adventure School | 15.8% | 65 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Aotea College | 9.2% | 38 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Discovery School | 17.5% | 72 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Papakowhai School | 13.4% | 55 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Paremata School | 6.8% | 28 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Pauatahanui School | 1.2% | 5 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Plimmerton School | 12.9% | 53 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Postgate School | 1.5% | 6 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Pukerua Bay School | 1.5% | 6 |
| Parent of child(ren) at Rangikura School | 2.9% | 12 |
| Parent of child(ren) at St Theresa's School, Plimmerton | 4.1% | 17 |
| Parent of child(ren) attending school(s) outside the North Porirua area | 4.4% | 18 |
| Parent of child(ren) enrolled in Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu (Correspondence School) | 0.2% | 1 |
| Parent of child(ren) at an Early Childhood Education provider in the North Porirua area | 16.5% | 68 |
| Parent of child(ren) not yet school-aged, but not enrolled in ECE in the North Porirua area | 10.2% | 42 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Adventure School | 1.2% | 5 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Aotea College | 1.9% | 8 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Discovery School | 1.7% | 7 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Papakowhai School | 1.5% | 6 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Paremata School | 1.5% | 6 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Pauatahanui School | 0.5% | 2 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Plimmerton School | 1.2% | 5 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Postgate School | 0.7% | 3 |

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Pukerua Bay School | 0.2% | 1 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Rangikura School | 1.0% | 4 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended St Theresa's School, Plimmerton | 1.2% | 5 |
| Parent of child(ren) who previously attended Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu (Correspondence School) | 0.0% | 0 |
| Other (please specify) | 1.7% | 7 |

TABLE 9. EDUCATION-RELATED EMPLOYEE DEMOGRAPHICS

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Employee at Adventure School | 2.5% | 2 |
| Employee at Aotea College | 18.5% | 15 |
| Employee at Discovery School | 6.2% | 5 |
| Employee at Papakowhai School | 17.3% | 14 |
| Employee at Paremata School | 7.4% | 6 |
| Employee at Pauatahanui School | 2.5% | 2 |
| Employee at Plimmerton School | 9.9% | 8 |
| Employee at Postgate School | 0.0% | 0 |
| Employee at Pukerua Bay School | 3.7% | 3 |
| Employee at Rangikura School | 11.1% | 9 |
| Employee at St Theresa's School, Plimmerton | 3.7% | 3 |
| Employee at an ECE provider in the North Porirua area | 3.7% | 3 |
| Employee at a school outside the North Porirua area | 18.5% | 15 |
| Other (please specify) | 14.8% | 12 |

TABLE 10. STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Student at Adventure School | 0.8% | 1 |
| Student at Aotea College | 99.2% | 122 |
| Student at Discovery School | 0.8% | 1 |

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Student at Papakowhai School | 0.0% | 0 |
| Student at Paremata School | 0.0% | 0 |
| Student at Pauatahanui School | 0.0% | 0 |
| Student at Plimmerton School | 1.6% | 2 |
| Student at Postgate School | 0.8% | 1 |
| Student at Pukerua Bay School | 0.0% | 0 |
| Student at Rangikura School | 0.8% | 1 |
| Student at St Theresa's School, Plimmerton | 0.8% | 1 |
| Student attending a school outside the North Porirua area | 0.0% | 0 |
| Student enrolled in Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu (Correspondence School) | 0.0% | 0 |
| Other (please specify) | 3.3% | 4 |

TABLE 11. FORMER STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Student who previously attended Adventure School | 16.7% | 9 |
| Student who previously attended Aotea College | 46.3% | 25 |
| Student who previously attended Discovery School | 22.2% | 12 |
| Student who previously attended Papakowhai School | 22.2% | 12 |
| Student who previously attended Paremata School | 18.5% | 10 |
| Student who previously attended Pauatahanui School | 0.0% | 0 |
| Student who previously attended Plimmerton School | 11.1% | 6 |
| Student who previously attended Postgate School | 20.4% | 11 |
| Student who previously attended Pukerua Bay School | 5.6% | 3 |
| Student who previously attended Rangikura School | 16.7% | 9 |
| Student who previously attended St Theresa's School, Plimmerton | 5.6% | 3 |
| Student who previously attended school(s) outside the North Porirua area | 9.3% | 5 |
| Student who previously attended Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu (Correspondence School) | 0.0% | 0 |

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Other (please specify) | 14.8% | 8 |

TABLE 12. BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEMBERS DEMOGRAPHICS

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Board of Trustees member at Adventure School | 6.7% | 1 |
| Board of Trustees member at Aotea College | 13.3% | 2 |
| Board of Trustees member at Discovery School | 13.3% | 2 |
| Board of Trustees member at Papakowhai School | 26.7% | 4 |
| Board of Trustees member at Paremata School | 13.3% | 2 |
| Board of Trustees member at Pauatahanui School | 0.0% | 0 |
| Board of Trustees member at Plimmerton School | 13.3% | 2 |
| Board of Trustees member at Postgate School | 0.0% | 0 |
| Board of Trustees member at Pukerua Bay School | 13.3% | 2 |
| Board of Trustees member at Rangikura School | 6.7% | 1 |
| Board of Trustees member at St Theresa's School, Plimmerton | 0.0% | 0 |
| Board of Trustees member at an ECE provider in the North Porirua area | 0.0% | 0 |
| Board of Trustees member at a school outside the North Porirua area | 6.7% | 1 |
| Other (please specify) | 33.3% | 5 |