Mt Wellington/ Waimokoia rapid payment standard findings and payments for the purpose of settlement

August 2024: This document has been updated to amend Ms C's start date at Mt Wellington/Waimokoia School, provide further information on the possible time out space and corporal punishment at Mt Wellington, and information on investigation into Mr F.

27 January 2026: The '**Payment**' column of this document has been updated to reflect Ministerial decisions made in December 2025 to increase rapid payments. The rest of the document has not changed.

Decade	Summary of findings	Standard findings			Payment
1960s	Supervision issues. One potentially abusive staff member present for short period. The number of residential staff was initially low, resulting in considerable pressure on existing residential staff and the head teacher, and some pressure on teaching staff. The inadequate number of housemasters in particular was a persistent problem. There were not enough people to cover out-of-school care of the children, including care of the boys overnight, until the late 1960s. There was generally high staff turnover in the 1960. In the 1960s, the boys' dormitory was entirely unsupervised for several nights a week, for a period of months or year.	Inappropriate use of timeout	Former students have described a timeout space at Mt Wellington as a plywood box/room under the boys' dormitory. While there is apparently a photo showing entry to a space under the building, no official documentation describing the space has been located. Former student descriptions state that the space was not used as a timeout space until the late 1970s.	No	Standard: $7,500 to recognise supervision issues Specific: $15,000 for people who were present between December 1960 and January 1961
			Under principal VE Hill (1960-1964), the school took a therapeutic approach to discipline – "treatment tends to permissiveness rather than control". Hill did not have tolerance for staff shouting at students and felt that asking a child to leave the dining room for misbehaviour during dinner time was tantamount to 'ostracising' them from the group. Subsequent principals, Tuohy (1964-1967) and Laughton (1967-1972), are known to have maintained much of Hill's school programme and general therapeutic approach.		
		Physical abuse (staff)	Mt Wellington's first principal V E Hill specifically forbade corporal punishment when the school first opened, expecting staff to "establish democratic relationships with the children by being at all times extremely tolerant and in every way avoiding strict discipline." Subsequent principals, Tuohy (1964-1967) and Laughton (1967-1972), are known to have maintained much of Hill's school programme and general therapeutic approach, making it unlikely that corporal punishment was part of accepted disciplinary policy at the school. We have found, however, one example of Hill using corporal punishment. In early 1962, a housemaster reported that Hill once strapped a pupil who had absconded "fourteen times in front of the whole school". The housemaster described this as "the first instance" of Hill breaking policy — he did not mention any further instances or give the date of the strapping. He did not suggest that Hill changed his policy on avoiding strict discipline; in fact, he wrote that Hill had later criticised him for "having too disciplinarian a relationship with the children". Therefore, while it is possible that other unrecorded uses of corporal punishment occurred, it appears that this strapping was an isolated incident.	No	
		Physical abuse (students)	Children admitted to Mt Wellington in the 1960s were sometimes described as "aggressive", though this was undefined. Of 19 children enrolled in 1962, six were thought to be "aggressive", and in 1963 ten of the 25 children enrolled were considered "aggressive". The admission committee actively sought not to admit too many aggressive students at any one time to limit problems for staff and students.	Yes	

			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Sexual abuse (staff)	**Mr A** was employed as a handyman at Mt Wellington from November 15 to December 30, 1960. The handyman was to act as a custodian of the school buildings during holidays, and so Mr A lived onsite. The role also involved providing relief assistance to the housemaster on his two days off, comprising ten hours of supervision a week plus stand-by for two nights. In early January 1961, the Child Welfare Division (CWD) were alerted to the fact that Mr A had been missing from the school and his position. A CWD officer conducted a search of his living quarters and found "evidence which made me suspect that this employee might have been guilty of criminal impropriety towards males". There is no information in records about what the evidence was. The CWD advised local police of Mr A's disappearance, and other Child Welfare institutions were forewarned against considering Mr A for employment in another Child Welfare institution.	Yes - Sexual abuse by Mr A between December 1960 and January 1961	
		Sexual abuse (students)	Sometimes students admitted to the school in the 1960s were described by parents or psychologists as "sexually deviant". Aside from admission and discharge reports little is mentioned about sexual activity.	Yes	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Psychological abuse (staff)	No finding.	No	
		Psychological abuse (students)	No finding.	No	
		Inappropriate Behaviour management Practices	Under principal VE Hill (1960-1964), the school took a therapeutic approach to discipline – "treatment tends to permissiveness rather than control". Hill did not have tolerance for staff shouting at students and felt that asking a child to leave the dining room for misbehaviour during dinner time was tantamount to 'ostracising' them from the group. Given this approach, corporal punishment would have been unlikely to be considered acceptable practice. Subsequent principals, Tuohy (1964-1967) and Laughton (1967-1972), are known to have maintained much of Hill's school programme and general therapeutic approach.	No	
		Teaching and Learning	No finding.	No	
1970s	Supervision issues, teaching and learning in 1975, timeout from 1977. Two	Inappropriate use of timeout	First allegations of excessive or inappropriate timeout are from students at the school in 1978. The school was then at its Mt Wellington premises, where timeout is alleged to have taken place in a plywood box/room under the boys' dormitory.	Yes – from 1977 onwards.	Standard: $15,000 to recognise physical abuse, lack

	potentially abusive staff members present from 1978. The school faced grave staffing problems in the 1970s which required the employment of temporary and short-term staff, particularly in the classroom. The boys' dormitory was supervised at night every day of the week except for two nights by the housemaster who was on duty until 9pm, and then on call throughout the night.		Information suggests timeout was in use from 1979, possibly as early as 1977. No official documentation describing the space under the dormitory at Mt Wellington has been located.		of appropriate supervision leading to abuse between students, teaching and learning issues Specific: $15,000 for people present between June and September 1978 and from 10 September 1979
			In late 1979 the school moved to its new premises at Bucklands Beach. Building plans suggest that the school planned to have a small one-to-one room in the teaching block, but there is no evidence to suggest this was used for timeout. According to witnesses in the McCardle and Mr B court hearings, the school had two timeout rooms – one in the basement area of the green cottage, and the other in the storage shed near the blue cottage. Witnesses agree that the main space used for timeout was the latter, and the basement was never used for timeout. The storage shed room used for timeout was made of concrete and was completely unfurnished except for a light. Witnesses state that the room could be locked externally but not internally, and some stated that there was a flap in the door that acted as a peephole.		
		Physical abuse (staff)	**Mr B** worked as a residential social worker and team leader at Mt Wellington/ Waimokoia between 10 September 1979 until 19 October 2001. Late in 2000, Mr B was disciplined for using excessive restraint which left a child with a fractured elbow. Mr B also allegedly used an "arm bar" restraint – holding a student's arm out straight and pushing in the wrong direction. During investigation into allegations against Mr B, children disclosed that at least two other staff were using a restraint they called the "arm treatment" where a child's arm was pulled up behind their back. In November 2000, Mr B was stood down pending an investigation by the school's commissioner, Ross Knight, after being accused of using "physical intervention outside of the parameters I [Knight] gave in my memorandum to staff on 28 July 2000". In particular, Mr B had restrained a child by the arm and during the following struggle the child suffered a fractured elbow and used the 'arm bar' with another student. Following the incident there was an investigation into use of physical restraints at the school. In early 2001, Mr B was invited to return to Waimokoia as a 'student aide' on the teaching side of the school. He commenced this role on 23 April 2001. However, on 5 September 2001, Mr B handed in his resignation citing concerns with behaviour management strategies, and a lack of support and professional development. On 7 September 2001, Waimokoia's executive director, Lorraine Guthrie, wrote to inform Mr B that she had "received complaints about your competence to fulfil your duties" including that Mr B was late to work, falling asleep during work hours, and unwilling to fulfil his duties. Even though Mr B had already indicated he wished to resign, the executive director suggested she would "gather information before deciding whether to make a recommendation to the school's Commissioner". Nevertheless, Mr B formally resigned on 19 October 2001. In the 2000s, several ex-students from Waimokoia came forward and alleged that Mr B had sexually abused them. Mr B appeared in court in 2009, but the trial was aborted due to his ill-health. Mr B died before a retrial could be held.	Yes – against the following staff members: • Mr B (from 10 September 1979) • Ms C (from 1977)	
			Ms C was employed at Waimokoia from c.1977 until 1999. In 1999, Ms C was involved in a disciplinary process following allegations made by staff and students that she assaulted three students and used excessive physical restraint, filed incorrect incident reports, and harassed students verbally. Ms C was stood down and resigned following the investigation.		

			The issues investigated during the disciplinary proceedings were: • Using excessive and inappropriate force when restraining students on three occasions in 1998 and 1999. The assaults included throwing a student bodily into a room, sitting and lying on students (sometimes for many minutes), pushing a student's face into carpet with sufficient force to cause carpet burns and break the skin, pulling a student's hair with sufficient force to topple him and herself over. • Filing false incident reports in relation to two of the events, and failure to file an incident report in relation to the third. • Harassing a student including calling them a liar in an assembly; shouting at, belittling, and behaving aggressively toward other students. • Treating colleagues in a discourteous and disrespectful manner.		
		Physical abuse (students)	In early 1978, with an influx of "very disturbed" children and a sense that the school's problems were being ignored, the residential staff threatened to go on strike. Children were again discharged to day pupil status, which temporarily resolved the staff's grievances.	Yes	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Sexual abuse (staff)	**Mr D** was employed as an assistant housemaster at Mt Wellington Residential School from around June 1978 until around September 1978. Mr D resigned at the request of principal Joe Keown, following his investigation into a report from a student claiming that Mr D had attempted to kiss him. Keown stated that Mr D's "general performance of his duties was not satisfactory" and that the kissing incident had "prompted me to insist on termination of employment". Keown did not report Mr D's behaviour to the police. On 14 November 1978, two children – including one who was a student at Mt Wellington Residential School – made statements claiming that Mr D had committed acts of indecent assault on them. While at the school, Mr D had invited the student to stay at his home address on a number of occasions where he persuaded the student to allow him to take nude photographs of him and sexually abused him. A search warrant of Mr D's property produced numerous photographs of nude and semi-nude young children in sexual positions, along with some naturist magazines. Mr D was arrested and charged with 23 counts of sexual abuse against five boys and two girls. On 22 March 1979, Mr D, who had plead guilty to all charges, was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment.	Sexual abuse by **Mr D** for males and females attending between June and September 1978. Sexual abuse by **Mr B** of males attending from 10 September 1979.	
			See **Mr B**.		
		Sexual abuse (students)	In early 1978, with an influx of "very disturbed" children and a sense that the school's problems were being ignored, the residential staff threatened to go on strike. Children were again discharged to day pupil status, which temporarily resolved the staff's grievances.	Yes.	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		

		Psychological abuse (staff)	See **Ms C**.	Yes – allegations against Ms C for verbal abuse	
		Psychological abuse (students)	In early 1978, with an influx of “very disturbed” children and a sense that the school’s problems were being ignored, the residential staff threatened to go on strike. Children were again discharged to day pupil status, which temporarily resolved the staff’s grievances.	Yes.	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Inappropriate Behaviour management practices	Force feeding upheld [case Z].	Yes – allegations against Ms C for inappropriate behaviour management practices, allegations of force-feeding	
			See **Ms C**.		
		Teaching and Learning	1975 proved to be a difficult year for the school. Staffing issues and instability created a difficult learning environment for students, and Principal I E Browne reported that it was “the area of the teaching programmes that the greatest fragmentation and disappointments occurred”. Consequently, with the appointment of a new principal, Joe Keown, and an almost entirely new set of teaching staff in 1976, the school’s teaching programme was altered considerably.	Yes, for the year 1975	
1980s	Timeout in use, known practice failures, potential and known abusive staff members present throughout. Children were supervised until lights out by residential social workers, night supervisors took over from around 9:30pm until 7am the following day. Usually there was just one night supervisor per cottage. NOTE: two RSW – Mr B and McCardle – sexually and physically	Inappropriate use of Timeout	Ongoing use of concrete shed. Timeout was typically used for 10-50 minutes. Departmental policy was that timeout should be 3-4 minutes, and that beyond 10 minutes could be counterproductive. Former staff testified that children were kept in timeout beyond recommended duration, and that there were times the record book was inaccurate.	Yes	$30,000 comprised of: • $15k for practice failures and ongoing inappropriate use of behaviour management (as with 1970s) • $15k for increased frequency of physical and sexual abuse throughout
		Physical abuse (staff)	**Mr E** was employed at Waimokoia from 1989 until 2001. In September 2000, following the Commissioner’s memorandum on physical restraint in July of the same year, Mr E was stood down for using excessive physical restraint, including using the ‘arm treatment’ on students. Mr E’s representatives argued he had been using the same ‘arm treatment’ restraint since his arrival at the school in 1989, and that the former principal (Joe Keown), other team leaders, his supervisor and most residential staff had seen him using the technique, which had been taught to him by a member of police during his time at another residential school. Probably sometime after this in 2001, Mr E’s employment at Waimokoia was either terminated or he resigned.	Yes. Physical abuse by: • Mr E (1989-2001) • Graeme McCardle (Term 2 of 1981 – end of 1987) • Mr B (throughout 1980s) • Ms C (throughout 1980s).	
			Graeme McCardle worked at Waimokoia as a residential social worker and team leader between Term II of 1981 and the end of 1987. McCardle lived on campus at Waimokoia between 1981- 1987. After working almost six years at Waimokoia, McCardle left. No claims were brought against McCardle during his time at Waimokoia, however, in 2009,		

	abused students they were meant to be supervising so it is likely supervision was inadequate in the residential units.		former students brought 26 charges against McCardle. The charges included several counts of indecent assault, attempts to sodomise, assault with intent to injure, injure with intent to injure, and sexual violation. The case went to trial in 2009, but the jury was unable to reach a verdict. At a second trial in June 2010, McCardle was found guilty of 15 of the charges, and was sentenced to six years' imprisonment on 22 October 2010. All convictions were in relation to sexual abuse charges. McCardle had been found to take advantage of situations where he could isolate students, and abuse occurred while he was on night shift, in the time out room, in the clothing storeroom, in a student's dorm room, in the lounge area of one of the cottages at night, and in the school bus.		the majority of the 1980s. No specific payment as increased exposure to abuse is factored into 'standard' payment.
			See **Mr B.**		
			See **Ms C**		
		Physical abuse (students)	Daybooks demonstrate a school culture where fighting and violence was common, if not rife. Occasionally fighting led to more serious injury such as a fractured wrist. Children also frequently damaged property.	Yes	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision (see notes above in summary of findings column).		
		Sexual abuse (staff)	See **Graeme McCardle.**	Yes. Sexual abuse by Mr B (males, throughout 1980s) or McCardle (males and females, Term 2 of 1981 – end of 1987).	
			See also **Mr B**.		
		Sexual abuse (students)	1980s daybooks occasionally record instances of children being found in each other's rooms and beds, children making sexualised comments, or children exposing themselves to others. When two children were recorded as having "attempted to lock themselves in the toilet together" and were "found with their pants around their knees", staff were asked to "keep an eye out and be aware". Less than ten days later, the students were "spoken to about sexual behaviour after lights out".	Yes	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Inappropriate Behaviour management practices	Isolated incidences begin to occur in daybooks in early 1983 of children being showered as a consequence for misbehaviour. Similar instances appear throughout the 1980s in daybooks.	Yes. Allegations against Ms C for inappropriate behaviour management practices.	
			Daybooks occasionally mention children missing out on going home for weekends as a consequence for misbehaviour. One residential social worker testified that students from the greater Auckland area would "go		

			home every weekend unless… they'd misbehaved at home the weekend before or something had occurred major at the school with them, they would be on punishment for the weekend".	The following punishments accepted as practice failures: • Showering or having mouth washed out with soap. • Not allowing children to return home. • Force feeding. • Extra exercise in gym.	
			See **Ms C**.		
			Additional assessment findings – school policies and procedures in relation to behaviour management were likely not adhered to (Case Y), force feeding (Case X), extra exercise in gym (Case W), washing one's mouth out with soap was a punishment used to correct behaviour (Case V).		
		Teaching and Learning	No finding.	Nil.	
1990s	Timeout in use, supervision issues, practice failures and potentially abusive staff members present throughout. From February 1997 to October 1998, night attendants were taking their half hour meal breaks away from the residential cottage in which they worked, leaving the children without an adult nearby for that period of time. This was being done at the direction of the Board of Trustees. A schoolwide review in 1999 commented that "there is one night supervisor per cottage who is required to regularly log into the computer data-base (every 30 minutes)". However, the report	Inappropriate use of timeout	Ongoing use of concrete shed. Frequent use of timeout. Record keeping described by a staff member as "spasmodic". Average duration in the limited available records in one quarter of 1995 was 13.5 minutes, never exceeding 20 minutes, while a 1999 daybook gave durations of30 minutes. A staff member testified that a child had been in timeout for days sometime in the 1990s or 2000s. A review noted staff did not know what their timeout policies were and were likely not following them. A 2001 ERO review recommended an urgent review of timeout and in house suspension.	Yes	$30,000 comprised of: • $15k for practice failures and ongoing inappropriate use of behaviour management • $15k for increased frequency of physical and sexual abuse throughout the 1990's. No specific payment as increased exposure to abuse is factored into 'standard' payment.
		Physical abuse (staff)	**Mr E** was employed at Waimokoia from 1989 to 2001. He was stood down for using excessive physical restraint including 'arm treatment'. He argued he had been seen using this practice by other staff i.e. it was widespread.	Yes – against the following staff: • Mr E (1989-2001) • Ms C (all of 1990s) • Mr B (all of 1990s).	
			See **Ms C.**		
			See **Mr B.**		
		Physical abuse (students)	Widespread, if not rife, violence and fighting. Property frequently damaged. Additional assessment finding: Inadequate management practices at the school led to violence in the school and hostel (Case U).	Yes.	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Sexual abuse (staff)	See **Mr B.**	Yes	

	continued, "occasionally this night supervision breaks down as evidenced by reported stealing, fighting, and raids". In light of this the school installed camera surveillance to improve supervision at night. Mr B likely sexually and physically abused students he was meant to be supervising so likely supervision was inadequate in residential units.	Sexual abuse (students)	Daybooks record occasional instances of sexualised behaviour from students in the 1990s, including propositioning, masturbation, and children exposing themselves to others. In August 1999, a male student approached a residential social worker to disclose that sexual behaviour was occurring at night in the dorms between some of the boys while night attendants were asleep. The five boys interviewed disclosed that they often ran around inside the cottages and into each other's rooms at night while the night attendant was asleep in the lounge, that some of the children were sexually propositioning other boys and showing them their genitalia, and that some of the boys had been engaging sexually with each other by "bumming" (ie. one child pulling their pants down and rubbing their penis in another child's bottom) or engaging in oral sex. Night attendants were found to be regularly sleeping on the job during the later 1990s and it may have also been happening earlier.	Yes	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Inappropriate Behaviour management practices	Sources occasionally mention that children missed out on going home for weekends or were returned early to school for misbehaviour.	Yes. Allegations against Ms C for inappropriate behaviour management practices. The following punishments accepted as practice failures: • Denial of access to toilet facilities • Culturally disrespectful or offensive behaviour • Failure to protect students from self-harm.	
			1990s daybooks demonstrate a growth in residential staff using showering as a consequence for misbehaviour.		
			See **Ms C**.		
			Additional assessment findings: denied access to toilet facilities at night and while in time out (Cases S and T), tikanga breached (Case S), inadequate action when student tried to harm himself in timeout (Case T).		
		Teaching and learning	No finding.	Nil.	
2000s	The school had a "terrifying and unhealthy" environment for students, inappropriate use of timeout, practice failures and known and potentially abusive staff present throughout.	Inappropriate use of Time out	Evidence of frequent use throughout the first half of the 2000s. Both daybooks and timeout registers record frequent use of timeout in the first years of the 2000s. Timeout registers for the residential side of the school appear incomplete. Duration of timeout in records increased from the 1990s. Average times for the cottages in 2003 and 2004 ranged from 22 to 32 minutes. In 2005, an ERO report noted concerns about Waimokoia's use of timeout. "Staff report that their use of timeout…is designed to protect students from harm rather than to serve as a punishment", the report stated. But ERO seemed unconvinced by this, pointing out that "the students are placed in a small concrete block shed…[with] no windows". "The commissioner should urgently review the use of timeout at the school", the report concluded. A 12-month review from ERO in 2006 reported that interventions following the 2005 report	Yes, up to the end of 2005.	$30,000 comprised of: • $15k for ongoing concerns with teaching and learning practices for

	This was a most difficult period in the school's life, with some staff the source of much of that difficulty. Some sources available for this period need to be treated with caution. There were staff members engaged in deceitful behaviour, including in their written accounts of events. That deceit skewed the understanding of others associated with the school, with a resulting impact on what they said. In the early 2000s, Waimokoia was employing a high number of childcare relievers (one source gave a rate of 20-35% of staff being relievers, involved in between 25 and 50% of shifts). Some of these staff were provided by security firms, and they usually had no training or relevant experience. Because of the physical demands of childcare work, any large men on staff were in demand to restrain children. Whether these untrained temporary staff were involved in restraint is not known. Students were supervised after lights-out by night attendants – usually one or more per cottage. Movements were monitored by night attendants using the camera surveillance system		had resulted in a major reduction in timeout use – according to the review timeout had only been used once since October 2005. In 2003, the school also began to use In-house suspension or isolation in addition to timeout. According to a 2005 ERO report, "students regard in-house suspension, that they refer to as isolation, as worse than timeout". The report stated that students were "removed from contact with any other students and confined to their rooms for an extended period of time". In response to concerns that in-house suspension 'isolated' a child for 'a number of days' in some instances, the school's director, Lorraine Guthrie stated that in-house suspension "had only been necessary in a very few cases and between 1-48 hours". But the 2005 ERO report said "senior managers should review the use of seclusion to determine how often it is used and why and to determine its impact on the emotional well being of students". The response from management at Waimokoia stated that in-house suspension "is reviewed every time it is used and has only been used once in 2005". A 12-month review in August 2006, noted that following the introduction of Therapeutic Crisis Intervention, "timeout and in-house suspension/seclusion strategies have only each been used once since October 2005". It is unclear where ERO sourced this information from.		a significant amount of time and inappropriate behaviour management. • $15k for ongoing physical and sexual abuse occurring during the 2000's, including between students. No specific payment as increased exposure to abuse is factored into 'standard' payment.
		Physical abuse (staff)	**Mr F** was the focus of numerous complaints and allegations from 2002 to 2007. Mr F first worked at Waimokoia as a teacher in 2001, and at the end of that year transferred to the residential staff. Some allegations affected multiple people, both children and adult members of staff. Complaints and allegations related to assaults on children, bullying and frightening them, use of physical force during inappropriate restraint, cold showering immediately followed by time out, and humiliation of students as a method of control; sexual harassment of staff, physical intimidation and assault of staff, and bullying and belittling of other staff members. Complaints were made by students and their whānau, other Waimokoia staff, and PSA (Public Service Association) organisers. A set of allegations against Mr F was independently investigated in 2005. The allegations were not substantiated and the investigator concluded the issue was primarily one of "differences between parties in their approaches to managing difficult children, in their basic values reflected in interactions and sanctions, and in the extent of their experiences and training." The investigator nonetheless made some recommendations. The first recommendation was: "That the Executive Director ensures that staff members working with children are not placed in vulnerable or isolating positions which could lead to allegations or suspicions of abuse. The ideal of having staff work in an open environment is commendable. However where privacy is required for one reason or another, strict rules around precautions to take and types of activity not permitted should be clearly set out and adhered to. In my opinion this would include a sole staff member taking students outside, in the dark, for the purposes of following up bad behaviour." The specific "not permitted" activities listed were behaviours Mr F had engaged in. When the school's commissioner Ann Hunt informed Mr F that he had been cleared, she noted that "[a]s discussed, the practice of isolating students outside and in the absence of other staff members places you at risk of allegation and/or misinterpretation." The "preferred method" of talking with students in private was to do so in sight of others, and Mr F was directed to model this for other staff. In 2007, Mr F was arrested and charged with assault of students. (Other members of staff were also arrested at the same time.) He was acquitted of these and other charges. In 2008, Waimokoia's fourth commissioner, Dennis Finn, investigated Mr F and found that he had:	Yes. Against the following staff members: • Mr F (2001-2008) • Mr B (until October 2001).	

	installed in 1999 in each cottage. Over the 1999-2001 period many staff left, including some who were dismissed or who resigned during a disciplinary process. The staff who left had worked at the school in the 1990s, and while some of the investigations were undertaken in 2000 or 2001, the actions that prompted them either occurred in the 1990s or were also occurring then. The issues [with night staff] were sleeping on the job, falsifying night reports, and failing to carry out half hourly checks on students. The period specified was March-May 2000, but it became apparent these behaviours were engaged in as a matter of course and had been occurring for at least a year. When other staff first raised these matters, it was also reported that some night staff were tampering with CCTV cameras. During investigation of the initial issues, the possibility that computer records were being manipulated was raised.		• created a climate of fear at the school, among staff and students. • behaved dishonesty - not advising the commissioner of his relationship with another staff member, obtaining over $40,000 from the school in addition to his salary, numerous overseas trips at the school's expense, excessive expenses for phone, petrol, and use of a school vehicle. • failed to complete timekeeping, annual leave, and professional development paperwork. Finn terminated Mr F's employment at Waimokoia. In 2013, the New Zealand Teachers Disciplinary Tribunal would find that "Mr F, by reason of the way that he behaved, created a terrifying and unhealthy environment for the students". The Tribunal cancelled Mr F's teaching registration. From the beginning of 2004 there were reports and complaints of staff using excessive or inappropriate methods of restraining children. Many related to Mr F. The earliest alleged incident occurred in 2003. On 18 December 2007, two staff members, Mr F and Mr G, were arrested following allegations made to CYFS by another staff member. Mr F was charged with assault on a child, including lifting a child by his collar and slamming him down on a nearby desk, and bouncing a ball off a child's head. Mr G was arrested following allegations that he had picked up a child and thrown him on a bed. Mr G was acquitted.		
			See **Mr B**.		
		Physical abuse (students)	Daybooks demonstrate a school culture where fighting and violence was common, if not rife. Occasionally fighting led to more serious injury. Children also damaged property. Staff noted in 2002 that "older/larger children are using threats to obtain what they want from younger/smaller children".	Yes – for the whole of 2000s	
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Sexual abuse (staff)	**Mr H** was employed as a Programme Co-ordinator at Waimokoia from 2005 until his arrest at Waimokoia in 2008, having previously worked for three years at another residential school. Following allegations in 2007 from other staff members that Mr H was behaving inappropriately towards female students, Waimokoia's executive director Lorraine Guthrie held an internal investigation into the complaint, after which it appears Mr H was promoted to Senior Shift Leader in February 2008, despite advice to the contrary. Later in February 2008, Mr H was arrested. It is unclear what the outcome of this situation was, but Mr H's employment was terminated around the same time.	Yes - Sexual abuse of girls 2005-2008 by Mr H. Yes - Sexual abuse of boys until 19 Oct 2001 by Mr B.	
			See **Mr B**.		
		Sexual abuse (students)	While the attendants slept, the children got up and ran around, and those in one cottage were engaging in sexual play which was often but not always mutually consenting.	Yes – for the whole of the 2000s	

			2001 daybook notes that a student had been seen “fondling his genitals…calling to his neighbour across the hall to look”. There was no comment on the staff response to this.		
			There were periods of inadequate supervision.		
		Inappropriate Behaviour management	See **Mr F.**	Yes – showering used as a punishment.	
			During an ERO review in 2005, a member of Waimokoia staff said a reviewer expressed concern about the way Waimokoia staff were using showering, and “implied that showers were used as a way to manage children and as a consequence”. Comment in reply from Waimokoia stated that showers “were often used after an incident to calm children, but not as a punishment”. Later in 2007, a residential staff member stated that when a shift leader informed the group at a staff meeting that she “forced children into cold showers with their clothes on for punishment”, a senior member of staff “responded by saying ‘Good’”. However, showering was never formalised as an official behaviour management strategy. 2000s daybooks include incidences of residential staff using showering as a consequence for misbehaviour.		
		Teaching and Learning	ERO raised concerns around the teaching programme in 2005 and 2008.	Some identified concerns 2005-2008.	