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Recommendations and conclusions

Recommendations
1. The committee recommends that DETA install covered links from classrooms to toilets in all future prep school facilities.
2. The committee recommends that DETA develop Best Practice Guidelines for prep facilities that include:
   a) a minimum of 3.4 square metres per child per classroom group of 25 students (excluding non-teaching space — the kitchen and teacher’s room);
   b) the location of toilets within the teacher’s line of sight and as close as possible to the prep classrooms (and, where this is not possible, provide new toilet facilities);
   c) a balance between outdoor and indoor learning areas for prep students; and
   d) siting of classrooms to maintain adequate playground space and proximity to existing outdoor areas.
3. The committee recommends that for future projects DETA seek input from all interested parties, including teachers and parents, in the consultation process.
4. The committee recommends that for future projects DETA conduct a post occupancy evaluation of all schools and ensure all interested parties are consulted, including teachers and parents.
5. The committee recommends that for future projects DETA ensure a local industry participation plan is prepared.

Conclusions
1. The work is suitable for its purpose.
2. The work is necessary and advisable.
3. On the information available, the committee is satisfied that the work is reasonable value for money.
4. The cost of the work is reasonable.
5. The committee is satisfied that the work has had a positive impact on the community, the economy and the environment.
6. The procurement methods for the project were reasonable.
7. The committee is satisfied with the balance of public and private sector involvement in the work.
8. The work was completed according to specifications, was delivered on-time, within budget and contractual obligations were met.
Foreword

The committee supports the $290 million prep school year capital works program, which was delivered through a partnership between the Department of Education, Training and the Arts (DETA) and the Department of Public Works (DPW).

The project has supported the introduction of a universally-available, non-compulsory, full-time preparatory year of schooling in 2007 with full implementation in 2008 in all state primary schools. It brings Queensland in line with other Australian states by giving Queensland children aged 4½ to 5½ an educational opportunity to help set the foundations for their success in school and beyond - regardless of their geographic location, economic, and social circumstances.

The prep capital works program involved the construction and/or modification of buildings over three years at around 1000 state primary schools across Queensland, including approximately 1800 classrooms at locations as remote as Saibai Island in the Torres Strait, and Boulia in the far west.

The committee is satisfied that the work is suitable for its purpose. It was impressed by the facilities, particularly given the tight time frames and scale of the work required. There was a high level of community demand for access to a universal full-time prep year and in general there has been positive feedback about the introduction of a prep school year in state schools.

Overall, the committee is satisfied that the project represents value for money for Queensland. Construction costs were comparable to similar buildings and the prep facilities are suitable for their purpose. The project generated employment in all areas of Queensland. Around 1640 private sector full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs and 466 FTE public sector jobs were generated by all contracts. Ongoing jobs have been created with the employment of teachers, administrative and other support staff and from maintenance of the buildings and grounds.

The committee considered a range of issues and makes a number of recommendations to improve the future design of prep facilities and to improve consultation at all stages of future DETA projects.

On behalf of the committee I thank all participants in the inquiry for their input and the committee secretariat for their research and administrative assistance.

Barbara Stone MP
Chair

Barbara Stone MP
Chair
Background and scope of the inquiry

1. This is a report from the committee’s inquiry into the Prep School Year Capital Works Program (prep program). The terms of reference for the inquiry were to examine and report on the project with particular reference to:
   a) the purpose of the work
   b) the suitability of the work for its purpose
   c) the necessity for, and the advisability of, the work
   d) value for money achieved, or likely to be achieved, by the work
   e) the cost, revenue produced by, and recurrent costs of the work
   f) the public value of the work, including the impact of the work on the community, economy and environment
   g) procurement methods for the work
   h) the balance of public and private sector involvement in the work
   i) the performance of the constructing authority and the consultants and contractors for the work.

The Public Works Committee

2. The Public Works Committee is established under the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001. The committee consists of seven members of parliament: four government and three non-government.

3. The committee’s role is to scrutinise the government’s capital works program. This can occur at any stage from planning to post completion and can include works by government departments and major works by government owned corporations. The committee may decide to conduct a particular inquiry or the parliament may refer specific works for investigation.

4. The committee tries to review projects from as wide a selection of departments and other constructing authorities as is practicable, in a variety of locations throughout Queensland, of differing cost and scale, and at various stages of implementation.

6. When investigating public works the committee believes it is essential to listen to the views of end users, as well as those held by people and organisations either affected by or with an interest in a particular project. One of its roles in facilitating this process is to provide a public forum in which the community can express an opinion, whether it is a suggestion, praise or criticism.

7. The focus of all government capital works projects must be on maximising the benefits to the community. The committee is determined to ensure Queensland gets best value for money from the development of capital assets by both public and private agencies, and that the agencies manage the assets to provide the best possible outcomes for Queenslanders.

---

Conduct of the inquiry

8. The committee advertised the inquiry and called for submissions in the Courier-Mail on Saturday, 27 October 2007. It also released a media statement and wrote to a variety of interested persons and organisations advising them of the inquiry and inviting them to make a submission.

9. As part of its inquiry, the committee inspected a number of prep school sites and conducted two public hearings. On Friday, 29 February 2008 the committee inspected the Birkdale, Aspley East, Wooloowin Primary and Upper Brookfield State Schools. It conducted a public hearing the same day at the Parliamentary Annexe in Brisbane. On Friday, 14 March 2008 the committee inspected the Upper Coomera State College and Springwood Central State School, and held a public hearing at the Parliamentary Annexe.

10. Copies of the submissions and transcripts of evidence are available from the committee secretariat.

Responsibility of Ministers

11. This report makes recommendations for action by the government. Section 107 of the Parliament of Queensland Act requires responsible Ministers to table a response to the report in Parliament within three months.

12. The response must set out—
   a) any recommendations to be adopted, and the way and time within which they will be carried out; and
   b) any recommendations not to be adopted and the reasons for not adopting them.

13. A full extract of s.107 of the Parliament of Queensland Act is set out in Appendix 3.
Background of the project

14. Preparing children for formal schooling is not new in Queensland. Preparatory schooling was provided from 1930 until 1953. In 1972 state preschools began to open across Queensland. By 2006 almost three-quarters of state schools provided free, part-time preschool education to children in the year they turned five.

15. In 2002 the government released Queensland the Smart State – Education and Training Reforms for the Future: A White Paper, which stated the government’s intention to focus on the early education years and trial a preparatory year across the state that, if successful, would replace the existing part-time state preschool system. Following trials in 2003 and 2004, the non-compulsory full-time preparatory year was implemented in 2007 as a half cohort with full implementation in 2008.2

Prep school year

16. The prep school year forms part of the wider Education and Training Reforms for the Future (ETRF) initiative of the Queensland Government that centres on strategies to foster educational opportunities and lifelong learning in every Queensland child.

17. Prep, like preschool, is a foundation learning year. However, it differs in terms of its curriculum, operation and management, and physical environment. There are three key differences between preschool and prep. Firstly, prep is integrated into the junior primary precinct of the school with classrooms and other facilities located in school grounds. Secondly, children must be five by 30 June in the year they start prep, which makes prep students, on average, six months older than preschool-aged children. And thirdly, it is full-time.

18. Generally, prep classes comprise up to 25 students. In some schools, prep children may be included in composite classes with Year 1, 2 or 3 students.

19. Registered primary school teachers and former state preschool teachers teach prep. Students in prep classes follow the Early Years Curriculum Guidelines (EYCG) published by the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA). The guidelines are based on active learning, which includes play and inquiry-based learning, where children and teachers work together to explore, observe, ask questions, and seek answers about everyday experiences.

Scope of the project

20. The $290 million prep program was delivered through a partnership between the Department of Education, Training and the Arts (DETA) and the Department of Public Works (DPW).3

21. The 2007 half-cohort implementation of the prep program was completed on time and within the allocated budget. The full cohort was implemented in 2008 with an estimated 36 700 students across the state accessing the facilities. 4

22. The Preparatory Year Implementation Brief provided classroom groups of 25 students.5 This involved the construction and/or modification of buildings over three years at around 1000 state primary schools across Queensland, including approximately 1800 classrooms at locations as remote as Saibai Island in the Torres Strait, and Boulia in the far west.6

---

2 2003 – 39 Preparing for Schools trials commence at State, Catholic and Independent schools.
2004 – 25 additional trials of prep commence across all school sectors.
2007 – All Queensland children of eligible age are able to attend a full-time prep year before starting year 1. The non-compulsory Prep Year is provided at schools offering primary education.

3 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 1

4 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 1

5 Note: Where the number of preparatory year students were projected to exceed 25 (or a multiple of 25), the residual number of students, up to a maximum of eight, were to be accommodated in a composite year one class. Where the number of students expected exceeded eight, an additional preparatory classroom was to be provided. (Joint department submission, p 2)

6 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 1
23. Work delivered by the prep program included: 7
   • construction of new classrooms where there was no pre-existing capacity within the school to upgrade or convert facilities into prep classrooms
   • refurbishment and conversion of existing facilities into prep classrooms where sufficient spare capacity existed within the school
   • provision of permanent and relocatable buildings as replacement classrooms where the refurbishment of an existing occupied classroom was the preferred preparatory year solution
   • allocation of funds for schools to enhance existing facilities 8
   • allocation of funds for schools to upgrade existing preschools for use as prep classrooms 9
   • undertaking of associated works, including new toilet blocks, replacement outdoor play areas and storage sheds 10
   • installation of toilet partitions to existing preschools used as preparatory classrooms and thermal mixing valves to classrooms with existing hot water services
   • installation of covered walkways from new prep buildings to toilets
   • provision of furniture kits, including teacher and student tables and chairs, shelving, bookcases, screens, a fridge, and an oven for new and refurbished classrooms.

24. The prep program delivered: 11, 12
   • 449 new prep classrooms
   • 607 refurbished classrooms
   • replacement of 29 general learning areas (GLAs)
   • new prep toilets (225 pans)
   • 5160m² of external storage at 284 schools
   • 1377m² of detached shade structures – outdoor learning areas - at 37 schools
   • allocation of 16 students-and-under grants of $4,448,000 to 412 schools
   • preschool funding allocations for 673 classrooms at a value of $13,460,000.

25. The following facilities were included as part of the new and refurbished buildings: 13
   • preparatory classrooms, including play and quiet learning areas, kitchenettes, internal storage and teacher preparation areas
   • outdoor learning areas, incorporating bag racks and art sinks in new building classrooms
   • toilet blocks in four and six pedestal configurations to suit 80 students and 120 students, each including a fully-compliant self-help toilet, where reasonable access to existing toilets was not possible
   • replacement of existing playgrounds where the site of the existing playground was required for the construction of the new-build classrooms
   • establishment landscaping - $1000 per new-build classroom
   • an extension of the existing electronic security system to the new prep buildings.

---

7 Joint department submission, p 3
8 Funding was allocated to schools with a cohort of 16 or fewer prep students through a base allocation of $5000 and $1000 for each preparatory student forecast for enrolment in the full-cohort year. Schools directly managed the work following departmental guidelines and with support from their regional DETA offices.
9 Allocations were made on the basis of $20,000 for each preschool space required for use as a preparatory classroom.
10 Facilities briefs were prepared to identify the requirement for these facilities on a school-by-school basis.
11 Joint department submission, p 4
12 An additional 71 prep classrooms were delivered outside the prep program by the DETA capital works program. Joint department submission, p 4.
13 Joint department submission, p 5
26. The following items were delivered through the prep program, but they were funded externally through the regular DETA capital works program:  
- information technology - data networking within buildings and data connection external to prep buildings
- telephone and intercom services
- air conditioning in refurbished and extended facilities within the Cooler Schools zones.

**Major project time frames**

27. The key project time frames were:
- January 2005 – commissioning of prototype facilities
- January 2005 – commissioning of facilities for 2005 phase-in schools
- January 2006 – commissioning of facilities for 2006 phase-in schools
- January 2007 – commissioning of facilities for half-cohort implementation
- January 2008 – commissioning of facilities for full-cohort implementation.

**Major consultants and contractors for the project**

28. The design and construct managers and contractors for the works were:
- Bovis Lend Lease – south-east Queensland (SEQ) design and construct manager
- The DPW/Joint Venture (Project Services/QBuild)- regional and remote design and construct manager
- Ausco Building Systems (Ausco) and Bendigo Relocatable Buildings (Bendigo) - manufactured building suppliers
- Evans Harch Pty Ltd – two-storey purpose built classroom buildings.

29. Project Services, DPW was the project and contracts manager. Davis Langdon was the audit quantity surveyor.

---

14 Joint department submission, p 5
15 Joint department submission, p 6
16 Joint department submission, pp 6, 7
17 Joint department submission, p 6
18 Joint department submission – Attachment 12

Photograph: Weir State School – new two-storey teaching block

---
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Photograph: Stafford State School – Linear design new build and storage shed

Photograph: Aspley East State School – shade structure and linear design of new building

---

19 Joint department submission – Attachment 12
20 Joint department submission – Attachment 12
Photograph: Tullawong State School – new stepped design building installed

Photograph: Thursday Island State School – new stepped design building

---

21 Joint department submission – Attachment 12
22 Joint department submission – Attachment 12
Photograph: Banksia Beach State School – Extension of S88 preschool

Photograph: Townsville Central State School – extension of preschool

---

23  Joint department submission – Attachment 12
24  Joint department submission – Attachment 12
Photograph: Western Cape College (Weipa) – new toilet block

Photograph: Aspley East State School – new toilet block

---

Joint department submission – Attachment 12
Joint department submission – Attachment 12
Photograph: Glasshouse Mountains State School – Internal refurbishment of PS78 classroom

Photograph: Kimberley Park State School – internal refurbishment PS78 classroom block

Joint department submission – Attachment 12
Joint department submission – Attachment 12
Photograph: Hercules Road State School – internal of new building 29

Photograph: Currumbin State School – enclosure under existing classroom block 30

29 Joint department submission – Attachment 12
30 Joint department submission – Attachment 12
Terms of reference

a) The purpose of the work

30. The purpose of the prep program was to support the introduction of a universally-available, non-compulsory, full-time preparatory year of schooling in 2007 with full implementation by 2008 in all state primary schools in line with the government’s ETRF and Smart State vision.31

b) The suitability of the work for its purpose

31. Overall, the committee was satisfied that the work is suitable for its purpose. It was impressed by the facilities, particularly given the tight time frames and scale of the work required. The committee considered a range of issues and makes a number of suggestions to improve the future design of prep facilities.

Site Planning

32. DETA advised the committee that an audit team visited each school and consulted with the principal and the community to develop a site-specific solution that complied with the school’s facilities brief.32 The following criteria was used to determine the location of new buildings or select buildings for refurbishment:33

- site preparatory facilities to integrate with the junior primary precinct of the school and with access to existing facilities
- comply with current master planning documents (if any)
- ensure visual supervision within the indoor area and across outdoor play areas
- place toilets within line of sight and/or within reasonable distance from the classroom (in accordance with the Review Team guidelines)
- access to existing outdoor play areas
- access to existing shade cover
- access to existing outdoor storage facilities
- climatic control – building orientation
- design disabled access to new prep buildings to ensure full compliance as defined in the Building Code of Australia (BCA), with one disabled access point provided to existing buildings that were refurbished or extended for prep
- access from car parks, set downs and the main pedestrian flow of the school
- connect to existing engineering services.

Location of prep toilets

33. During the course of the inquiry, the committee was made aware that there was broad concern with the facilities brief’s criteria to place toilets within line of sight or within reasonable distance from the classroom.

34. DETA’s preferred solution, as set out in its facilities brief, is for the toilets to be located within a reasonable distance (at a maximum distance of 100 metres) or within the line of sight to the classrooms. However, DETA acknowledged that this did not occur at every school. Where this was not achievable, additional toilets were provided.34

35. This issue was also raised in a post occupancy evaluation (POE) report conducted jointly by an independent consultant, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd Queensland, and DETA.35 POE

---

31 Joint department submission, pp 7, 10
32 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, pp 2, 3
33 Joint department submission, p 2
34 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, pp 9, 19
35 The post occupancy evaluation report was conducted jointly in June 2008 by DETA and an independent consultant, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd Queensland. 130 schools were selected from a broad geographic spread, which represented the various facilities solutions that comprised the prep project.
respondents (school principals) reported that the movement of young children to toilets, which are located some distance from the classroom and out of the line of sight, can pose an increased risk.\textsuperscript{36} The POE report proposed that future early childhood year classrooms should be close to toilets and play areas and, where this is not possible, DETA should provide new toilet facilities.\textsuperscript{37}

36. Early Childhood Australia (ECA) recommends that each prep classroom be close to easily accessible toilets; that is, no further than 30 metres and with visibility at all times from the prep classroom.\textsuperscript{38}

37. In the situation where prep students are required to walk up to 100 metres to a toilet and are not within the line of sight of the classroom, the committee agrees that this may pose an increase in potential risk to young children. Young children of this age group need to be in the teacher’s line of sight within the indoor area, across the outdoor learning area and to the toilets. The committee supports the location of toilets within the teacher’s line of sight and as close as possible to the prep classroom. Where this is not possible, new toilet facilities should be provided.

\textbf{Size/Scale}

38. The general requirement for a prep classroom was to accommodate up to 25 students and to include an open and flexible space to cater for students working in small or large groups. The classrooms feature areas available for the display of student work and information for parents and carers; a wet area; a carpeted area large enough for 25 children; a cooking facility; and adequate storage for indoor and outdoor equipment.

39. Each classroom was designed to allow: adequate visual supervision; movement of resources; compliance with workplace health and safety standards; completion of administrative duties by the teacher; and access to toilets and play areas.\textsuperscript{39}

40. DETA set a target allocation of 3.4\text{m}^2 per student as the standard for the construction of new classrooms (new-builds) and refurbishments.\textsuperscript{40} Other standard space allocations include:\textsuperscript{41}

- general learning area, including teacher’s preparation area and kitchen: 84\text{m}^2
- indoor storage: 5\text{m}^2
- external storage sheds: maximum of 18\text{m}^2 for up to 100 students
- outdoor learning area: 20\text{m}^2 for up to 100 students.

\textbf{Indoor learning area}

41. DETA prepared its Educational Brief based on information gathered during its 2003-04 prep school trials. From this, DETA determined a targeted area of 84\text{m}^2 of useable space per classroom group of 25 children to support the delivery of the prep curriculum and functions in the classroom. It should be noted that the size of the preschool classroom was approximately 101\text{m}^2 compared to the minimum size for a prep classroom of 84\text{m}^2.\textsuperscript{42} The Queensland Association of State School Principals (QASSP) said that it had received general positive feedback about the size of the refurbished preschool classrooms.\textsuperscript{43}

42. In the initial design phase, DETA received feedback expressing concern that the prep classroom would not provide enough space. However, it received general positive feedback in response to the next stage of development: DETA set up a ‘mock up’ prep classroom to allow interested

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item 36 EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 7; POE respondent’s comments: no covered walkways to toilets is unsafe for staff and students…; prep building is not located close to toilets. It is a high block structure requiring students to walk up and downstairs; and access to main toilets has involved distance.
\item 37 EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, pp 10, 11
\item 39 Joint department submission, p 8
\item 40 This calculation is based on 25 students per class.
\item 41 Joint department submission, p 4
\item 42 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 3
\item 43 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 14
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
43. Despite the general feedback being favourable, there was concern raised that DETA’s target allocation of 3.4m² per child per classroom group of 25 students was misleading and may be lower than the recommended space allocation for a good quality learning environment. DETA’s overall calculation of the standard space allocation included the kitchen and teacher’s area, which are generally considered as non-teaching spaces. DETA said that, although the kitchen was part of the functional space of the prep classroom, the kitchen was provided for use by adults only and that the children would observe the activity.

44. DETA advised the committee that there is no current national standard for the type and size for a pre-year 1 classroom. However, ECA and QASSP recommends 4.64m² per child per classroom of 27 students with a total useable space of 125.29m² for a high quality environment in early childhood classrooms. QASSP argues that a teaching space provision of less than 3.4m² per child is not sufficient to meet the recommended space allocation for a good quality learning environment.

45. The committee supports DETA’s targeted area of 3.4m² per child per classroom group of 25 students, excluding non-teaching areas – the kitchen and teacher’s room – to ensure children are provided with a consistent space standard for prep classrooms that reflects a good quality learning environment.

Outdoor learning area

46. QASSP believes that an outdoor learning area is equally as important a teaching space as the indoor learning area in the early childhood year curriculum. It is concerned that the location of some prep constructions has reduced the amount of outdoor learning area significantly, enough to severely limit the mandated play-based curriculum. The QASSP supports a two-storey building for schools with restricted space.

47. DETA advised the committee that it did receive feedback from schools who were concerned about the adequacy of the outdoor learning area. It stated that on a case-by-case basis, DETA’s intent was to use the existing junior play equipment in the schools. This was part of the siting

---

44 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 10
45 EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 6. The report provided some comments that indicate that the design and size of the facilities were two of the strong points of the prep project – some examples are: ‘fresh and spacious’, ‘larger rooms’, ‘good size for the numbers’, ‘it is an open plan design with plenty of space’.
47 QASSP was also concerned that the kitchen area had been counted twice in the floor area: once for each classroom in the prep building. Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 14.
48 DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
49 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, pp 2, 3
50 See: www.earlychildhoodaustralia.org.au/state_territory_branches/queensland_branch/response_to_feedback_on_the_proposed_facilities_for_the_preparatory_year.html (Accessed 11/6/08); Corrie, L, Politics, the Provision of Physical Amenities and the ‘Push-down’ Curriculum, School of Education, Edith Cowan University, Volume 24, Number 3, September 1999, pp 5-10
51 Hearing (14 March 2008) Exhibit A: QASSP position paper, March 2004, p 3: The ECA’s space recommendations:
   - High quality environments: 4.64m² per child x 27 children = 125.28m²
   - Good quality environments: 3.9m² per child x 27 children = 105m²
   - Basic quality environments: 2.35m² per child x 27 children = 87.75m²
52 QASSP submission (Revised), p 1
53 QASSP provided the committee with two examples. At Kimberley Park State School a new prep building was constructed on the site of the preschool’s playground and reduced the play space to an area not much bigger than a tennis court. Based on an anticipated increase in the number of prep students in 2009, this small play area will have to cater for some 250 prep and year 1 students. The need to site the prep classrooms within the junior school precinct at another school resulted in the reduction of the outdoor space. Transcript, 14 March 2008, p 12.
criteria that located new prep facilities as close as possible to the junior precinct of the school. New buildings were sited to minimise the impact on the existing outdoor learning area and, where play structures were required to be removed, schools were provided with funds for their replacement.

48. As part of its inspections of prep facilities, the committee saw the inconsistency in the size of useable outdoor learning areas. It is concerned that restrictive physical settings can constrain curriculum objectives and impact on children’s development. The committee emphasises that the outdoor learning area is as equally important a teaching space as the indoor learning area in the early childhood year curriculum.

49. The committee is concerned about the inconsistency in the allocated outdoor learning area in schools and the impact of the unforeseen growth of the number of prep students (particularly in SEQ) on the available outdoor learning area. The committee supports a balance between the indoor and outdoor learning areas and that an adequate outdoor learning area for prep students should be provided.

Storage space

50. DETA’s facilities brief provided for internal storage space of 5m$^2$ per prep classroom for both new and refurbished classrooms and a maximum of 18m$^2$ for up to 100 students for external storage sheds.

51. During the inquiry the committee became aware that there was some general dissatisfaction with the provision of storage space. The Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific POE report found that 39.4 per cent of the respondents were dissatisfied with internal prep facilities, including storage space. The report concluded that DETA provide stronger focus on getting the ‘little things right’ for future projects and cited the size of storage spaces as one of the ‘little things’.

52. QASSP said that the amount of internal and external storage space was an issue. Feedback about the adequacy of the internal storage was that the standard design for the PS78 refurbishment, when compared to the converted preschools and new-builds, appeared to have less storage space: only two cupboards compared with an existing storeroom. Also, concern was expressed about the adequacy of the size of outdoor storage, especially because of the possible impact of unforeseen growth in the numbers of prep students.

53. DETA believes that the storage provision of 5m$^2$ per prep classroom for both new and refurbished classrooms is adequate. In regard to the standard design for the PS78 refurbishment, the storage provision of 5m$^2$ per prep classroom includes the use of the existing storeroom by one prep classroom and the use of two new storage cupboards by the second prep classroom.

54. The committee acknowledges the need and importance for adequate internal and external storage space in prep. It is concerned that the size of internal and external storage spaces may be inadequate to meet the various needs of prep. As part of its inspections of prep facilities, the committee has seen the inconsistency in the size of storage spaces. The committee supports the provision of internal storage space of 5m$^2$ per prep classroom for both new and refurbished classrooms and 18m$^2$ for up to 100 students for external storage sheds.

---

55 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 4; DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
56 DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
57 EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 3
58 EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 4
59 Respondent’s comment: ‘Not enough storage space is provided and rooms are smaller than the original pre-school facilities…’ (EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 9).
60 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 14
61 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 5; QASSP (Revised) submission
62 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 14
63 DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
Design

55. The new-build design solution enabled the prep program to:

- enhance the range of educational opportunities available to the community
- provide a safe and secure educational environment
- provide facilities, which are of a high standard based on value for money educational solutions
- promote efficient and effective use of resources, including teacher preparation areas, withdrawal spaces, technical equipment, storage areas (both indoor and outdoor) and outdoor play activity areas.

56. General design features of the new-build designs include:

- internal planning arrangements to allow spatial flexibility
- colour and texture combinations in the finishes to enhance place identity
- consideration of environmental factors.

57. The committee considered a number of design related issues including: the removal of the withdrawal room, floor cleaning, floor vibration, noise levels, access paths, play equipment, enclosure under ramps, drinking taps, kitchen area, covered links, and fencing.

Removal of withdrawal room

58. At a number of schools, the PS78 series classroom block was converted into two prep classrooms to facilitate the integration of prep with the junior precinct of the school. To achieve the space target of 84m² per classroom the removal of the small central withdrawal room was required. QASSP said that it received feedback from principals who expressed disappointment at the removal of the withdrawal room amenity. The withdrawal room was a standard provision and a loss for people who were using it for a specific purpose, such as a computer room.

59. DETA informed the committee that because the withdrawal room was used in a variety of ways it was not possible to provide a standardised replacement solution. Where the withdrawal room was used as a specialist space, such as a computer laboratory, the prep program funded its relocation. This refurbishment solution was used by the independent Review Team to scope the prep program and formulate the budget.

Floor cleaning

60. QASSP reported that there was an issue with the cleaning of the floors of the prep classrooms in new buildings. The textured hard surface floor of the new-builds is difficult to clean. QASSP believed the problem was the dimpled surface of the vinyl flooring and the type of old metal furniture used in some classrooms.

61. DETA also believed that it was the use of old metal furniture that left black marks on the floor. During DETA’s 2003-04 prep school trials, which formed its Educational Brief, school cleaning staff were invited to provide feedback on the suitability of the flooring materials. It was found that one of the two types of vinyl flooring offered was marked more noticeably by furniture and a recommendation was made to schools to use the better performing vinyl. The manufacturer’s recommendation for cleaning the vinyl floors was also made available to schools.

---

64 Joint department submission, p 8
65 Joint department submission, p 9
66 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 11
67 DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008; Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 8
68 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 11
69 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 11
70 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 8
Floor vibration

62. QASSP reported there was some vibration in the floor of prep buildings. They said the vibration was enough to disrupt CD players when teachers use music and children move and jump to the music.\(^{71}\)

63. DETA received feedback about vibration in the floor of prep buildings when trialling the initial prototypes. DETA responded to the concern and increased the structure under the floor to eliminate the vibration. Since the design of the two prototypes was changed in 2005, DETA advised that it has not received any further feedback.\(^{72}\)

Noise levels

64. QASSP reported that there was a problem with the acoustic performance of some prep solutions (PS78 and some new-builds).\(^{73}\) This was also reported in the Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific POE, which recommended that DETA: a) develop noise level standards, and design future classrooms to meet these standards; and b) test all prep classrooms to examine noise levels and develop rectification strategies unique to each site.\(^{74,75}\)

65. DETA said it was aware of this problem in the initial trialling of the prototypes for the new-builds. The acoustic performance of the new building was improved after the review of the trial of new buildings through a range of design enhancements such as: perforated, corrugated metal in the ceiling, soft finishes on the wall, and 20m\(^2\) of carpet added to reduce reverberation.\(^{76}\)

66. DETA advised the committee that the six schools that received non-standard refurbishment solutions reported that the noise levels within their classrooms were a distraction. Acoustically, the non-standard solutions did not perform as well as the common standard solutions. Subsequently, a sound attenuation treatment was provided to these schools.\(^{77}\)

Access paths

67. QASSP was concerned that in some schools the placement of steps in the new-builds prep solutions did not lead to access pathways that connected the prep classrooms to the rest of the school. The new build prep solutions were provided with a standard 60 centimetres of turf leading up to the edge of the staircase landing.\(^{78}\) However, the lack of path presented another problem during the wet weather with muddy areas being created at the bottom of these steps. As a consequence, verandas and the interior floors were soiled for students, teachers and cleaners. A POE respondent commented that not having a sealed pathway to the entrance of the prep school was dangerous for parents and students.\(^{79}\)

68. The committee supports the need to connect the prep classroom to the rest of the school, as well as ensuring that there is a path leading to the main point of entry to the prep school. It also acknowledges the impact for students, teachers and cleaners during wet weather with soiling of the verandas and the interior floors.

Play equipment

69. QASSP questioned the appropriateness of the existing playground equipment for the play-based curriculum.\(^{80}\) Existing playgrounds were replaced where the site of the existing playground was required for the construction of the new-build classrooms. In the case where the prep program funded the replacement of playground structures, DETA advised that it developed design

\(^{71}\) Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 11; QASSP (Revised) submission
\(^{72}\) Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 8
\(^{73}\) Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 11; QASSP (Revised) submission
\(^{74}\) Respondents' comments: 'noise level, very poor acoustics limit activities in shared buildings', 'the rooms are quite noisy due to the elevation and vinyl flooring', and a suggestion on how to improve future prep facilities – 'reduce the noise level'. EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, pp 8, 9
\(^{75}\) EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 11
\(^{76}\) Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 8; DETA correspondence, 28 Mary 2008
\(^{77}\) DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
\(^{78}\) Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, pp 11, 12; QASSP (Revised) submission
\(^{79}\) EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 7
\(^{80}\) QASSP (Revised) submission
guidelines for providing junior playground structures. DETA ensured that schools had access to this information through their regional facilities managers.81-82

70. However, QASSP is concerned about the schools with existing equipment that was approved in the 1970s and 1980s. This equipment no longer meets current standards and/or is not age appropriate for prep students.83,84

71. Apart from where DETA replaced existing playgrounds in cases where the existing playground site was required to construct new-build classrooms, the provision for new playground structures in each prep school is outside the scope of the prep program budget. The committee does, however, support the need for appropriate height of the playground equipment in prep schools, as well as for those structures to meet current standards.

Enclosure under ramps

72. The QASSP raised the need for battening under the ramps of the new-builds to prevent children from gaining entry under the building.85 To address safety concerns, DETA completed battening under the ramps of all new-builds throughout the state from the prep facility enhancement program.86

Drinking taps

73. QASSP would like drinking taps to be included as a standard provision.87 Drinking taps were not installed in the new build prep solutions where there was no existing connecting infrastructure to the rest of the school. This is also related to the issue of children moving around the school where there are no covered links or if there is some distance involved. QASSP expressed concern about the potential risk to children who had to leave the building to get a drink. The issue of no drinking taps in the prep area was also brought to the committee’s attention during the inquiry.88

74. DETA advised the committee that the implementation of the prep program was made on the basis that schools would access existing facilities. This included access to existing drinking taps.89

75. The committee supports the need to provide drinking taps in the prep area, particularly in the case of the new build prep solutions. It shares the concern of QASSP in regard to children moving around the school where there are no covered links or there is some distance involved.

Kitchen area

76. Feedback from QASSP, as part of the prep school trials, influenced adjustments to the new-builds, including the kitchen area. However, during the inquiry, concern was raised about the kitchen area in the prep classroom. Specifically, the kitchen should have been constructed to child height and considered health and safety issues, such as whether there is a need for a safety gate.90

77. DETA advised the committee that it had received no feedback on the issue of the health and safety of children in the kitchen area. The only feedback on the kitchen area was about the height issue. In regard to this, DETA said that the intent was for the teachers to use the kitchen equipment and children would observe the activity, or the activity would be moved to the

---

81 Information was made available to schools where the prep program funded replacement of playground structures.
82 DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
83 Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, pp 12, 13
84 Concern was raised in D & D Berndt’s submission, who are parents of a prep student who broke the radius bone in his wrist while playing in the playground.
85 QASSP (Revised) submission; Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 13
86 QASSP (Revised) submission, DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
87 QASSP (Revised) submission
88 Hearing transcript, 14 May 2008, pp 5, 13, 14
89 DETA correspondence 28 May 2008; Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 5
90 Hearing transcript, 14 May 2008, p 6; EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, pp 8, 9. During the inspection of prep schools, some prep school teachers told the committee that they believed a safety gate in the kitchen area would minimise the potential safety risk to children.
classroom area.\textsuperscript{91} Although the kitchen was part of the functional space of the prep classroom, it was provided for use by adults only.\textsuperscript{92}

78. Given the potential dangers in a kitchen when it comes to child safety and the feedback received from prep school teachers, the committee supports the need to include simple design adaptations and incorporate safety features into the kitchen area to reduce the potential hazards to children.\textsuperscript{93}

**Covered links**

79. There is generally broad support for covered links from the prep classroom to toilets.\textsuperscript{94} The committee acknowledges and supports the need for each prep school to have covered links from the prep classroom to toilets.

80. DETA advised the committee that although the original project cost allocation of $260 million excluded the provision of covered links, $20 million was announced in the 2006-07 State Budget to fund the prep facility enhancement program, which included the installation of covered links to the existing school path network and toilets. This funding has been used to install covered links to new prep facilities in DETA's regions north of the Barkly Highway, east of the Great Dividing Range and north of the Greater Brisbane region. The 2008-09 State Budget provided for $23 million to complete the remaining covered walkways of prep facilities at state schools in SEQ (Greater Brisbane, Moreton and South Coast regions).\textsuperscript{95}

**Recommendation 1:**

The committee recommends that DETA install covered links from classrooms to toilets in all future prep school facilities.

**Fencing**

81. QASSP would like DETA to consider installing a fence in prep schools where the students are identified as 'flight' risks.\textsuperscript{96} This issue was supported in the POE report. A comment by a respondent in the POE report supported the inclusion of fencing for safety reasons, particularly when classrooms and playgrounds are near a major road.\textsuperscript{97}

82. DETA advised the committee that the intent was for the prep school to form part of the junior primary campus – prep to year 3. However, in the case where the prep school has students who are considered a 'flight' risk, DETA would provide adequate fencing.\textsuperscript{98}

**Access**

83. The design of all the new prep buildings complied with disability access requirements, as defined in the Building Code of Australia.\textsuperscript{99}

84. As refurbishment work and extensions to existing buildings are generally limited and no special access provisions need to be made, refurbishment and access to existing amenity blocks to meet disabled requirements was not undertaken as part of the prep program.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{91} Hearing transcript, 14 May 2008, p 6
\textsuperscript{92} DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
\textsuperscript{93} Some examples of safety measures that minimise children's access to kitchen hazards include: a stable child-proof barrier at the entrance to the kitchen, locks on the oven and fridge doors, and stove guards.
\textsuperscript{94} QASSP supports the need for a covered link from prep classrooms to toilets. QASSP (Revised) submission: The POE report identified this as an issue and recommended that DETA complete the Covered Walkways project. EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, pp 7, 9, 10
\textsuperscript{95} Joint department submission, p 3; Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 3; DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008; 2008-09 Queensland State Budget - Service Delivery Statements - DETA, 2-4
\textsuperscript{96} QASSP submission
\textsuperscript{97} EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 9
\textsuperscript{98} Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 3
\textsuperscript{99} Joint department submission, Attachment 1: Preparatory year Facilities Implementation Brief, p 13; Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 8
\textsuperscript{100} Joint department submission, Attachment 1: Preparatory year Facilities Implementation Brief, p 13
Technical and environmental performance

85. The design features of the new-building designs are:101

- suspended steel and plywood flooring system used for its stability properties in all environments including the tropics
- strong and sufficiently robust for transportation
- lightweight materials, including metal sheeting, fibre cement sheeting to upper areas and timber battening to under floor areas
- external finishes are low maintenance
- sunscreens and battened screens to provide function, as well as create visual interest using a play of light and shade
- design and orientation to increase the use of daylight, which in turn reduces the energy demand for artificial light while also having a positive effect on the users of the building
- generous roof overhangs to provide shading to windows with reduced glare and heat load
- materials are used creatively for maximum functional and environmental efficiencies, such as plywood sheeting to lower wall areas where activity is maximised and colourful profiled metal sheeting on the upper walls
- the building is designed to be adaptable for multiple orientations and site conditions.

Recommendation 2:
The committee recommends that DETA develop Best Practice Guidelines for prep facilities that include:

a) a minimum of 3.4 square metres per child per classroom group of 25 students (excluding non-teaching space — the kitchen and teacher’s room);

b) the location of toilets within the teacher’s line of sight and as close as possible to the prep classrooms (and, where this is not possible, provide new toilet facilities);

c) a balance between outdoor and indoor learning areas for prep students; and

d) siting of classrooms to maintain adequate playground space and proximity to existing outdoor areas.

Project timeframe

86. The key driver for the timing of the work from 2004 was the government’s ETRF policy to implement a preparatory year of schooling by 2008 in all state primary schools. The prep year of schooling was rolled out over the following 4 stages:102

- Stage 1 – 2004
  - site audits and facilities briefs were completed by December 2004 for each of the 485 schools identified on the building program
  - trial of building solutions – design and construction of building solutions at 25 schools throughout Queensland in 2004 as part of the 2005 phase-in of prep, including a mock up of the new prep classroom.

- Stage 2 – 2005
  - review of February 2005 enrolment census and revision of facilities provisions as required
  - tender and award of design and construct contract for regional and remote Queensland on 29 April 2005
  - tender and award of design and construct contract for SEQ on 29 April 2005
  - allocation of preschool funding to 445 schools in May 2005
  - trial of building solutions – design and construction of building solutions at 20 schools throughout Queensland in 2005, as part of the 2006 phase-in of prep.

101 Joint department submission, p 9
102 DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
Stage 3 – 2006
- review of February 2006 enrolment census and revision of facilities provisions as required
- provision of 16-and-under cohort grants to 412 schools in February 2006
- design and construction of facilities at 324 schools by December 2006.

Stage 4 – 2007
- review of February 2007 enrolment census/revision of facilities provisions as required
- design and construction of facilities at 212 schools by December 2007 to support the half-cohort implementation of prep in January 2008
- installation of toilet partitions at 442 schools by December 2007
- installation of thermal mixing valves at 497 schools by December 2007
- installation of covered links at 227 schools by December 2007.

87. DETA has been acknowledged for accomplishing a significant achievement with the rollout of the prep year of schooling in all state primary schools by the start of the 2008 prep year, particularly given the tight timeline.

88. The committee also acknowledges the overall success of the prep program. However, it does note a number of issues, which have been raised in this report. More time during the design phase of the project may have avoided some of the design issues. The committee suggests that for future school capital works projects, DETA ensure key time frames for the project, such as the design and planning phase, are reasonable, with input from interested parties. The committee believes that, in future projects, design changes can be implemented to further improve the learning environment for students and teachers.

Post Occupancy Evaluation

89. Consultation with interested parties was undertaken throughout the prep program. The prep program project team consulted with school communities, and stakeholders, including Queensland Teachers’ Union (QTU) and QASSP; the Primary Principals’ Association (PPA); members of the DETA Minister’s Early Education Reference Group; Queensland Council of Parents’ and Citizens’ Associations Inc (QCPCA); officers from DETA’s Strategic Implementation Branch, Facilities Services Branch and Regional Facilities Account Managers; and officers from the DPW and Queensland Treasury.

90. As part of the consultation process, a ‘mock-up’ of the new classroom design (developed primarily for new-builds) was constructed for the purpose of consulting representatives of DETA, QASSP, QTU, and early education groups.103

91. DETA reported that the main concerns raised during the consultation process were in regard to the classroom size and the proximity of prep classrooms to toilets. QTU and the QASSP raised concerns regarding classroom size during the initial phase of the prep program. DETA believes that these concerns about the size of the classroom had been resolved during the consultation process.104 DETA also believes that the issue of the proximity of prep classrooms to toilets was addressed.105 However, during evidence, QASSP told the committee that the issue had not been resolved to their satisfaction.

92. QASSP advised that there were a few reports of communication problems between some schools and the prep capital works team about changes to the building program that originated from a change of school principal.106 As part of the briefing process DETA developed a design solution for each school in consultation with the school principal at that time, which was

---

103 Joint department submission, pp 18, 19
104 Joint department submission, p 19
105 It stated that there was no need to provide additional toilets where preparatory classrooms could be sited within reasonable distance (100 metres) and/or line of site from classrooms to existing toilets. Where this was not achievable, additional toilets were provided. Joint department submission, p 19
106 QASSP (Revised) submission; Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 13
approved by that school principal. DETA considered any requested changes to design solutions originating from a change of school principal and accommodated them wherever possible.\textsuperscript{107}

93. During its inspections the committee was told by prep teachers that they were not consulted during the course of the project. Specifically, they did not seem to have much input in the design of the prep facilities at their school. The committee believes that the issues raised in this report may have been minimised if the consultation process included more input from prep school teachers and other early childhood professionals.

94. The committee is supportive of post occupancy evaluations being conducted as part of all projects. Feedback gathered during this process can be particularly helpful to identify any issues that did not meet expectations and to inform future designs.

95. The Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific POE report focused on the success of the facilities in meeting the needs of the schools, and to inform future DETA projects. Out of some 600 prep schools, 130 schools were selected from a broad geographic spread and included the various prep solutions. From 130 schools, 98 schools responded to the questionnaire. While feedback from the principals was mostly favourable, the POE report identified a number of issues that did not meet expectations, including:\textsuperscript{108}

- location and number of power and data points
- size of storage spaces
- inclusion of covered walkways and teaching areas
- siting and access to ‘prep friendly’ toilet facilities.

96. While the POE did identify areas that can inform future designs, the committee believes all prep schools should be included in a POE because new prep facilities impact on every school differently and each school should have the opportunity to provide feedback. The committee recommends that for future projects DETA conduct a POE of all schools and ensure all interested parties are consulted, including teachers and parents.

97. The committee is satisfied that the work is suitable for its purpose though, as outlined above, there are some opportunities for future improvement.

\begin{boxed推薦}{Recommendation 3:}
The committee recommends that for future projects DETA seek input from all interested parties, including teachers and parents, in the consultation process.
\end{boxed推薦}

\begin{boxed推薦}{Recommendation 4:}
The committee recommends that for future projects DETA conduct a post occupancy evaluation of all schools and ensure all interested parties are consulted, including teachers and parents.
\end{boxed推薦}

\begin{boxed結論}{Conclusion 1:}
The work is suitable for its purpose.
\end{boxed結論}

\textsuperscript{107} DETA correspondence, 28 May 2008
\textsuperscript{108} EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, p 4
c) **The necessity for, and the advisability of, the work**

98. The government’s ETRF: A White Paper (2002) identified the need for the project. The paper outlined the government’s proposed package of reforms to improve the education and training of young Queenslanders, including its initiative for the early years of schooling to consider a preparatory year of school.

99. This initiative was undertaken by the government in response to the need to better prepare young Queenslanders for life by providing the best learning opportunities, regardless of their geographic location, economic, and social circumstances.\(^{109}\)

100. The ETRF initiative states the importance of the early years of schooling to children’s ongoing learning and development because it sets foundations for learning and progress through school. The paper cites research that shows early childhood education prepares children for school and that these programs enhance thinking skills, school performance and social adjustment. Research also shows that early education leads to long-term improvements in school achievements and greater learning capacity.\(^{110}\)

101. The paper also notes that at that time Queensland was the only Australian state where state schools did not offer a full-time year of education for children before they started Year 1. Queensland children were also at least five months younger than their interstate counterparts when they started Year 1.\(^{111}\) The government’s ETRF initiative proposed a preparatory year of schooling to prepare children aged 4½ to 5½ before they enter Year 1 to help set the foundations for their success in school and beyond.

**Options considered**

102. As part of the basic planning for any project, a range of options, including doing nothing, should be considered. Options may include, among other things, new building constructions, extensions, major refurbishments (or upgrading) and configuration. Following identification and preliminary assessments of all reasonable building, non-building location and site options, the most suitable options should be short-listed for detailed analysis. The purpose of detailed project analysis is to ensure best value for money through economic, environmental, social and budget analysis of all short-listed options.

103. To meet the anticipated need for some 2000 prep year classrooms (around 400 of these classrooms at smaller schools are shared with other classes – referred to as the 16-and-under students cohort), DETA identified three sources of prep year dedicated classrooms:\(^{112}\)

a) existing preschool classrooms that required some minor upgrading

b) refurbishment of spare classrooms to make them suitable for the preparatory year in terms of size and location

c) a new-build option (if 1 or 2 could not be fulfilled)

104. To ensure consistency across all schools and to maximise value for money outcomes, a range of standard design solutions was developed both for the refurbishment options and for the new-build options.\(^{113}\)

**Options selected**

105. The infrastructure needs of the project provided for increased educational provision for students aged 4½ to 5½ in line with the government’s ETRF and to facilitate the delivery of the prep play and inquiry-based curriculum within a Prep to Year 3 precinct (P-3) where possible.\(^{114}\)

106. Selecting the best and most practical options for prep year classrooms was dependent on the delivery of the program of works within the time frame to the required standard and within an agreed budget.

\(^{109}\) Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 1


\(^{112}\) Joint department submission, p 12

\(^{113}\) Joint department submission, p 12

\(^{114}\) Joint department submission, p 10
107. To select the best option, DETA sought feedback from key stakeholders and assessed data based on: prep trials in state schools over the 2003–06 period, which covered a range of capital works provisions from one-teacher schools to new classrooms; the display of a full-scale mock-up of a prep classroom; and the development of prototypes of new-build classrooms and most common classrooms types for refurbishment. Feedback then informed the design and documentation of the major contract packages of work which commenced roll-out in 2005.115

108. The following options were developed for classrooms required for implementing the preparatory year:116

- allocation of funding for 16-and-under students cohort117
- allocation of funding for the refurbishment of existing preschool classrooms118
- refurbishment of existing classrooms119
- new purpose-built classrooms120
- general learning areas121
- two-storey teaching blocks.122

109. DETA reported that surveys conducted during 2007, as part of prep monitoring in state schools, showed very high levels of satisfaction among principals, prep teachers and parents with the overall implementation of prep. In the most recent survey in November 2007, around 90 per cent of principals indicated their satisfaction with their school’s readiness for prep.123

**Conclusion 2:**

*The work is necessary and advisable.*

d) **Value for money likely to be achieved by the work**

110. Within the context of the Queensland State Purchasing Policy, value for money as it applies to government building projects includes consideration of a number of factors. These include cost, non-cost factors, such as fitness for purpose and quality, and the contribution of the project to the advancement of government priorities.

111. A summary of the measures the government took to achieve value for money include:124

- contracts were tendered competitively, in accordance with State Purchasing Policy
- a governance model was applied to monitor the prep program, involving a Review Team, a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Steering Committee and a complementary Senior Officers Group (SOG)125

---

115 Joint department submission, p 12
116 Joint department submission, pp 11, 12
117 Eligibility for this ‘one-off’ facility improvement funding allocation was based on an assessment of a school’s enrolment trends where the preparatory year cohort was expected to be less than or equal to 16 in 2008. This was in recognition of the costs of implementing prep year. Forecast preparatory year student enrolments were calculated on an average of February Census 2004 and 2005 Year 1 enrolments. This funding allocation was finalised in April 2005.
118 Eligibility for this ‘one-off’ facility improvement funding allocation associated with a minor refurbishment of an existing preschool building was based on an assessment of a school’s preparatory year facilities requirements by the Review Team. This facilities improvement funding allocation was $20 000 (excluding GST) per classroom.
119 Provided where existing facilities could accommodate the preparatory year requirement.
120 Provided where existing facilities could not accommodate the preparatory year requirement.
121 Provided where existing occupied facilities could be refurbished to accommodate the preparatory year requirement but needed to be replaced because of capacity constraints.
122 Provided where existing facilities could not accommodate the preparatory year requirement and school sites were constrained for space to site the new manufactured buildings.
123 Joint department submission, p 13
124 Joint department submission, pp 13, 14
125 Both the CEO and the SOG comprised officers from Education Queensland (Chair), Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Treasury and the DPW. The SOG met on a monthly basis and assumed accountability for all facets of the program including scope setting, procurement, timing and budget issues. The CEO committee provided strategic direction over the program and six monthly reports were provided to the CBRC, jointly signed by the
• implementation of a state-wide program of works, which delivered a uniform, design solution and achieved economies of scale with the bundling of individual school projects\textsuperscript{126}
• audits of all schools were undertaken to ensure that the standard design solutions would be best implemented at each school
• an assessment of contract packaging was undertaken via a procurement risk workshop\textsuperscript{127}
• Specialist Design and Construct Contractors were engaged to manage the logistics of implementing construction at schools state-wide
• using off-site fabrication for the new-build construction to accelerate the construction phase and minimise onsite construction in a time of escalating building prices and when large areas of the state were experiencing shortages of building trade skills and resources.\textsuperscript{128}

Cost factors

112. A summary of the measures the government took to achieve cost efficiencies and value for money initiatives include:\textsuperscript{129}
• bundling procurement
• cost benchmarking
• cost monitoring
• tendered schedule of rates
• standard design solution
• selection of materials to minimise ongoing maintenance
• ESD initiatives
• flexible delivery solutions to deliver facilities on time to meet enrolment projections.

113. While a financial assessment of the prep program was included in the Review Team report to the Cabinet Budget Review Committee (CBRC), DETA advised the committee that the Review Team did not undertake a whole-of-life Net Present Value (NPV) cost for the project.\textsuperscript{130} DETA said it was difficult to carry out a NPV as the program involved various prep solutions. Although DETA expects the manufactured new-builds to have a 40-year life cycle, it has no supporting documentation. The refurbishment work was carried out on existing buildings that were at least 20 years old. While the work would extend the refurbished prep building’s existing life cycle, DETA advised that it was hard to conduct a NPV. For this reason, an analysis on the special builds was not done.\textsuperscript{131}

114. Whole-of-life cost efficiencies were made through DETA’s maintenance and life cycle costs using the DETA's school facilities design guidelines. DETA’s ‘Maintenance Model Allocation’ was used to determine the maintenance portion of whole-of-life costs for prep facilities. For existing classrooms, extended or refurbished for the implementation of prep, the model provides

\textsuperscript{126} An alternative approach, involving a series of individual school-by-school design and construction solutions on a site-by-site basis that used different contractors and consultants, was considered but provided a lesser value-for-money option and represented a higher risk of not meeting the program’s time and budget requirements.
\textsuperscript{127} This workshop considered issues, such as the scope and quantum of work included in each package, the geographic spread of the work and whether the work should be undertaken by private or public sector resources. The risk assessment identified that large packages of onsite building work in SEQ and regional and remote areas were appropriate for delivery under Design and Construct contractor arrangements. It was also identified that the manufacture and delivery of the large number of factory-manufactured new-buildings required across the state would be best undertaken by the private sector.
\textsuperscript{128} Two new-build fabrication suppliers were engaged to provide sufficient volume to yield economies of scale but also to allow flexibility to change between suppliers at a particular school if there were issues of the availability of resources or delivery performance.
\textsuperscript{129} Joint department submission, pp 15, 16
\textsuperscript{130} Note that the RT report is a Cabinet-in-confidence document: Joint department submission, p 16
\textsuperscript{131} Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, pp 3, 4
a recommended annual maintenance budget of some 0.5 per cent of the replacement value of the buildings, with new buildings receiving proportional funding for the first 10 years.  

**Construction costs**

115. Benchmarking of construction costs can provide an indication of the value for money of a work. At each stage of the project, costs were benchmarked against existing school building projects by both the internal and external quantity surveyors.  

116. A comparison of construction costs between new prep buildings and similar traditional school projects is set out in the table below. Due to the wide variation in works required in refurbishment and extension work, no meaningful comparisons were able to be made with other refurbishment projects.

**Table 1: Comparison of construction costs between new prep buildings and similar traditional school projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULAR BUILDS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prep new-builds - Bendigo and Ausco supplied units plus associated costs</strong> (based on sample of projects in SEQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FECA 187m$^2$ UCA 46m$^2$ GFA 232m$^2$ Building rate (FECA) - supply and install new-builds</td>
<td>$2,064 /m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project cost (GFA) - supply and install new-builds, site works and external services</td>
<td>$2,347 /m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T2000 modular buildings - costs from modular supply program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FECA 151m$^2$ UCA 44m$^2$ GFA 195m$^2$ Building rate (FECA) - supply and installation</td>
<td>$1,160 /m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project cost (GFA) - supply &amp; install T2000, site works and external services</td>
<td>$1,282 /m$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD BUILDS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prep two-storey buildings - Evans Harch contract</strong> (adjusted for BPI and design fees) (average rates from tender for nine buildings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building rate (FECA)</td>
<td>$2,217 m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project cost rate (GFA)</td>
<td>$1,990 m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional school projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four space GLA block - single storey</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FECA 405m$^2$ UCA 81m$^2$ GFA 486m$^2$ Building Rate (FECA)</td>
<td>$2,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost rate - (GFA)</td>
<td>$2,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eight space GLA block – two-storey</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FECA 784m$^2$ UCA 275m$^2$ GFA 1059m$^2$ Building rate (FECA)</td>
<td>$2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project cost rate- (GFA)</td>
<td>$2,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FECA: fully enclosed covered area UCA: under cover area GLA: general learning area GFA: gross floor area  

**Source:** Joint department submission: attachment 5

117. The committee notes that the costs for prep new-builds are higher than the traditional T2000 modular buildings as the new-build included a kitchen, high level skylight windows and sun screening, and a higher standard of materials and finishes were used. The rates for the two-
storey prep buildings compare favorably with the traditional two-story GLA block.\textsuperscript{136} The costs for this contract benefited from economies of scale by having one contractor, Evans Harch, tender for the original nine projects and a further four through variations at agreed prices.\textsuperscript{137}

**Non-cost factors**

118. Non-cost factors include fitness for purpose and quality. As outlined earlier in this report, the committee is reasonably satisfied that the prep program has delivered facilities that are fit for purpose. No other government program of works of this type and scale, and within such a tight time frame, has been attempted. The project reached final completion in time for the start of the prep school year in 2008. The work has been completed in accordance with contractual obligations of the various contracts. The overall positive feedback since the prep school year was introduced to all Queensland state schools in 2008 is a good indicator of the project’s success.

119. A summary of the measures the government took to achieve value for money in terms of non-cost factors include:\textsuperscript{138}

- prep solutions were designed to achieve cost efficiencies through the use of materials, resources and environmentally sustainable developments
- a school-by-school audit to determine site-specific prep solutions for each school
- pilot projects were used to test design solutions and a consultation process was undertaken with schools
- a high level of governance was applied to the project with the creation of project teams
- each stage of the project underwent cost benchmark comparisons using quantity surveyors from the DPW and from the private sector
- the project was delivered within the budget approved by the CBRC in 2004 (subject to additional funding approved to reflect changes in scope) at a time when building resources were scarce and cost escalation varied between 6 to 10 per cent per annum.

**Advancement of government priorities**

120. The State Purchasing Policy uses a wide definition of ‘value for money’ and requires government agencies to undertake their purchasing functions in a way that supports the achievement of government priorities.

121. Current government objectives include: improving health care and strengthening services to the community; realising the Smart State through education, skills and innovation; protecting our children and enhancing community safety; managing urban growth and building Queensland’s regions; delivering responsive government; growing a diverse economy and creating jobs; and protecting the environment for a sustainable future.

122. The prep program introduced a universally-available, non-compulsory, full-time preparatory year of schooling in 2007 with full implementation in 2008 in all state primary schools. The project generated employment in all areas of Queensland. Around 1640 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs were created in the private sector and 644 FTE jobs were created in the public sector. Ongoing jobs are created with the employment of teachers, administrative and other support staff and from maintenance of the buildings and grounds.

123. Overall, the committee is satisfied that the project represents value for money for Queensland. Construction costs were comparable to similar buildings and the prep facilities were suitable for their purpose. The project is in line with the government’s Smart State vision to provide learning opportunities for every young Queenslander regardless of their geographic location, economic and social circumstances.

**Conclusion 3:**

*On the information available, the committee is satisfied that the work is reasonable value for money.*

---

\textsuperscript{136} The prep buildings include toilet areas.

\textsuperscript{137} Joint department submission: attachment 5

\textsuperscript{138} Joint department submission, pp 15, 16
e) The cost, revenue produced by, and recurrent costs of the work

124. The budget for the prep program was $290m, comprising the following approvals:  

- April 2004 - $1m approved for phase in projects  
- June 2004 – original budget of $230m and $30m contingency approved  
- August 2006 - $20m approved for prep facility enhancement program  
- December 2006 - $9m approved for additional costs identified in the September 2006 budget review.

125. A breakdown of the final budget is set out on the next page.

126. The budget was established as a result of the Review Team cost model contained in the report to the CBRC. The Review Team cost model was developed from a review of 382 schools and a cost estimate developed using a proportionate extrapolation of the review figures.

127. The maintenance of the prep facilities is provided for under the existing asset maintenance program and the special maintenance program.

Cost escalation

128. In July 2004, Davis Langdon, the audit quantity surveyors, reported the total escalation allowance for the prep program was $8.3m. This amount was allocated in the budgetary allowance at the time that the tenders were sought. A total of $2,895,660 was incurred for escalation during the program delivery. DETA said that it did not anticipate the following additional costs in the original cost model: higher than expected asbestos removal costs; additional building cost escalation; and additional number of classrooms.

129. As the delivery of the prep program occurred over an extended period of two and half years, DETA reduced the risk of future cost fluctuations to all the contracting parties by including a rise and fall clause that was applied to the tender rates to the SEQ and regional and remote contracts. The exception to the inclusion of this clause was the contracts for the supply of offsite new-build fabrication because of more stable financial conditions with a factory-built solution. Also, DPW elected not to provide this clause within the contract.

130. The formula for rise and fall is based on the Building Price Index published in Rawlinson’s Australian Construction Handbook (Industry Standard). The clause was applied in the contract 12 months after the date of acceptance of the tender in April 2005 and then at six monthly intervals, but not beyond the Date for Practical Completion. The percentage rates were applied to the tender rates for the work undertaken within the time period applicable to that percentage rate. Rises were as applied as follows:

- 19 April 2006 – 6.88 per cent  
- 29 October 2006 – 11.12 per cent  
- 29 April 2007 – 13.23 per cent  
- 29 October 2007 – 15.49 per cent.
Table 2: Prep School Capital Works Program Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>A Upper limit budget</th>
<th>B Total committed</th>
<th>C Final forecast cost</th>
<th>D Actual (cash) life of project total</th>
<th>E (C - D) Balance to be expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportables</td>
<td>82,740,696</td>
<td>67,423,452</td>
<td>82,422,929</td>
<td>81,803,416</td>
<td>619,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east Queensland contract</td>
<td>78,392,409</td>
<td>78,903,685</td>
<td>78,996,230</td>
<td>77,946,801</td>
<td>1,049,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and remote contract</td>
<td>54,980,472</td>
<td>48,009,315</td>
<td>49,378,297</td>
<td>49,708,707</td>
<td>-330,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor works outside main contracts</td>
<td>723,610</td>
<td>1,218,167</td>
<td>723,610</td>
<td>1,229,278</td>
<td>-505,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered walkways</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>19,964,612</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>19,425,302</td>
<td>574,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional costs for toilet partition program</td>
<td>1,248,151</td>
<td>1,331,920</td>
<td>1,331,920</td>
<td>1,285,849</td>
<td>46,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor refurbishments / upgrades</td>
<td>13,374,998</td>
<td>13,354,998</td>
<td>13,354,998</td>
<td>13,349,162</td>
<td>5,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of air conditioning units</td>
<td>562,139</td>
<td>558,570</td>
<td>559,605</td>
<td>494,845</td>
<td>64,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist contract - 2 storey 4 GLA</td>
<td>19,740,000</td>
<td>19,471,085</td>
<td>19,544,710</td>
<td>19,239,416</td>
<td>305,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist contract - T2000</td>
<td>474,593</td>
<td>474,593</td>
<td>474,593</td>
<td>474,593</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist contract contributions to EQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist contract - other schools</td>
<td>2,138,691</td>
<td>1,978,895</td>
<td>1,978,905</td>
<td>1,967,880</td>
<td>11,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist contract - supply and install TMV</td>
<td>756,000</td>
<td>749,901</td>
<td>756,000</td>
<td>478,106</td>
<td>277,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist contract - EQ network hardware</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>999,411</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,005,111</td>
<td>5,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>5,270,000</td>
<td>5,443,659</td>
<td>5,443,659</td>
<td>5,443,659</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small school funding programs / under 16 cohorts</td>
<td>4,421,668</td>
<td>4,421,668</td>
<td>4,421,668</td>
<td>4,421,668</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment replacement / relocation</td>
<td>1,393,874</td>
<td>1,392,767</td>
<td>1,392,767</td>
<td>1,377,767</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On costs (professional, audit &amp; scoping fees, client costs)</td>
<td>9,335,532</td>
<td>9,235,532</td>
<td>9,029,794</td>
<td>9,707,349</td>
<td>322,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005 phase-in facilities</td>
<td>2,016,082</td>
<td>2,011,246</td>
<td>2,011,246</td>
<td>2,011,246</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program contingency</td>
<td>2,323,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk pool funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>300,892,665</td>
<td>276,943,485</td>
<td>293,820,929</td>
<td>291,370,155</td>
<td>2,450,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total less external contributions</td>
<td>-10,892,665</td>
<td>-10,892,664</td>
<td>-10,892,664</td>
<td>-10,892,664</td>
<td>-10,892,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total prep school program                    | 290,000,000          | 276,943,485       | 282,928,265           | 280,477,491                           | 2,450,774                        |

Source: DETA correspondence, 26 November 2008

Conclusion 4: The cost of the work is reasonable.
f) The public value of the work, including the impact of the work on the community, economy and environment

The community

131. There was a high level of community demand for access to a universal full-time prep year. Current statistics show 38 550 Queensland prep students were enrolled in state prep year classes in 2007-08 with 38 700 estimated for the 2008-09 year.147,148

132. The prep year will give Queensland children aged 4½ to 5½ an educational opportunity to help set the foundations for their success in school and beyond - regardless of their geographic location, economic, and social circumstances.

133. As set out earlier in this report a POE was undertaken and in general there has been overall positive feedback about the introduction of a prep school year in state schools.

The economy

134. Impacts of the work on the economy have occurred through the construction phase of the project. As the SEQ and regional and remote contract delivered the prep program throughout the state, employment has been generated in all areas of Queensland. Employment generated by all contracts, based on Treasury Guidelines – Capital Works Employment Generation Multipliers for 2006-07, has been calculated at 1640 FTE jobs in the private sector and 644 FTE jobs in the public sector.149

135. The following table shows the employment created. Calculations have been based on Treasury guidelines: capital works employment generation multipliers for 2006-07.

Table 3: Public and private sector employment generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Private $M</th>
<th>Public $M</th>
<th>Private employment (weeks)</th>
<th>Public employment (weeks)</th>
<th>Private FTE Jobs (No.)</th>
<th>Public FTE Jobs (No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply of new factory built buildings (Ausco &amp; Bendigo)</td>
<td>82.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,913</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site building works in SEQ (Bovis Lend Lease)</td>
<td>78.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,261</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site building works in regional and remote Qld (DPW JV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,826</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose built two-storey buildings (Evan Harch)</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,957</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of air-conditional units (existing standing offer arrangements)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of standard transportable classroom buildings (T2000 – Ausco &amp; Bendigo)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects outside main contracts (Helensvale, Kallangur and Northlakes)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>78,717</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,370</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Joint department submission, Attachment 7
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Local industry policy

136. DETA advised the committee that as the procurement principles were established in the Cabinet-endorsed Review Team report and the procurement strategy was consistent with the government's Local Industry Policy, a Local Industry Participation Plan was not produced.\(^{150}\)

137. Local industry participation policy is required for projects over $5 million or that are regionally significant. As the prep program consisted of a large number of small-scale projects delivered across Queensland, DETA did not consider it appropriate to prepare a local participation plan. However, DETA advised that tender documents included non-price selection criteria for government objectives including:\(^{151}\)

- the approximate number and/or percentage of subcontractors and the major supply components to be locally sourced
- the extent of use of locally manufactured products, equipment and materials.

138. The procurement strategy in the areas outside SEQ involved DPW procuring individual trade contract packages for each project at each regional location, which provided maximum opportunity for local trade and subcontractor resources to participate. DPW procurement (in accordance with the Capital Works Management Framework) through QBuild included the opportunity for regional contractors to subcontract through regional QBuild offices, as well as the ability to offer alternative locally-produced products, equipment, and materials.\(^{152}\)

Recommendation 5:
The committee recommends that for future projects DETA ensure a local industry participation plan is prepared.

Training policy

139. The Queensland Government has a 10 per cent training policy. The policy is designed to maximise the potential of Queensland Government capital works projects to address skills shortages and create additional employment opportunities for apprentices, trainees and cadets in the building and construction industry.

140. Standard public works contract clauses requiring adherence to the training policy were included within the contracts, excluding the contract for the supply of transportable buildings. The 10 per cent training policy was negotiated to 5 per cent with DETA for the supply of the factory-built buildings. This was because it was impossible to achieve the 10 per cent target within the manufacturing process of the factory environment in which the buildings were constructed.\(^{153}\)

The environment

141. Environmental analysis was undertaken on a site-by-site basis as part of onsite audits and the briefing and design stages of the project. Under the contract, the contractor was responsible for dealing with onsite environmental issues, including contaminants, runoff, and flora and fauna, which were managed through the contractor's environmental Construction Management Plan.\(^{154}\)

Environmental issues

142. Site asbestos was the most common environmental issue encountered for the prep program. This was also identified in the POE.\(^{155}\) Other environmental issues were heritage listings, removal of significant trees, and other various site-specific hazardous materials.\(^{156}\)

143. Steps were taken to avoid and/or lessen any adverse impacts on the environment on a site-by-site basis.\(^{157}\)

---

\(^{150}\) Joint department submission, p 20
\(^{151}\) Joint department submission, p 20
\(^{152}\) Joint department submission, p 21
\(^{153}\) Joint department submission, p 21
\(^{154}\) Joint department submission, p 21
\(^{155}\) EQ Preparatory Year POE Report, Whitehead Miller Asia Pacific Pty Ltd/DETA, June 2008, pp 10, 12
\(^{156}\) Joint department submission, p 22
• Asbestos was removed where it was likely to be disturbed as part of the works in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Work Place Health and Safety, Australian Standards and National Codes of Practice, and the Department of Education, Training and the Arts guidelines for asbestos removal in schools.

• A small number of schools have heritage listing for various structures or site components. Where there was a potential for impact to these components, application was made to the Queensland Heritage Council and approval received to carry out the works.

• A small number of significant trees were removed where necessary after alternative solutions had been explored. Prior to removal, investigations were carried out to determine if existing Vegetation Protection Areas or Vegetation Protection Orders existed. School communities and neighbours were consulted where appropriate.

• Craigslea State School has an existing arsenic ground contamination as a result of its construction on an old tannery site. Installation of new-builds to this site required the use of specialist environmental consultants, soil testing, and treatment to ensure community safety.

**Environmentally sustainable design features**

144. The principles of the Green Building Council of Australia Green Star rating system were adopted where possible and used during the design phase of the prep program solution as a design guide to achieve best practice for a green and sustainable design.\(^{158}\)

145. Environmentally sustainable design features were incorporated into the prep design solutions, including:\(^{159}\)

• reducing energy consumption by: good building orientation with a preferred north/south main building axis; shading by overhangs; sunscreens and awnings; insulation; natural lighting; passive solar gain and cooling; and efficient use of mechanical systems. Materials were used efficiently by minimising waste, sourcing locally, and selecting materials with a low embodied energy i.e. recycled components with low maintenance finishes

• incorporating innovative design flexibility in the solution for design solutions for new-builds with the ability to slide modules to accommodate alternative planning options to suit a variety of sites

• minimising the impact on the existing environment by adopting measures through the site selection process for new-builds, such as avoiding or reducing tree removal, ground profiling

• incorporating technology and sustainability in building design by using overhangs and sunscreens for shading and enhanced insulation for thermal control.

**Conclusion 5:**

The committee is satisfied that the work has had a positive impact on the community, the economy and the environment.

---

\(^{157}\) Joint department submission, p 22  
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g) **Procurement methods for the work**

146. The procurement strategy is included in the Review Team report to CBRC. DETA, with specialist advice provided by DPW’s Contract Services group, undertook a detailed procurement risk analysis prior to procuring and delivering the prep program. As part of the process, DETA considered the following four generic procurement models:160

- traditional model – project by project
- non traditional – managing contractor (program approach)
- lump sum document and construct
- partnering / alliance arrangement.

147. The procurement system selected was expanded to include a single design and construct contract for the delivery of 13 two-storey teaching blocks. These facilities emerged as additions to the contract when school audits of the schools progressed and identified site-specific factors influencing their requirement.161

148. The work involved three components: refurbishment, new-builds and purpose-built two-storey buildings. Rather than managing individual projects, DETA and DPW decided to create a program of works, which standardised quality and design, and provided an opportunity for economies of scale.162

**Onsite building works**

149. The work was procured using the design and construct lump sum (modified AS4300) with provision for a schedule of rates and lump sums form of contract.

150. The works were split into two broad geographic packages across all categories of work, including refurbishments and extensions to existing buildings and infrastructure works associated with new-builds installed by others: 163

- DETA SEQ regions were delivered by one contract (South East Queensland – SEQ).
- DPW delivered works in the remainder of the state (Regional and Remote contract) on a similar basis as the SEQ contract.

151. The selection criteria for the tenders of the onsite building works for the prep year SEQ region included a mix of price (75 per cent), government priorities (5 per cent) and project specific objectives (20 per cent).164 The non-price criteria included:165

- providing jobs in Queensland using the services of local suppliers, subcontractors and labour166
- capacity to undertake the work as a PQC Level 3 contractor
- experience in construction of school facilities
- resource strategy for providing and controlling a labour force across multiple construction sites around the state.
- methodology for undertaking and managing quality control of a construction project consisting of multiple construction sites across the state.
- demonstrated management skills in programming, coordination logistics and cooperation
- tendered price
- client references
- prior experience.

---
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Factory built buildings (new-builds)

152. Factory built buildings (new-builds) were used to provide consistency across the state, as well as to avoid the heated building industry. The new-builds meant the works were more a part of the manufacturing industry rather than the building industry.\(^\text{167}\)

153. The contract form was design and construct lump sum (modified AS4305) with provision for a schedule of rates to address site specific variables, including the height of the building and lump sums for specific building types placed one metre above ground level. The work was divided into two work packages to facilitate the engagement of two supply contractors for the supply and installation of factory built buildings.\(^\text{168}\)

154. The tender evaluation criteria for factory-built buildings (new-builds) was based on the tender sum (80 per cent), government priorities (5 per cent) and project specific objectives (15 percent), including:\(^\text{169}\)

- providing jobs in Queensland using the services of local suppliers, subcontractors and labour\(^\text{170}\)
- project specific objectives
- proven ability for a rolling program
- demonstrated capacity
- organisational structure
- support for government priorities
- tendered price.

Purpose-built two-storey buildings

155. The form of contract was design and construct lump sum (AS4300). The works consisted of purpose-built two storey buildings on school sites with limited land available for development.\(^\text{171}\)

156. The tender evaluation criteria were based primarily on the price – 95 per cent - with 5 per cent for non-price criteria. The criteria included:\(^\text{172}\)

- PQC Level 3 contractor
- ability to work within an operational school campus
- management, organisational and resource capability to undertake nine geographically diverse projects under the same contract
- tendered price.

Tenders

157. The selected procurement model involved five major contractors, including:\(^\text{173}\)

- Bovis Lend Lease as design and construct manager for the SEQ region
- DPW Joint Venture as design and construct manager for the balance of the state
- Evans Harch Pty Ltd for 13 two-storey teaching blocks to suit school sites where there were site constraints
- Ausco for 50 per cent of the offsite new-build fabrication (quantity at time of tender)
- Bendigo for the other 50 per cent of the off-site new-build fabrication (quantity at time of tender).

158. As there was significant capacity and market interest in the SEQ region, tenders for the onsite building works for SEQ were sought from industry by expressions of interest.\(^\text{174}\) Out of the six

\(^\text{167}\) Hearing transcript, 14 March 2008, p 9
\(^\text{168}\) Joint department submission, p 23
\(^\text{169}\) Joint department submission, p 24
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\(^\text{172}\) Joint department submission, p 24
\(^\text{173}\) Joint department submission, p 14
submissions that were received, four tenderers were short-listed as being suitable. Bovis Lend Lease was awarded the tender for the onsite building works for SEQ on the basis it provided the most favourable financial result.\textsuperscript{175}

159. Tenders for the onsite building works for the Regional and Remote contract were received from:\textsuperscript{176}

- A Joint Venture Group (JV). This consisted of DPW Commercialised Business Units Project Services and QBuild, which was formed and invited to provide a tender proposal.
- A value for money proposal was received in response to the tender documents similar to the SEQ contract.

160. The DPW – Joint Venture (DPW JV) was selected for the onsite building works (regional and remote).

161. For the factory-built buildings (new-builds), a public tender was sought with invitations to price a number of package options, ranging from 23 buildings to approximately 215 buildings. Tenders were received from four tenderers.\textsuperscript{177} Based on the highest score in the tender sum criterion, Ausco and Bendigo were awarded the tender for the factory-built buildings (new-builds).\textsuperscript{178} Using two suppliers mitigated against any risk involved with installing the factory-built buildings.

162. Select tenders were sought for the purpose-built two-storey buildings from three tenderers. Evans Harch Pty Ltd was selected as the supplier of the purpose-built two-storey buildings.\textsuperscript{179}

Selection of consultants

163. The primary project management and contract administration consultancy was undertaken in-house by Project Services, DPW. This appointment was made in accordance with the recommendations of the Review Team. DPW Joint Venture design and documentation consultancies were undertaken in-house by Project Services personnel. The appointed managing contractors, Bovis Lend Lease and Evans Harch Pty Ltd, appointed private consultants as necessary, as part of their design and construction contracts.\textsuperscript{180}

164. Other consultancies were relatively minor and selection and appointments were appointed in accordance with DPW quality assurance and DETA procedures for engagement of consultants.\textsuperscript{181}

Conclusion 6:

The procurement methods for the project were reasonable.
h) The balance of public and private sector involvement in the work

165. The indicative split of public and private sector involvement in the works is shown in Table 4. Of the total project budget, most of the work by value was undertaken by the private sector.

166. The private sector undertook: 182
   - the majority of work within SEQ
   - the supply of factory-built buildings throughout Queensland
   - the construction of 13 purpose-built two-storey buildings (12 buildings are located within SEQ and the other is located in Townsville).

167. The public sector (Joint Venture Group) undertook: 183
   - work in regional and remote areas of Queensland
   - a small number of projects within SEQ that required unique solutions that were not scheduled in the scope of works at the time of tender for the SEQ contract. It was considered that the Joint Venture could provide the most cost effective delivery.
   - while the work was managed by public sector resources, the majority of the trade work was undertaken by local private sector trade subcontractors engaged by QBuild on a project-by-project basis in accordance with QBuild procurement procedures.

Table 4: Breakdown of public and private sector involvement in the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply of new factory built prep buildings, including T2000s (Bendigo)</td>
<td>$39.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of new factory built prep buildings, including T2000s (Ausco)</td>
<td>$42.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite building works in SEQ (Bovis Lend Lease)</td>
<td>$78.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite building works in Regional and Remote Queensland (DPW JV)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose built two-storey buildings (Evans Harch)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of air-conditioning units (existing Standing Offer arrangement)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation of standard transportable classroom buildings (T2000 – Ausco and Bendigo)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects outside main contracts (Helensvale, Kallangur &amp; Northlakes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.33 $1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$181.05</td>
<td>$1.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Joint department submission, p 28
* The majority of trade works contained in this figure was undertaken by local private sector trade subcontractors.

168. DETA undertook an assessment of contract packaging via a procurement risk workshop to assist with the awarding of contracts to the private and public sectors. This workshop considered issues, such as the scope and amount of work included in each package, the geographic spread of the work and whether the work should be undertaken by private or public sector resources. 184

169. The risk assessment identified that a large package of onsite building work in SEQ was appropriate for delivery by a private sector contractor due to the competitive interest and cost effectiveness and efficiency. It was also identified as appropriate for the private sector to deliver
the large number of factory-built new buildings required across the state to meet time constraints and provide a uniform and acceptable final product.\textsuperscript{185}

170. The assessment identified that a significant package of onsite building work in regional and remote Queensland would not be attractive to the private sector due to the wide geographical spread of the schools. In this way, a significant advantage was identified with the public sector (DPW/QBuild) undertaking onsite building work in regional and remote Queensland, particularly because of DPW’s local presence in these areas and their experience at project delivery in schools. It was also identified as advantageous that DPW/QBuild routinely engage local private contractors as an inherent part of doing business.\textsuperscript{186}

171. The committee is satisfied with the balance of public and private sector involvement in the work. The various roles and responsibilities for the prep program have been allocated to the parties in the best position to undertake them.

\begin{boxedtext}
\textbf{Conclusion 7:}
\textit{The committee is satisfied with the balance of public and private sector involvement in the work.}
\end{boxedtext}

i) \textit{The performance of the constructing authority, the consultants and contractors for the work}

172. DETA and DPW are satisfied with the performance of each of the consultants and contractors to date. Satisfactory Performance Reports on private sector consultants and contractors were made during the works. The work has been undertaken in accordance with the specification and design intent required in the ‘Design and Construct’ documentation of the contract. Many of the projects are currently in the 12 months defects liability phase of the contract. Defects in workmanship or materials are being attended to as they are identified. To date the work has been completed in accordance with contractual obligations of the various contracts:\textsuperscript{187}

- Practical completion for the contract in SEQ was issued four months ahead of the contractual date for practical completion and has been completed within budgetary allowances.
- Practical completion for the onsite building works (regional and remote) was achieved on 21 December 2007. It is anticipated that the contract will be completed within the budgetary allowance for the scope of work. Tracking of costs to date support the projection.
- The supply of factory-built buildings (new-builds) has been delivered in accordance with agreed time schedules. It is anticipated that both contracts will be completed within the budgetary allowances for the scope of work.
- Practical completion of the purpose-built two-storey buildings was achieved for the start of the 2007 school year. The final contract sum is currently being negotiated with Evans Harch. It is anticipated to be completed within the budgetary allowances for the scope of work.

\begin{boxedtext}
\textbf{Conclusion 8:}
\textit{The work was completed according to specifications, was delivered on-time, within budget and contractual obligations were met.}
\end{boxedtext}

\textsuperscript{185} Joint department submission, p 28
\textsuperscript{186} Joint department submission, p 28
\textsuperscript{187} Joint department submission, pp 29, 30
Appendix 1 – Advertisement calling for submissions

Advertisement placed in Brisbane’s Courier Mail on Saturday 27 October 2007

Public Works Committee
Call for Submissions

INQUIRY INTO PREP SCHOOL YEAR CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM

The Public Works Committee has determined to review the Prep School Year Capital Works Program.

The committee is calling for submissions from interested persons and organisations. You should base your submission on the Terms of Reference outlined in the Inquiry Information Paper which also gives details on the inquiry, the project, the committee and how to make a submission.

To get a copy of the paper visit our Internet site at http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/Committees/ or phone the committee secretariat on 07 3406 7230.

Please send your submissions by Friday, 14 December 2007 to:

The Research Director
Public Works Committee
Parliament House, George Street
Brisbane Qld 4000

Barbara Stone MP, Chair
Appendix 2 – Witnesses

Public hearing held on Friday, 29 February 2008

- Ms Prue Walsh
  Play Environment Consulting Pty Ltd

Public hearing held on Friday, 14 March 2008

- Mr Al Wagner
  Acting Assistant Director-General
  Strategic Facilities (Education)
  Department of Education, Training and the Arts

- Mr Max Smith
  Deputy Director-General, Works
  Department of Public Works

- Mr Ross Harvey
  Co-Chair
  Facilities Standing Committee
  Queensland Association of State School Principals

- Mr Stephen Doyle
  Co-Chair
  Facilities Standing Committee
  Queensland Association of State School Principals
Appendix 3 – Ministerial Responses – s.107 of the Parliament of Queensland Act

107 Ministerial response to committee report

(1) This section applies if–
   (a) a report of a committee, other than the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee, recommends the Government or a Minister should take particular action, or not take particular action, about an issue; or
   (b) a report of the Members’ Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee recommends a motion be moved in the Assembly to implement a recommendation of the committee.

(2) The following Minister must provide the Assembly with a response–
   (a) for a report mentioned in subsection (1)(a)–the Minister who is responsible for the issue that is the subject of the report;
   (b) for a report mentioned in subsection (1)(b)–the Premier or a Minister nominated by the Premier.

(3) The response must set out–
   (a) any recommendations to be adopted, and the way and time within which they will be carried out; and
   (b) any recommendations not to be adopted and the reasons for not adopting them.

(4) The Minister must table the response within 3 months after the report is tabled.

(5) If a Minister can not comply with the subsection (4), the Minister must–
   (a) within 3 months after the report is tabled, table an interim response and the Minister’s reasons for not complying within 3 months; and
   (b) within 6 months after the report is tabled, table the response.

(6) If the Assembly is not sitting, the Minister must give the response, or interim response and reasons, to the Clerk.

(7) The response, or interim response and reasons, is taken to have been tabled on the day they are received by the Clerk.

(8) The receipt of the response, or interim response and reasons, by the Clerk, and the day of the receipt, must be recorded in the Assembly’s Votes and Proceedings for the next sitting day after the day of receipt.

(9) The response, or interim response and reasons, is a response, or interim response and reasons, tabled in the Assembly.

(10) Subsection (1) does not prevent a Minister providing a response to a recommendation in a report of the Scrutiny of Legislation Committee if it is practicable for the Minister to provide the response having regard to the nature of the recommendation and the time when the report is made.  
    Example–
    If the committee recommends that a Bill be amended because, in the committee’s opinion, it does not have sufficient regard to fundamental legislative principles and the Bill has not been passed by the Assembly, it may be practicable for the Minister to provide a response.

(11) Subsection (6) does not limit the Assembly’s power by resolution or order to provide for the tabling of a response, or interim response and reasons, when the Assembly is not sitting.

(12) This section does not apply to an annual report of a committee.
Appendix 4 – Reports of the Public Works Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Date Tabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Annual Report for the Period Ending 30 June 1989</td>
<td>6 July 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inquiry into the Proposed Construction by the Brisbane and Area Water Board of a Dam on the Albert River at Wolffdene (September 1989)</td>
<td>28 September 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report for the Period 1 July to 19 October 1989</td>
<td>19 October 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Public Works Committee Report No. 3 was issued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Annual Report for the Period 6 March to 30 June 1990</td>
<td>23 August 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bundaberg Hospital Redevelopment - Stage Two (October 1990)</td>
<td>24 October 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing - The Future (May 1991)</td>
<td>28 May 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Building Another Mental Institution or Housing a New Mental Health Service? - A Report on Community Debate Concerning Construction of the New Kirwan Psychiatric Rehabilitation Unit (October 1991)</td>
<td>24 October 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Consultation and Planning for Schools and Colleges between State and Local Authorities (November 1991)</td>
<td>5 December 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Proposal to Build a 33-Level Office Block at 111 George Street (November 1991)</td>
<td>5 December 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kirwan Psychiatric Rehabilitation Centre</td>
<td>2 March 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Proposed Upgrade of the Townsville Correctional Centre</td>
<td>3 March 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Public Housing in Toowoomba</td>
<td>19 March 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Development of the Sciencentre - the Old Government Printery</td>
<td>13 May 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies</td>
<td>13 May 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cairns Courthouse, Police Headquarters and Watchhouse Complex</td>
<td>20 May 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Replacement Schools for Herberton and Mission Beach</td>
<td>15 July 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report for Year 1992-1993</td>
<td>1 September 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brisbane Convention and Exhibition Centre</td>
<td>13 October 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The Construction of New Government Office Accommodation in Rockhampton</td>
<td>18 November 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Health Facilities in Far North Queensland - Preliminary Report</td>
<td>3 December 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cairns Convention Centre</td>
<td>28 April 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Landsborough Highway, Jessamine Creek, and University Road, Townsville</td>
<td>28 April 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report for Year 1993-94</td>
<td>2 August 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Development of Mountain Creek High School</td>
<td>31 August 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nambour Hospital Block 6 and Associated Matters</td>
<td>9 September 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Queensland Cultural Centre - Stage Five</td>
<td>28 October 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Technology Facilities Toowoomba College of Technical and Further Education</td>
<td>23 February 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Development of the Teemburra Dam and Associated Irrigation Areas</td>
<td>24 March 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Development of the Mackay Small Craft Harbour</td>
<td>31 March 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Development of the Hervey Bay Courthouse</td>
<td>6 June 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Development of the Bundaberg Police Headquarters and Watchhouse</td>
<td>6 June 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Date Tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the Cairns Base Hospital</td>
<td>23 July 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Expansion of the Lotus Glen Correctional Centre Farm</td>
<td>23 July 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Construction of the new Woodford Correctional Centre</td>
<td>29 October 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tilt Train Project</td>
<td>26 March 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The Expansion of the Dairymple Bay Coal Terminal</td>
<td>8 May 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the Princess Alexandra Hospital — interim report</td>
<td>27 May 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>The provision of infrastructure in Cape York</td>
<td>27 June 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The South East Transit Project</td>
<td>22 July 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The Mareeba/Dimbulah Irrigation Area Project</td>
<td>19 August 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The Development of 75 William Street</td>
<td>19 August 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>A re-evaluation of the South East Transit Project</td>
<td>9 October 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The construction of a joint Emergency Services head office facility at Kedron Park</td>
<td>28 October 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The construction of a standard gauge rail line to Fisherman Islands</td>
<td>10 December 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>The operations of Q-Build</td>
<td>17 March 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The construction of a replacement watchhouse and arrest courts in Brisbane</td>
<td>17 March 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the Princess Alexandra Hospital — 2nd interim report</td>
<td>23 April 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Review of the construction of the Queensland Cultural Centre Stage V</td>
<td>16 September 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The upgrading of the Townsville Correctional Centre</td>
<td>22 October 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Construction of a hot fire training facility by the Queensland Fire and Rescue Authority</td>
<td>22 October 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Heritage Train project (Great South Pacific Express)</td>
<td>12 November 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Townsville Hospital redevelopment</td>
<td>12 November 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Construction of 30 Citytrain carriages</td>
<td>17 December 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Construction of a new school and secondary department at Tin Can Bay</td>
<td>17 December 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the Maryborough Hospital</td>
<td>17 December 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Construction of public housing for seniors in the Brisbane statistical division</td>
<td>29 April 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Construction of the Ron Camm Bridge and port infrastructure development by the Mackay Port Authority</td>
<td>8 June 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Construction of the Tarong-Blackwall power transmission line</td>
<td>8 June 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Robina and Noosa Hospital Projects</td>
<td>27 August 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>St George Irrigation Area Project</td>
<td>27 August 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Public Sector Backflow Prevention Programs</td>
<td>30 November 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>The Construction of Additional Female and Male Correctional Centres in South East Queensland</td>
<td>3 December 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Capital Maintenance Program for the Queensland Cultural Centre</td>
<td>3 December 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Maintenance of the State-controlled Road Network</td>
<td>23 March 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Date Tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Building Refurbishment at the Gold Coast Institute of TAFE (Southport Campus)</td>
<td>30 May 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Norman River Bridge Project</td>
<td>30 May 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Cairns Seaport Development</td>
<td>20 June 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Bentley Park College</td>
<td>4 July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Tweed River Sand Bypassing Project</td>
<td>25 July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3rd Interim Report on the Princess Alexandra Hospital Redevelopment</td>
<td>5 September 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Queensland Police Service – upgrade of the district headquarters and replacement of regional headquarters Rockhampton</td>
<td>14 November 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Rockhampton TAFE College Engineering Technology Facility</td>
<td>7 August 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Cairns Convention Centre – Stage 2</td>
<td>13 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Construction of a New Government Office Building, Cairns</td>
<td>8 March 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Annual Report 2001/2002</td>
<td>1 August 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The Redevelopment of the Tallebudgera Outdoor Recreation Centre</td>
<td>19 September 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Water – Engineering Solutions and Environmental Consequences</td>
<td>5 December 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>The Burdekin River Project</td>
<td>1 May 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Maryborough Correctional Centre</td>
<td>15 May 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Cooloola Sunshine Institute of TAFE redevelopment stage 2 (Mooloolaba)</td>
<td>21 August 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>The Redevelopment of the Mabuiag Island Primary Health Care Centre</td>
<td>24 November 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>The Brisbane Magistrates Court Project</td>
<td>13 November 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Construction of a new government office building at 33 Charlotte Street, Brisbane</td>
<td>20 May 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>The Upper Coomera State College (Stage One)</td>
<td>19 August 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>The Great Walks of Queensland Project</td>
<td>29 September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Queensland Rail Coal Electric Locomotive Upgrade Project (Stage 1)</td>
<td>10 March 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>The Ayr Hospital Redevelopment</td>
<td>9 June 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the Moa Island (Kubin Community) Primary Health Care Centre</td>
<td>24 November 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Weipa Hospital Precinct</td>
<td>1 December 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Date Tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Roma Street Fire and Ambulance Station</td>
<td>8 March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the Sir David Longland Correctional Centre</td>
<td>19 April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report 2006/07</td>
<td>17 August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>The Tugan Bypass Project</td>
<td>4 December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Suncorp Stadium Project</td>
<td>12 March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Townsville Correctional Centre Project</td>
<td>17 April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report 2007/08</td>
<td>9 October 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information please contact the committee secretariat:

Telephone:................................. 07 3406 7230
Fax:............................................ 07 3210 0128
Email: ........................................ pwc@parliament.qld.gov.au

Information on the committee, copies of committee reports and the terms of reference for current inquiries are available on the committee’s Internet site: http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/PWC