

**ACHIEVING QUALITY:
EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE IN NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITIES**

Paul Williams

and

David Woodhouse

(editors)

New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit

**Te Wahanga Tatari Kaute Tohungatanga
o nga Whare Wananga o Aotearoa**

June 1999

**AAU Series on Quality: Number 3
ISSN: 1174-8826**

The support of



in the publication of this monograph
is gratefully acknowledged by the Academic Audit Unit.

**Third Sight has expertise to improve the effectiveness of Tertiary Education providers.
This includes:**

- Evaluating and establishing “partnering”/ alliance relationships
- Identifying, analysing and capitalising on new opportunities
- Addressing the costs of an organisation’s activities while enhancing quality
- Managing projects and implementing new market-focused initiatives

Third Sight is proud to support innovation and good practice in the Tertiary Sector.

**Contact: Auckland – 09 3607554; Wellington – 04 3890591;
navigate@thirdsight.co.nz**

About the editors:

Paul Williams, Business Strategy and Policy Manager, Lincoln University
PO Box 94, Canterbury
tel: +64-3-325-3830
email: williap@kahu.lincoln.ac.nz

David Woodhouse, Director, Academic Audit Unit
Box 9747, Wellington, New Zealand
tel: +64-4-801-7924
email: director@aau.ac.nz

ISBN: 0-9582041-2-8

Achieving Quality: Examples of good practice in New Zealand universities

<i>Section and Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Background</i>	
<i>Section 1: Staff Development</i>	
Chapter 1: General Staff Development Review	2
Chapter 2: Training Teaching Assistants	6
Chapter 3: Mentoring General Staff Women	10
Chapter 4: Staff Development for Middle Managers	15
Chapter 5: Performance Review and Planning (PRP) System	19
Chapter 6: Procedures for the Appointment of Academic Staff	23
<i>Section 2: Student Support and Learning</i>	
Chapter 7: Supervision Processes in International Multi-Disciplinary Education	28
Chapter 8: The Alternative Calendar	34
Chapter 9: Class Representative System	39
Chapter 10: A Unified Student Service	44
Chapter 11: Course Outlines	48
<i>Section 3: Programme Management and Development</i>	
Chapter 12: Quality Assurance in a Dual Mode Institution	52
Chapter 13: Conjoint Programmes – Policies and Procedures	57
Chapter 14: Developing and Managing International Agreements	64
Chapter 15: Reporting on the Completion of the First Cohort of Students	69
<i>Section 4: Evaluation</i>	
Chapter 16: Review Process and Use of Key Performance Indicators	74
Chapter 17: Getting and Using Feedback from Employers	79
Chapter 18: More Comprehensive Evaluation of Teaching Systems	84
Chapter 19: Colleague Evaluation of Teaching	89
Chapter 20: Quality Matrix	94
<i>Section 5: Abstracts</i>	
Chapter 21: Teaching and Learning Plan	100
Chapter 22: Joint Academic Grievance Committee	101
Chapter 23: Postgraduate Administration and Management	102
Chapter 24: Equal Employment Opportunities	104
Chapter 25: International Linkages – Universitas 21	106
<i>Appendices</i>	
Appendix A: Nomenclature	
Appendix B: Template	
Appendix C: List of Authors	

© New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit
 ISSN: 1174-8826
 ISBN: 0-9582041-2-8

Background

The Academic Audit Unit (AAU) audited the seven universities during the period 1995-1998, beginning with Victoria University of Wellington, which submitted its audit portfolio to the AAU in February 1996, and ending with Lincoln University, whose audit report was published in June 1998.

During the course of these audits, the AAU found much good academic practice to commend. For the assistance of other universities and educational institutions, over twenty of these instances have been gathered together in this publication.

The process of compiling this collection was as follows. From the audit reports, the AAU selected possible examples of good practice and asked each university to indicate who in the institution would be best placed to write a description of the respective practices. These authors drafted descriptions, and then gathered in Wellington for a day during which all the drafts were discussed in small groups. This enabled the authors to identify areas that would benefit from either abbreviation or elaboration in order to make the descriptions most useful to other institutions. Authors then revised their papers, which were edited by Paul Williams and David Woodhouse of the AAU.

These descriptions are written as in 1999, not as in the year when the audit took place. Nonetheless, readers should recognise that the respective universities do not necessarily claim that these descriptions represent their current thinking on best practice. Indeed, in some cases, a university felt that the practice noted by the AAU has not proved to be as valuable as it appeared at the time of the audit, and therefore declined to contribute an item on that topic. It is also worth noting that when a new practice is introduced, much time is spent getting the procedures right, and the actual implementation can drift from the original aim. All the practices finally included were found to be of value by the group that discussed them at the Wellington workshop.

Authors were given a template (Appendix B) and a request for a limited word count. This means that some have been unable to elaborate as much as they may have wished on the theoretical base or the historical background. In each case, however, authors have been asked to write as fully as possible about any problems encountered, as these are most likely to be of assistance to other institutions as they attempt to avoid the same pitfalls. Authors are also willing to be contacted for further information by anyone seriously contemplating implementing the procedure they describe.

The major acknowledgments for this publication go to the authors who contributed a great deal of their time in the interests of assisting other institutions. Authors are listed in Appendix C. Thanks are also due to Neville Withers of the University of Waikato who suggested that the original drafts be discussed by colleagues. This discussion and revision process proved to be immensely useful

Wellington
June 1999

David Woodhouse
Director
Academic Audit Unit

SECTION 1

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Chapter 1: General Staff Development Review

1. Purpose

The Development Review process for general staff enables the staff member to meet annually with their reviewer to discuss their job description, work performance, and development and training needs.

2. Context

All full and part-time general staff are involved in the process. General and academic staff who supervise General staff are asked to act as reviewers.

3. Key principles and concepts

The process is designed to be formative and therefore has been kept separate from salary, promotions and disciplinary procedures. Research on appraisal in higher education supported this decision. In most instances, the reviewer is the supervisor of the staff member being reviewed, and this will often be an academic staff member. There is also provision in the process for a third party to attend the review discussion, either as a support person or as a facilitator. Either the reviewee or the reviewer can request a third party, but both parties must agree as to who this person will be.

All reviewees and reviewers are required to attend a briefing session run by the Centre for Professional Development (CPD) prior to their first review discussion. In addition, reviewer training sessions are regularly offered as part of the university's generic staff development programme.

The objectives of the Development Review process outlined in the staff Guidelines booklet as follows:

- to know where you stand in regard to your effectiveness in your present job
- to consider the forthcoming year and the achievable objectives that could be set
- to discuss possible future staff development activities which may increase your knowledge, competence, and career path openings

Key principles to ensure the Development Review discussion is effective are explained in the Guidelines booklet and in briefing sessions. The first is that both the reviewee and the reviewer should be well prepared for the review discussion. Secondly, the discussion is a two-way process, and the reviewee is asked to contribute in an assertive way (examples of how to do this are provided). Reviewers are also asked to "seek feedback on how the reviewee perceives the way in which they have been managed through the year - usually by you, the reviewer", in addition to giving feedback. Thirdly, the Development Review is designed to be an on-going process. The discussion regarding the past year is intended to be a summary of all the feedback given and received during that time, and there is a ground-rule of "no surprises" regarding a reviewee's work performance. Fourthly, the goals and objectives that are agreed should take into account the goals and objectives of the department, and those of the University. Finally, all agreed actions, including professional development activities, should be followed up appropriately.

4. Process

Considerable flexibility has been encouraged during the Development review implementation to allow departments autonomy in reviewer allocation, and in setting the time frame for their annual review discussions. Faculty, Registries, and in some cases individual departments each have a Review Coordinator who is responsible for distributing forms and signing off completion of the review discussions. A staff member of the CPD has the overall responsibility to coordinate the review process across the University. This involves negotiating time-frames, sending out forms, briefing staff, and follow-up (which includes the use of development plans as a needs analysis for CPD programme planning). On occasions this person is also requested to act as a third party in review discussions.

The development review process begins with the reviewer and the reviewee completing separate preparation forms which ask them to:

- review and update the reviewee's job description (including the standards expected/outcomes column)
- reflect on the actions taken from the previous review discussion (where applicable)
- reflect on the strengths and achievements of the reviewee
- reflect on any problems encountered by the reviewee in the previous year
- discuss ways in which the job could be reorganised to make the work run more smoothly and give a greater sense of achievement to the reviewee
- discuss sources of help/support that have been given to the reviewee or are required
- set goals and objectives for the next twelve months
- identify staff development (skills, knowledge, courses) that would be helpful for the reviewee's job or ongoing development

This is followed by a meeting that uses the preparation form as the agenda. A 'Summary of Discussion' form and a 'Development Plan' are completed after the review discussion. The reviewer and reviewee each keep a copy of these. The forms are also forwarded to the Head of Department, with a copy of the Development Plan forwarded to the CPD if appropriate. Specialist or external training needs are usually required to be funded through the reviewee's department. Staff are also encouraged to consider addressing identified staff development needs through actions other than training courses, for example, by access to information and key people, or by a modification of work procedures or systems.

5. Implementation

The decision to introduce a general staff review system was made through the Registrar's office in 1990. The Development Review process was developed by a working party consisting of coopted members of the General Staff Development Committee and facilitated by the Staff Development Officer at that time. The draft policy, guidelines, and forms were circulated to staff via the Unions (Association of University Staff and the Public Service Association) in 1992. The process was piloted in three different areas of the University. Feedback from the consultation and pilot process was incorporated into the scheme. In November 1993 an information bulletin was sent out to all staff from the Registrar explaining the new appraisal scheme and how it was to be implemented over a three-year period. By the end of 1996, all faculties, schools, departments and centres had conducted at least one Development Review round for general staff. All staff (reviewees and reviewers) were requested to attend a three-hour briefing session prior to participating in the review process. These briefing sessions were facilitated by the Staff Development Office (and now by CPD) and held within each department.

With regard to acceptability, differing views about the purpose of appraisal have been an ongoing issue. Some believe that the process should combine formative and summative elements. While many staff were initially concerned about possible hidden agendas in the process, and voiced scepticism at the briefing sessions, the process has now been widely accepted and is embedded in university practice.

6. Evaluation

During the implementation phase, all staff involved in the 1994 review round were invited to fill in an evaluation form at the completion of their review discussion. Reviewees and reviewers were asked to comment on the review materials (guideline, booklet and forms), the briefing session, their actual review discussion, and the overall process. The feedback was largely positive and no significant changes were made to the process. However, there was concern that not all review discussions had taken place. A working party considered the evaluation summary and made recommendations to the General Staff Development Committee for accountabilities to be specified for the department, the reviewer and the reviewee. These were described together with the results of the evaluation in an information bulletin sent to all general staff and Heads of Department.

A second evaluation was conducted during 1997 and investigated the extent to which the development review process assists general staff in the identification of professional development activities. The evaluation was primarily a qualitative case study, with some quantitative data collected. The methodology was chosen to gain an understanding of the review process from both reviewees' and reviewers' perspectives, using questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The return rate for the questionnaire was relatively low, with 270 reviewees (25%) and 124 reviewers (approximately 47%) responding. The findings suggested that, while the review process had been beneficial in introducing opportunities for giving and receiving feedback, problem solving, agreeing on expected standards, setting goals and objectives, and identifying staff development needs, each of these aspects had only partially been met. The attitude and skill of the reviewer were found to be critical to the effectiveness of the review process. The lack of feedback to the reviewers regarding their performance was identified as a key issue needing to be revisited. The study also showed a need for more opportunities for reviewers to develop the appropriate skills, and for those skills to be seen to be valued by the organisation.

Despite the limits to interpretation given the small sample size, a number of significant issues were raised. First, the review discussions were considered to be more useful by reviewers than reviewees. The findings concurred with other studies showing that the attitude and skill of the reviewer are critical to the success of the review process. Secondly, despite the guideline booklets and briefing sessions, reviewees and reviewers were in many cases unclear about the objectives of the review process and were only partially addressing them. Revision of the forms to include explicit prompts for both reviewers and reviewees has been recommended. Thirdly, there was little evidence to indicate that the process enhanced the identification of staff development needs, and many concluded that the lack of career pathways for general staff in the University was a major constraint on their development. Finally, the findings suggest that the aims of the review process need to be revised to ensure that it does not promise more than it can deliver.

It is important to emphasise that, prior to the introduction of the Development Review Process at the University of Auckland, few general staff had the opportunity to engage in an in-depth discussion about their job with their supervisor, to receive feedback, set objectives, and discuss their professional development needs. While the evaluation found that the review process could be greatly improved, its introduction was held to be beneficial by many staff.

7. Adaptation

Generic applications to other organisations should include the following considerations. Firstly, appraisal processes should be periodically reviewed against their objectives. Secondly, organisational commitment is essential to the review process and will greatly influence the performance and attitudes of the reviewers. The organisation must be seen to value the process, by ensuring that senior staff model good practice and they have a high level of interpersonal skills. Thirdly, reviewers and reviewees need to be clear about the objectives of the process, and those objectives must be practical and achievable.

8. References

Auckland, The University of Auckland. (1996). *Development Review Guidelines*. Auckland: The University of Auckland.

Hope, C. (1998) *The Development Review Process and its Effectiveness In Identifying Staff Development Needs at The University of Auckland*. Unpublished Masters thesis, The University of Auckland, Auckland

9. Contact

Kim Hope
Centre for Professional Development
The University of Auckland.
Private Bag 92019 Auckland.

ph: 3737-599 ext. 5342.
email: k.hope@auckland.ac.nz

Chapter 2: Training Teaching Assistants

1. Purpose

Teaching Assistant is the general term used by Canterbury to describe those people who assist in the teaching within a department - teaching in tutorials, demonstrating in laboratories, marking assignments - and who are available for consultation by students. Teaching Assistants make up about 60% of the total number of teaching staff and are of crucial importance to undergraduate students, providing the 'face' of the University for many students, especially for those enrolled in courses with high enrolments.

While lectures and readings should inform students of the knowledge base of a discipline, it is in the laboratories and tutorials that students learn to engage with the discipline in a way that will help them to understand and practice within it. In these contexts students need to be able to distinguish the important from the unimportant, to learn about what counts as relevant evidence and how to collect it, about how to use evidence to support an argument, and how to understand and use tools appropriate to their task. Consequently there is a responsibility placed on the University to ensure that Teaching Assistants are well trained: well-trained and effective Teaching Assistants can facilitate student learning and may also positively influence student retention in a course and a department. To protect Teaching Assistants, the University has policies covering contractual aspects of their employment

2. Context

For many years up to 1994, the Education Research and Advisory Unit (ERAU) had run cross-campus courses for Teaching Assistants. These were effective in providing new tutors with some basic survival techniques, but participation (for the most part voluntary) was limited and mainly from disciplines in the Arts and Social Sciences. Trials with cross campus courses for demonstrators and tutors working in laboratories and problems classes proved less satisfactory as it was difficult for participants to appreciate the relevance of generic skills away from a close association with the discipline. Experience with occasional workshops arranged at the request of departments further demonstrated the value of a disciplinary context for training.

In an extensive survey of Teaching Assistants in 1995 almost half the respondents in their first year of teaching said they received little or no specific information and/or training for their new roles. Overall for all respondents, two thirds considered opportunities for ongoing skill development as poor or non-existent, and fewer than half reported opportunities for sharing experiences with each other. For many the terms of their working contracts had been conveyed informally and less than half thought they received adequate instruction about procedures for handling disputes or their responsibilities for health and safety.

3. Key principles and concepts

These results clearly indicated need for improvements in preparing Teaching Assistants for their work. The University adopted a two-pronged approach, firstly by developing policy, guidelines and working templates for recruitment and contractual documents and secondly by establishing the expectation that departments provide training and support which is departmentally based for all Teaching Assistants. A senior casual teaching position was also recognised - that of Teaching Assistant Coordinator - who is someone in a larger department who is responsible for organising and supervising the work of other Teaching Assistants in the department and liaising with academic staff; this recognised instances of existing de facto practice.

From 1995, in line with this shift, ERAU reoriented its work in this field from cross campus provision to helping departments put in place custom-designed procedures which:

- are ongoing for as long as Teaching Assistants are employed
- are context sensitive to both the department and the particular course in which Teaching Assistants work
- are appropriate to the Teaching Assistants' developmental levels
- involve both specific training and ongoing support

ERAU's support is offered in three areas:

- initial consultation to identify needs and devise a programme structure
- contribution of initial workshops and special purpose workshops
- assistance with Teaching Assistant evaluation and programme review

All workshops are planned cooperatively with the expectation that departments assume ownership and responsibility for them once they become established in a programme.

4. Process

In the consultative planning stage (usually with an academic staff member who has overall responsibility for Teaching Assistants and/or a Teaching Assistant Coordinator) key questions are:

- Is what the Department wants Teaching Assistants to do (consistent with the department's educational goals)?
- What training will they need to do it?
- How will the department know whether what needs to be done is done?

Only once these issues are addressed can appropriate training be devised - training that is internally coherent (addresses present and future needs in a way that builds on previous training and experience) and consistent in content and process with the educational goals of the department.

ERAU believes that such training should have the following characteristics.

- Training should take account of the nature of the subject and the educational objectives of the course. Should they, for example, attend the lectures their students are attending?
- Training should take account of the roles which Assistants are expected to perform.
- Training should take account of the characteristics of the Assistants themselves. Are they undergraduate students, graduate students, or people employed specifically for the purpose? How can they be taught a repertory of teaching skills to enable them to meet the needs of their students? How good are their interpersonal attitudes and skills and how might they be developed so as to allow them to build satisfactory relationships with students? Are their verbal and written skills appropriate to the task?
- Training should take account of the nature of the learners who are to be taught. How do students learn? What are the students' academic backgrounds and how should they deal with the anticipated variety of background and knowledge? What are the characteristic ways of thinking and learning in the discipline and how can Assistants foster this in their students? How should they provide feedback on assessed work?

5. Implementation

By 1998 most departments (31 of the 35 using Teaching Assistants) were able to report some form of induction/training procedures. These vary from a single interview with the provision of written material; to a combination of information sessions, discussion of content and approach for specific tutorials or laboratories, ongoing forums that allow Teaching Assistants to focus on their experiences and specific training sessions undertaken at appropriate times throughout the year.

Teaching Assistants can themselves contribute directly to the evolution of a department's training programme by running workshops that draw on their experiences. An ongoing forum in which Teaching Assistants can share their successes and discuss their concerns and difficulties is an important part of a balanced training programme.

Teaching Assistants also need specific information about their work, and departments have a responsibility to provide them with written information about the course, their role, pay and conditions, health and safety, and help and resources available for themselves and for the students under their care.

Since introducing a department-centred approach to training in 1995, 26 departments (out of 35 do not use Teaching Assistants) have so far contacted ERAU for an initial briefing. Initial interest came from social science and humanities departments - both have traditionally placed an emphasis on tutorial programmes. Other departments, prompted by the promulgation of policy, began to introduce programmes and most recently enquires have been instigated improved awareness of the value of Teaching Assistant training programmes *elsewhere* in the university. In the first year (1995), over 100 Teaching Assistants attended workshops conducted by ERAU in departments and many more received specific help, information and support in less formal settings. Since that time, some departments have taken over the responsibility for basic training and call on ERAU only for consultation or to work on advanced workshops however, participation in ERAU conducted workshops has doubled.

Provision of a Certificate of Participation awarded jointly by ERAU and the department has been trialed for one programme, and there are plans to extend such recognition to other comparable training.

6. Evaluation

Most departments (23) report some evaluation of the performance of Teaching Assistants, although for the most part this is by end-of-course questionnaire when it has limited developmental value. Evaluations should be integral and drawn from a number of sources; to date such an approach (involving tutor sought developmental feedback, observation and questionnaire) is reported by only two departments.

A thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of the present level of training and support has yet to be undertaken, although preliminary findings from several of the established programmes are encouraging. Instances of Teaching Assistants now requesting training programmes as a result of word-of-mouth publicity or their own experiences in another department is an indicator of the change that has taken place. Nevertheless, ERAU's observations of the schemes presently offered suggest that in many departments, training programmes are in place for only some of the Teaching Assistants (most commonly those working with 100-level students). In some instances the programme has been left to a Teaching Assistant Coordinator to organise for little help from the department. This is rather disappointing to ERAU personnel, who see as the next stage efforts to identify and promote good practice and its consequences for student learning. By so doing, it is hoped that departments will be encouraged to give greater commitment (and time) to the on-going training and support that Teaching Assistants seek and need.

It is hoped that over time, all departments employing tutors or demonstrators will have appropriate training programmes in place, and will feel free to take advantage of the help offered by ERAU. This has proved more appropriate than having a centrally located programme, at arm length to the concerns of a department.

7. Adaptation

The Canterbury scheme relies on departmental commitment and the greatest benefits come from such a scheme when there is strong departmental ownership. However, this raises a question as to what a university's commitment to training Teaching Assistants is or should be.

A university should ensure that those people who are involved in frontline teaching and tutoring have appropriate training, and the extent to which a university will support and/or resource this should be articulated. With the continual turnover of Teaching Assistants, commitment and leadership in such a scheme must be ongoing.

8. Contact

Margaret Harrison
Educational Research and Advisory Unit
University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800
Christchurch.

ph: (03) 366 7001
email: m.harrison@erau.canterbury.ac.nz

Chapter 3: Mentoring for General Staff Women

1. Introduction

In June 1996 a pilot mentoring programme for general staff women was set up at the University of Otago. This trial programme, consisting of 25 matched pairs, ran over a twelve-month period and was rigorously evaluated. The final report indicated that the programme had been successful and participants had found the experience very beneficial. As a result the Staffing Advisory Committee recommended that the programme become a regular component of the University's staff development programme. Since then a new programme, consisting of 27 matched pairs, has been established and is running over a ten-month period (February - November 1999).

2. Purpose

To assist general staff women to develop their professional careers within the University through interaction with more experienced and senior colleagues.

To encourage and support the development of professional skills and organisational knowledge that enables women to operate more confidently and successfully in the university environment.

3. Context

General staff women were feeling dissatisfied with their career opportunities. Women tended to be clustered in the lower grades and were not progressing to the higher grades at the same rate as men as indicated through Ministry of Education statistics.

The 1993 report on The Position of General Staff Women in New Zealand Universities (by Jane Strachen and Lindsay Duirs commissioned jointly by the AUS and PSA) indicated that women were disproportionately represented in the lower salary scales and frustrated by the lack of clear career paths. Since that report little had changed.

Staff Women's Caucus, an organisation for both academic and general staff women had through networking, seminars and meetings raised women's consciousness of gender issues on campus and was promoting the professional development of women specifically.

4. Key Principles and Concepts

The aim is to maintain a programme that:

- is open to all levels and occupations and assists participants to realise their individual potential
- uses a consultative and cooperative approach to planning and administration of the programme
- encourages networking and communication across the University
- increases mutual understanding between general and academic staff
- provides a safe and confidential environment for the exchange of ideas and information
- is empowering and gives the mentees the knowledge and confidence to make their own decisions
- ensures that the beliefs, personal attitudes and values of all participants are respected

5. Process

In consultation with Staff Women's Caucus the Training and Development Adviser and the EEO Adviser, both of whom were already involved in the Women in Leadership programme, drew up a proposal for a pilot mentoring scheme. The scheme was approved by Staffing Advisory Committee and supported by the Vice-Chancellor who also funded the project.

The Training and Development Adviser and the EEO Adviser volunteered to administer the programme.

5.1 Organisational Structure

Two administrators and a reference group of six women who represented a wide range of occupational classes including academic women supported the programme. A link to the Staff Women's Caucus was established for feedback and communication.

5.2 Scope of Scheme

Twenty-five pairs met over a twelve month period July 96 - June 97 on average one hour per month and not more than one hour per fortnight.

5.3 Initial Planning

Information was sought from Australian universities and modified to suit Otago.

5.4 Selection and Matching of Participants

The programme was advertised in the Staff Circular and through email lists and prospective mentors and mentees were asked to submit CVs on a specially designed form. These CVs, supplemented by institutional and personal knowledge of the participants, were used as the basis for matching pairs. Academic women were included as mentors.

Initially not enough mentors volunteered, partly because the scheme was new and people were nervous about what they were getting into and also because there were very few women in the senior grades. As a result, four male mentors were included.

Both mentors and mentees were given the opportunity to reject their chosen partner. Only one mentee did so, for entirely valid reasons and a new partnership was established. Mentees were given the option of suggesting a mentor but only one did this.

5.5 Supporting documentation

Application forms including a CV questionnaire, the attributes of mentors and mentees, a contract outline for the roles of mentors and mentees and a diary sheet for recording meetings were specifically developed.

5.6 Training

An external consultant provided a one-day of training for mentors and mentees and half day for the reference group. The objectives of the training were to

- clarify the roles of mentors and mentees including their legitimate expectations of the programme
- establish the boundaries and parameters eg. there should be no interference in the supervisory relationship
- provide a small amount of skills based training eg giving and receiving feedback

- publicise the support systems.

5.7 Support systems

The reference group members and the administrators were available to mentors and mentees to answer questions, clarify issues and provide general support as required. A full list of mentors was supplied to all mentors so that they could network if necessary.

A few weeks into the scheme the administrators met with the mentors to see if there were any issues to be resolved. Six to eight weeks into the programme all pairs were contacted to check they were working well. Also, in February a social occasion with a speaker was organised in order to provide some impetus for the new year and encourage networking in the large group.

At the end of the programme a lunch was held for all participants in order to celebrate our success and mark the formal end of the programme.

6. Evaluation

The programme was rigorously evaluated to capture as much feedback as possible. Evaluations were held as follows:

- six- eight weeks into the programme informal feedback from all participants
- at six months a formal evaluation by questionnaire and the production of an interim report
- at twelve months evaluation by questionnaire plus meetings with all participants to follow up on issues identified in the questionnaires
- formal report forwarded to the Vice-Chancellor.

7. Funding and Resources

The Vice-Chancellor granted \$4000 which was spent on training by the external consultant, typing and clerical support, photocopying and catering for meetings.

The reference group committed approximately 30 hours over the year on developing, maintaining and evaluating the programme. The two administrators committed approximately 60 hours over the year supporting the programme. It is estimated that the second programme will take less than half this time.

8. Implementation

Evaluation revealed that the biggest weakness in the first programme was the failure to fully involve the supervisors of the mentees, some of whom resented the programme and feared that it would interfere in the supervisory relationship. In the 1999 programme, supervisors of mentees, instead of simply receiving a letter explaining their staff member's involvement, were invited to a meeting at which the above issues were discussed and resolved.

A few mentees were reluctant to end the relationship at the end of the first programme and some mentors feared they would not be able to make the break. It is critical that the finite nature of the relationship needs to be stressed during training.

The cross gender mentoring pairs worked well but many women preferred not to have a male mentor because for them gender issues were critical and they would not have felt comfortable about raising them with a male mentor.

The mentors, as highly skilled and successful staff, were also very busy and some of them

found it difficult to find time for meetings. In the future, the programme will run over a ten-month period in alternate years to avoid exhausting the goodwill of these senior staff.

Three mentees from the first programme are now mentors on the second programme and enjoying making a contribution to the programme. A reserve of trained mentors is needed in case a mentor withdraws.

The reference group and the administrators were there to provide support in case problems should arise. In fact there were few problems and those that occurred were of a minor nature. However it is important to define clearly how difficult issues will be dealt with should they arise, this includes having a process for dealing with unsuitable applicants.

The programme was essentially a cooperative venture, the impetus coming from the grassroots. It is unlikely that the programme would have been so successful without the input of the reference group and the strong support from Staff Women's Caucus. Staff Women's Caucus networks and strong commitment to the professional development of women in the University was critical.

9. Adaptation

The Otago programme could be adapted to suit other university environments. However, it is important to set limits to the programme so that it can be efficiently managed. Thirty pairs is probably the upper limit for the resources described.

10. Conclusion

Mentees were very appreciative of what they had gained from the programme:

"Before the scheme I felt isolated and frustrated. I now see how I can develop my career since gaining an understanding of the culture of the university, and am now enjoying greater job satisfaction."

An unexpected benefit was the extent to which the mentors felt that they benefited from the scheme. They had expected to give rather than receive and were delighted that the experience gave them a better understanding of the issues for staff and a greater awareness of their own management styles. It also widened their knowledge of the organisation and the way it operates.

"I learned about myself because of the mentoring and that is helping my work as a manager."

One of the most pleasing things about the mentoring programme is the way in which academic and general staff women worked so well together. Also, networking and for skills sharing has spread beyond the original scheme. Many of the original participants report that now that they are aware of the value of mentoring they are practising it in an informal way in their workplace.

In the 1999 programme, processes have been refined and the documentation improved. In addition variants on the mentoring programme are being explored such as the possibility of setting up a skills register and facilitating meetings between selected women and senior staff within the University to enable more junior women to improve both their organisational knowledge and their understanding of leadership issues.

11. Contacts

Penny Love
Training and Development Adviser
Personnel Services
University of Otago
PO Box 56
Dunedin.

ph: 03 479 8116
fax: 03 474 1607
penny.love@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Ann Marie Mullaney
Equity and Personnel Planning Adviser
Personnel Services
University of Otago
PO Box 56
Dunedin.

ph: 03 479 8246
fax: 03 474 1607
annmariemullaney@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Information about Staff Women's Caucus can be obtained from:

Dr Jane Malthus
Consumer Sciences
University of Otago
PO Box 56
Dunedin.

ph: 03 479 7548
fax: 03 479 7567

Chapter 4: Staff Development for Middle Managers

1. Purpose

The University of Otago's Leadership Development Programme was established in 1997 to provide academic and administrative leaders with the skills and resources to meet the challenges of change arising from academic audit and other reforms.

2. Context

The University's first Academic Audit Report was published in November 1996. It identified areas in which the University had responded positively to new demands by enhancing quality processes, and it also highlighted areas in which improvement was needed.

To guide development of a strategy for responding to the audit report, the University held a Quality Retreat involving thirty-six representatives from throughout the institution. At the Retreat, participants were asked to nominate barriers likely to inhibit implementation of the audit recommendations. The main concern expressed was a lack of the necessary leadership (and management) skills at all levels. Among the skills needed, the following were identified: strategic planning, managing change, and gaining staff commitment to quality improvement initiatives.

The Quality Retreat coincided with a University Working Party Review of all aspects of the Head of Department role. The Review noted that while the traditional characteristics of a good Head of Department, namely scholarship and outstanding research, were still valuable, changes in the university system demanded a more extensive array of skills. These additional requirements were identified as; vision, leadership, a strategic sense, a clear customer focus, and staff management and organisational skills. Significantly, it noted that few individuals appointed to the headship of a department were likely to have the range of skills required to fill completely the demands of the position.

The clear message arising from the Quality Retreat and Heads of Departments' Review was that the University needed to equip its academic and administrative leaders with the necessary skills and resources to lead and manage change.

In early 1997, a Steering Group was established to oversee the formation of a University Leadership Development Programme. The primary concern of the Steering Group was to develop and implement a programme that participants found worthwhile, and which equipped them with a range of skills required by a modern academic or administrative leader.

3. Key Principles and Concepts

The programme's target group was defined as experienced heads of academic departments already established in the position, and experienced senior administrative staff. Later, however, this brief was extended to include staff identified as future leaders. In this form, the leadership development programme provided a vehicle for extending the skills of experienced Heads of Departments and senior administrative leaders, and for developing the skills in staff who were potential future Heads of Departments and administrative leaders.

An early decision was made to avoid the term "management" and prefer the term "leadership" in publicity and course handouts. It was a decision which had more to do with internal politics – the Otago experience was that academics were more responsive to the term "leadership" than the word "management" with its business sector overtones – than the debate about the differences or similarities between leadership and management roles and training.

To maximise learning outcomes a number of propositions were developed to underpin the programme design. These were derived from feedback obtained during the consultation

processes discussed above, and related to the belief that academic and administrative leaders in the context of the University of Otago would learn best when programme presenters were:

- outstanding colleagues
- other key stakeholders (students and employers)
- the University's senior leaders including the Vice-Chancellor

It was also determined that:

- at least half of the programme should be devoted to workshop discussion with peers about the key issues raised
- wherever possible, resource material should be customised to reflect the distinctive context of each academic or administrative participant's workplace. (For example, when departmental strategic planning was discussed, each Head of Department was encouraged to reflect on the appropriateness of their own departmental plan.)

4. Process

In addition to the establishment of a Steering Group, several other strategies were adopted to ensure success:

- An outside facilitator, Ms Lynne Watts of Lynne Watts Consulting was appointed to work with the Steering Group to assist in designing the programme. Ms Watts had extensive experience in similar programmes conducted by the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee and brought a fresh perspective to the University.
- A Reference Group comprising experienced Heads of Departments and administrative leaders was established to provide expert advice in relation both to programme content and the process and to develop a sense of ownership for the programme.
- A resource text, *Challenges Facing Universities: Quality Leadership and the Management of Change* was written by Dr Phil Meade, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) to provide a resource base to many of the issues explored throughout the leadership programme.

The first phase of the programme in September 1997 comprised a Foundation Seminar 'Choosing to Lead', followed by two modules on 'Developing a Strategic Direction for your Department' and 'Leading People'. The 1998 programme consists of two modules on 'Working with Staff to Achieve University Goals' and 'Building a Research Culture' as well as a special interest module on 'Women in Leadership'. The 1999 Programme consisted of a repeat of the Foundation Seminar 'Choosing to Lead' and two modules on 'Women in Leadership' and 'Building a Research Culture'.

The objectives of the Foundation Seminar, titled 'Choosing to Lead in Higher Education', were to enhance leadership by:

- increasing awareness of quality principles and quality systems, including the University's commitment to becoming a "learning organisation"
- examining external factors impacting on the internal life of the University
- providing sufficient opportunity to reflect on personal values and behaviours
- helping develop strategies to respond to and address these factors in the workplace

Training included modules on the following topics:

- Developing a Strategic Direction for your Department
- Leading People
- Working with Staff to Achieve University Goals

In addition to participation in the module, participants could elect to undertake an assessment of their performance using a 360-degree feedback questionnaire and participate in a half-day workshop to explore the implications of the responses.

These workshops included sessions on the following:

- Module 2/1998 – ‘Building a Research Culture
- Module 3/1998 – ‘Leadership Development for Women
- Module 1/1999 – ‘Choosing to Lead in Higher Education
- Module 2/1999 – ‘Women in Leadership
- Module 3/1999 – ‘Building a Research Culture

The Foundation Seminar and modules were each of two days duration and repeated three times for three different groups. A similar presentation format was followed for the foundation seminar and modules. The format consisted of a mix of presentations and workshops and the groups included both academic and administrative leaders. The majority of presentations were made by experienced staff from within the University some of whom also attended the programme as participants. The Foundation Seminar is to be repeated every second year.

5. Implementation

The number of academic and administrative leaders who elected to participate in the programme encouraged programme planners. Forty-eight percent of Heads of Departments attended one or more of the modules in the 1997-98 cycle. Those who attended responded very favourably in programme evaluations and feedback obtained in programme evaluations has been used both to inform programme presenters and refine future modules.

Heads of Departments and administrative leaders have reported an improved understanding of the leadership and management responsibilities of their positions and a heightened sense of the importance of these roles. Increased confidence in carrying out their various functions and responsibilities has also been expressed.

6. Evaluation

The following evaluations have taken place:

- The external facilitator, Lynne Watts, reviewed the 1997 phase of the programme.
- A paper entitled “Equipping Leaders to Capitalise on the Outcomes of Quality Assessment in Higher Education” by Dr Phil Meade, Ms Margaret Morgan and Professor Chris Heath was published in *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 24, No.2, 1999.

Lynne Watts’ review perceived:

- a noticeable shift in the attitude, acceptance and understanding of participants towards University-wide initiatives as they became more familiar with wider systemic issues.
- a greater acceptance by participants of the value of planning and the importance of involving their staff in planning activities.
- an increased willingness to become more involved in the University’s reform agenda, including responding to the outcomes of audit, and to support their staff through these changes, as leaders have developed a greater understanding of strategic issues.

In the next year or so, it will be necessary for the University to undertake a formal evaluation of professional development activities in the University to try and gauge more precisely the extent to which a cultural shift has taken place. At this early stage, it is possible to confirm only that those academic and administrative leaders who attended the programme are

satisfied with their experience. However, other important questions remain unresolved, for example:

- Did heads of departments and administrative leaders learn from the programme? (can leadership skills be taught?)
- Has the programme resulted in heads of departments changing their leadership behaviour?
- Has the programme resulted in improved departmental performance?
- Has participation in the programme facilitated a transfer of leadership skills within departments and across the University?

7. Adaptation

The University of Otago's Leadership Development Programme could lend itself to successful adaptation in another environment, provided careful account is taken of the context of that environment.

Several key observations are as follows:

- The appointment of an external facilitator has been an asset in the development and presentation of the Otago programme.
- The establishment of a Reference Group has helped promote 'buy in' to the programme.
- Of the 48 percent of Heads of Departments, who attended the 1997-98 cycle, the majority attended only one or more of the five modules. This would be an important factor for any programme developer to bear in mind when considering how many modules to mount in a cycle.
- While participants have requested the programme be ongoing and mainstreamed in to the University's staff development process, attendance at the Otago programme is voluntary. However, the University's role description for academic leaders advises that "it is expected that the Dean or Head will participate as appropriate in the Leadership Development Programme." When this issue has come up for discussion, the Reference Group has consistently expressed the view that the interests of the programme are best served by having willing participants.

8. Contacts

The University of Otago's Leadership Development Programme is coordinated by the University's Higher Education Development Centre (HEDC). Any queries should be directed to:

Professor Chris Heath
Director, HEDC
University of Otago
PO Box 56
Dunedin.

ph: 03 479 8439
fax: 03 479 8362
email: chris.heath@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Chapter 5: Performance Review and Planning (PRP) System

1. Purpose

Performance Review and Planning (PRP) is the process by which all staff employed by the University for more than twelve months review their past performance and agree upon their responsibilities and plans with their immediate supervisor or agreed alternate for the coming year. The stated aim of the process is to help individual staff to improve their performance of their duties and thereby enable the University to enhance the quality of its teaching, research, and community service. The emphasis is developmental rather than summative and it is not directly linked to remuneration.

2. Context

PRP was designed by a joint and union management working party as a result of an agreement in the 1995 employment contract negotiations. Members consulted relevant literature and internal experts, surveyed current practice in Australasian universities, contacted every staff member for submissions and interviewed a random selection of staff. One member attended the 1996 AVCC Forum on Managing for Performance.

The appraisal system for academic staff in the existing contract was not perceived to be working effectively. For general staff, appraisal had been incorporated into the annual salary review process. PRP is now incorporated into the Collective Employment Contract that covers both academic and general staff (Massey University 1998).

The joint working party produced its report in late 1996 but the new Vice-Chancellor postponed further action until he had reached decisions about management structures. There were further discussions with the Vice Chancellor and Deans Committee and with the union. Thus PRP came to be implemented in 1997 at a time of structural change when most academic departments were being reorganised into much larger units than previously existed.

3. Key principles and concepts

The Performance Review is intended to assist in planning future performance. It is normally confidential to the interviewee, interviewer and Head of Department or Section (if not the interviewer). Any wider dissemination is only with the permission of the interviewee.

Where there are concerns about performance, the PRP interview provides an opportunity for standards to be discussed and documented in the Performance Plan that can then be monitored during the year as necessary. However, the PRP interview may not constitute a warning under the University's disciplinary proceedings. There are separate guidelines and procedures for corrective action. One of the purposes for separation is to ensure that problems are identified and acted upon in a timely fashion and according to the appropriate procedures. Concerns about performance are expected to be addressed as they arise during the year and not held over for the PRP interview.

When considering recommendations in relation to confirmation of appointment (for academic staff), academic promotions or salary reviews, HoDs will reach their decision based in part upon knowledge they have gained through the PRP process. For confirmation of appointment they should review staff members' progress against the current Performance Plan. The PRP interview may provide an opportunity to discuss a staff member's readiness for promotion and set goals to help achieve this but Performance Reviews do not form part of the documentation for any of these procedures.

The Performance Plan is intended to be used for aligning organisational and individual goals and career development. For academic and many general staff, it will be appropriate for their contribution to departmental Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to be included in their Performance Plans for the coming year and for their performance to be evaluated against them at the end of the year. Should the PRP interview reveal significant concerns about performance these should be reflected in the Performance Plan for the coming year and specific mechanisms for monitoring set up. Human Resources Advisors are available for consultation on appropriate processes.

As part of their planning and review processes, departments or individuals may choose to include a range of other activities such as peer review, upward review (staff input into reviews of managers), or team-based reviews (evaluating the work of the team as a whole).

All staff should be briefed as to how the PRP process works in their department. Managers of staff who are new to their jobs (even if not new to the University) are required to meet with the new staff member within four weeks of their appointment, to clarify what is expected of them, explain how PRP works in the department, and set goals and training and development needs for the period until the next round of PRP interviews.

One of the University's Key Performance Indicators for all managers is that annual appraisal processes have been implemented in accordance with University policy. All interviewers are required to be trained. Training is also available for interviewees. The University's Training and Development Unit conduct training sessions.

4. Process

To conform to requirements, the Performance Review and Planning process must include at least the following:

- a face to face interview of at least 30 minutes (preferably at least 1 hour) conducted before the beginning of the academic year
- discussion of the job profile for the position
- a confidential written Performance Review of the past year
- a written Performance Plan for the coming year, incorporating tasks and/or objectives to be accomplished and training and development plans

There is deliberately some flexibility regarding timing to allow for variation in work pressures in support departments but the expectation is that all PRP Plans will cover the calendar year to align with departmental plans. Interviews are generally held between October and February.

There is a Handbook (Massey University 1997) for staff and standard forms for the Review and the Plan. Departments or individuals may choose to incorporate additional material. Completed forms are to be held in departments for at least three years. While staff are generally expected to fill out a form or produce a report before the interview, written input from the staff member is not an absolute requirement. An optional pre-interview form is available.

Usually the interviewer will be the staff member's immediate supervisor. However, it is not considered desirable for any one person to conduct more than about 12 interviews. Delegation for undertaking the PRP interview would normally be to a senior staff member who has regular contact with the staff member to be interviewed. The person being interviewed should agree to any delegation. The Head of Department retains responsibility for oversight of the process. In some instances it may be appropriate for more than one interviewer to be present. With prior notice, another Massey staff member may accompany an interviewee. Following the interview the interviewer completes a Performance Review of the past year and a Performance Plan for the coming year. Where agreement cannot be reached, the matter may be referred one level up.

PRP is a continuous management process. The interview serves as a formal point of contact for review and planning purposes within this process. Staff who have not been appraised are expected to approach the next level of management (ie. their Head of Department or Section if he or she is not their immediate manager, or their Pro Vice-Chancellor or Assistant Vice-Chancellor).

5. Implementation

The launch of PRP at the end of October 1997 was marked with a photograph in the campus newsletter of the Vice-Chancellor and his management team at a training session. At that session he asked his managers to make an appointment for their interviews. Thus there was a strong initial message that this was to be taken seriously. This was reinforced by the fact that one of the Key Performance Indicators on which Pro and Assistant Vice-Chancellors have to report under the University's devolved management system is the percentage of staff who have had a PRP interview (normally expected to be 100%).

All staff were sent a personally labelled copy of the PRP Handbook and mandatory training sessions were held for interviewers within each College (Faculty) and Division (comparable administrative units). There were also voluntary briefing sessions open to all. As anticipated, considerable resistance to the scheme itself and to mandatory training was encountered. This was partly because its introduction coincided with a major restructuring of academic departments and faculties that created uncertainty as to who would be in what organisational units and some resentment at increased managerialism.

334 staff attended the initial training session for PRP interviewers in 1997 or 1998, about 1 in 7 permanent staff. Considerable time was spent in the three-hour session in 1997 and early 1998 outlining the mechanics of the system and handling questions and comments. Repeats of this session for new interviewers later in 1998 lasted one hour. 132 of the 334 attended a two-hour follow-up workshop on giving effective feedback before the 1998-99 round. 180 staff attended voluntary one-hour briefings in 1997 and 113 attended voluntary three-hour workshops on preparing for their PRP interview in 1998. Some interviewers have had one-to-one coaching. From 1999, interviewer and interviewee workshops will be held annually.

6. Evaluation

The University restructuring meant the scheme had a prolonged start-up phase and the larger size of the new organisational units (some with over 100 staff reporting to an HoD) led to some concerns as to how responsibility for interviewing could be effectively delegated. The emphasis upon planning and not just on a backwards appraisal is the main new element, intended to assist in achieving individual as well as institutional plans. All PRP Reviews and Plans have to be signed off by the HoD. This is necessary as HoDs have management and budgetary responsibilities which PRP plans need to reflect. However it makes a long-drawn out process.

The joint union-management committee set up for two years to monitor the implementation of the scheme conducted a survey of all senior managers and a preliminary survey of a random sample of staff in September 1998 (before the second round of training). Of the respondents to the staff survey who had had an interview, most found the PRP Plan a useful working document and most said means were being set up to achieve agreed development objectives. Most comments on the process were positive. The opportunity to take stock and plan for the coming year was generally valued; negative respondents felt it achieved little. A more comprehensive survey will be conducted in 1999.

It is not known whether many staff have felt the need to refer matters to a higher level though this was not mentioned in feedback from senior managers. Some staff have exercised their right to be interviewed by their HoD rather than a suggested alternate. It is too early to say whether the system has enhanced organisational performance or increased the quality or quantity of professional development for individuals.

7. Adaptation

The system was designed to be flexible enough to apply to all staff and therefore should prove relatively portable. Terminology such as “objectives” could be replaced by a more general term such as “work plans for the coming year”. It was designed before the University introduced Key Performance Indicators for HoDs. While it was easily adapted to this system, it is not dependent upon it.

8. References

Massey University (1997) *Handbook on Performance Review and Planning*

Massey University (1998) *Collective Employment Contract*

9. Contact

Judith Nathan
Director, Training and Development Unit
ph 06 350 4989
email: J.M.Nathan@massey.ac.nz

or Bill Kimberley
Human Resources Advisor
Human Resources Section
ph: 06 356 9099
email: W.P.Kimberley@massey.ac.nz

Chapter 6: Procedures for the Appointment of Academic Staff

1. Purpose

To provide a means whereby applicants for academic positions may be “interviewed” over a number of days, typically three, within the relevant Department in order to ensure that the person best suited to the job is appointed and that costly mistakes in appointments are not made.

For the purposes of this paper, “academic” positions are regarded as referring to continuing appointments of the grade of full-time lecturer and above.

2. Context

Universities and other state sector employers are charged in terms of S.60 of the State Sector Act 1988 with “(giving) preference to the person who is best suited to the position”. It behoves employers, therefore, to use all practicable means to ensure that appointments are so made. In making appointments, the University also has to bear in mind the provisions of the Education Act 1989, the Human Rights Act 1993, and the Employment Contracts Act 1991 as well as the Treaty of Waitangi and the University’s own Equal Employment Opportunities policy.

3. Key Principles and Concepts

Until the 1990s, the University appointed academic staff, particularly those from overseas, on the basis of the written application, which usually consisted of a CV together with reports from referees nominated by the applicants. Occasionally, a ‘telephone interview’ would be held, or a staff member on sabbatical overseas might meet an applicant by chance or design and report back accordingly. While most appointments made were satisfactory, this was not always the case and some have subsequently been the source of regret.

Interviews have been found vital in assessing short-listed applicants and providing departments with an opportunity to:

- assess the commitment of the applicant to the application and position
- assess the personality of the applicant under pressure
- gauge how the applicant might gel or otherwise with both the staff and ethos of the department
- assess the applicant’s grasp of the specialist subject area
- observe the performance of the applicant in teaching and research through undergraduate and postgraduate lectures and seminars

Additionally, a visit to the Department can allow short-listed applicants to:

- meet the staff of the department
- become familiar with the University
- experience the community life of the city
- check out opportunities for professional growth, eg. research

Short-listed applicants, on average three, are advised well in advance of the nature of the visit to the department, including suggested topics for the lecture and research seminar.

4. Process

The University has a comprehensive set of policies, guidelines and procedures for the appointment of staff, of which the visit to the department is only one component. A summary of the schedule for departmental visits is attached as Appendix A.

The process for a typical visit to the department after shortlisting and notifying applicants would be to:

- Arrange travel through the University's travel agents
- Arrange accommodation for the duration of the stay
- Appoint a liaison person for each applicant
- Compile the programme for the visit (an indicative programme is attached as Appendix B) and make appropriate arrangements

While the applicants will normally meet all members of the department during a visit, a smaller group from the department can conduct the formal one-hour interview if this is appropriate.

5. Costs

The costs incurred in this process are, both in relative and absolute terms, minimal. Transport (return air flight at economy rates), accommodation (at a nearby motel), and incidentals rarely amount to over \$4,000 - \$5,000 per interviewee. In the Canterbury system, the costs are met from using salary savings from the vacant position.

6. Implementation

Additional points to note in relation to implementation are:

- encourage the spouse or partner to accompany the applicant to ease consideration of an offer of appointment (the costs thereof are the responsibility of the applicant)
- provide for ample free time for applicants to explore both the city and the country if required
- provide a comprehensive pack of information to each applicant, e.g. departmental brochures, student guide, visitors guide for the city, city and campus maps, real estate information, cost-of-living information, timetable for interviews, seminars, etc.
- ensure the open seminars are notified to the University community through the Weekly Diary
- provide applicants, where possible, with an outline of issues likely to be covered during the interview, eg. research plans, thoughts on teaching, where they might fit into the department's teaching programme, network links they would bring to the department and University, etc.

7. Evaluation

The process has not been evaluated formally before now. Anecdotal evidence gained when Heads appear before the University's Appointments Committee to speak to the departmental recommendation has suggested in every instance that the opportunity to have short-listed applicants in the department for an extended period is invaluable.

In the preparation for this report, however, Heads were asked to comment on the interview process. Without exception, the comments have been more than favourable, eg.

"When I arrived, I could not believe that interviews were not a matter of course here. Appointments were being made that could ultimately involve up to a million dollars in salary over the working life of a lecturer and yet decisions were being based only on CVs and referees' reports, which can be highly unreliable."

"The question should not be how do we justify interviews, but, rather, how can the University possibly justify not having them."

"In one case we finally appointed an applicant who made it onto the interview list only after a higher-ranked applicant dropped out. In the interview and seminars, strengths which were not so apparent on the papers became manifest and it has proved an extremely worthwhile appointment."

"We have made a couple of bad mistakes in the past and these were undoubtedly mistakes that could have been avoided had we interviewed the candidates."

"Initial reaction to 'paper' candidates has often been substantially revised on physical contact."

"The rank ordering established on the documentation alone was reversed after the interviews when we found that our top-ranked candidate would have been quite unsuitable in the local context for one reason and another."

The University is in the process of reviewing comprehensively the appointment processes for academic staff and changes can be expected in the mechanisms involved. It is unlikely, however, that visits to the department would be dispensed with.

8. Adaptation

Provided the inherent purpose and outcomes as described above remain intact, departments are able to make minor modifications to the process to meet their individual needs. This could include, for example, participation in a field trip as appropriate or in practical fine arts or music master classes in addition to the usual seminars etc. The processes could readily be adapted to suit the purpose of any other university.

With the appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor recently, many of the policies and procedures followed by the University are to be reviewed. The University's appointment processes will feature in this review. Issues to be addressed could include, for example:

- devolution of budgets, including staffing, to departments
- devolution of further aspects of the appointments processes to departments;
- role of the central administration in appointments
- monitoring of statutory and other responsibilities, e.g. Equal Employment Opportunities

9. Contact

Mr David Towns
Human Resources Registrar
University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800
CHRISTCHURCH

ph: 03 364 2853
fax: 03 364 2325
email: d.towns@regy.canterbury.ac.nz

Appendix A**Department of Mythical Studies - Programme**

Saturday	9.15 am	Applicant A arrives at airport (flight NZ533) (Dr Someone)
Sunday	10.15 am	Applicant B arrives at airport (flight AN713) (Dr Another)
Monday	10.00 am	Department meets applicants in open meeting
	2.00 pm	Applicant A: Undergraduate lecture
	3.30 pm	Applicant B: Research seminar
	5.00 pm	Social function
Tuesday	9.00 am	Applicant B: Undergraduate lecture
	11.00 am	Applicant A: Research seminar
	2.00 pm – 5.00 pm	Meetings with individual staff members
Wednesday	9.00 am –	
	12 noon	Meetings with individual staff members
	2.00 pm	Formal interview: Applicant A
	3.30 pm	Formal interview: Applicant B
	7.00 pm	Dinner
Thursday University	9.00 am	Consider of applicants and formulation of recommendation to
Friday	9.00 am	Applicant A departs (flight AN654)
	11.00 am	Applicant B departs (flight NZ565)

SECTION 2

STUDENT SUPPORT AND LEARNING

Chapter 7: Supervision Processes in International Multi-Disciplinary Education

1. Purpose

This model for the supervision of graduate research was developed in order to make better use of limited resources. An increasing number of students needing supervision without a proportionate increase in staffing required us to find complementary approaches to the supervisory load of staff while maintaining quality of the supervision process. The supervision process in the Centre now consists of a model that has some core components that are compulsory for students to participate in and some supporting components that are optional.

2. Context

This model was developed in the Centre for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education Research (CSMTER) at the University of Waikato. The Centre is a focused academic interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary unit involved in graduate teaching and research in the areas of science, mathematics, technology and computing education. We do not have an undergraduate cohort. As such, the permanent staff have high supervision loads and smaller teaching loads.

In 1999 we have 80 enrolled students - 23 full-time and 57 part-time. Of the full-time students, 11 are international and 12 are from New Zealand. The international cohort is made up of full fee paying students, scholarship students (eg New Zealand ODA, Commonwealth), and permanent residents. There are 3 international part-time students. A large number of our overseas students come to study at the Centre because of the international profile of the Centre's research. In addition, we are the only Centre of our kind in New Zealand, that is, focused on postgraduate study in our disciplines. The rest of the student cohort, 12 full-time and 54 part-time, is made up of New Zealand students. Most of the New Zealand part-time students are in full-time employment, usually in the educational sector.

Overall, many of the Centre's students are inexperienced at the research required by academic study. Most of the students are mid-career teachers studying masters or doctoral degrees and postgraduate diplomas. The majority are mature and educational professionals, having had several years of teaching and/or administrative experience. A few students have come straight from undergraduate work, not all as educators.

3. Key principles and concepts

The key principles included in this model are that:

- supervision is a reciprocal relationship where both staff and students have responsibilities toward each other
- students should be active in the supervisory relationship
- the model must be flexible to accommodate a wide range of students we attract and the changing needs of students and supervisors as the supervisory process proceeds
- collegiality
- personal and social comfort of our students
- there is a need to make better use of the limited resources available
- in the case of international students, having an advisor in their home country.

4. Process and Implementation

Central to the process and implementation of our model is the use of full-time and associate staff, funding, the social cohesion of the mix of students and the features of the model itself.

4.1 Staff

The Centre has 3 full-time and 15 associate staff. The full-time staff are involved totally with teaching and supervising in the Centre. The associate staff work primarily in other departments within the university and contribute to teaching on our courses and the supervision of students. They are essential to the model in providing a larger pool of supervisors. In addition, they teach on our courses and are involved with the formulation and development of Centre policy through having representation on committees in the Centre. The work they do for the Centre is counted as part of their workloads and monies/EFTS are transferred from the Centre to their Schools/departments. The relationship is extremely important and works on the basis of 'valued contribution' and giving associate staff some 'ownership' in the management and running of the Centre.

4.2 Funding

The Centre has devolved funding based on a business plan. For example, a proportion of international student payments comes directly to the Centre. A priority of the Centre is that income from research contracts is used to enhance the resource base (eg. computing facilities) or the educational opportunities (eg. setting up scholarships). In addition, we have a large cohort of part-time students, largely off-campus, that are not resourced in the same manner as the on-campus full-time students. All these elements contribute to making this model work.

4.3 Social cohesion

The social dynamics of the group is developed using a number of strategies that are alluded to throughout this paper. For example, we have a student body large enough that we can have groups of students working on projects of a similar nature, for example, assessment. Students are able to choose the subject of their studies and this includes doing work in their own country. On a more personal level, we take their personal comfort seriously and group students in offices as much as we can according to the latitude of their home countries. New Zealand winters can be very cold for international students and the heating levels of the rooms vary considerably.

5. Features of the model

To achieve an optimum process of supervision for the students, the Centre provides a number of activities that can act separately and work together. While some activities have some very specific learning outcomes, other activities and practices contribute to the general ethos of the Centre. The following sections are a summary of the mechanics of the model.

5.1 Regular supervision meetings - Individual time for students with their supervisor(s)

This is done on a needs basis through scheduled meetings. We have identified a number of important issues in the supervisory relationship that need to be dealt with early in the process because they are extremely important to the relationship. They are:

Early establishment of conflict management strategies

Establishing conflict management strategies, at a time when the relationship is typically uncomplicated by any incidents, is considered to be useful. This indicates to students an awareness that differences may occur, and that both parties need to know how such differences might be dealt with and managed before any problems occur.

Establishment of expectations through the supervision process

An important feature is that we have developed a handbook called *Student Guidelines* which contains a series of discussions for students and supervisors to establish expectations and processes through the supervision process. Most importantly, this process emphasises the

reciprocal nature of the supervision relationship and provides an opportunity to discuss fundamental issues that invariably arise during the course of the supervision relationship. The discussion guidelines (developed from Graham & Grant, 1993) include:

- (i) Supervisor/student understandings
eg. What is a thesis? Meetings; Advice and support; Time frame; Joint supervisors;
- (ii) Departmental expectations and resources
eg. Written information; Access to amenities and resources; Monitoring supervision
- (iii) University requirements
eg. University guidelines; Assessment; Extensions/deferment; Ethics; Protocols

Establishing recording processes

During the meetings, students use a record sheet to briefly document the meeting and notes what each participants' obligations are. At the end of the meeting the student photocopies the sheet and gives one copy to the supervisor and keeps one for themselves. The supervisor files the copy in the students' file. The use of recording sheets also provides a reflection on how the supervision process is going over a period of time and provides a time management tool, particularly for the student.

Appointment of 'home' advisors for international students

If we are dealing with an international student, we may discuss and appoint an advisor in their home country. Currently it is informal and tends to be through personal contacts, and include academics from the local university or alumni students of the Centre. Many of the students set up their own network in their own countries and they interact with it when back collecting data. We also ensure that students have ready access to staff at other times through the use of email. This aspect of the incorporation of 'home advisors' has not been well developed and could be extended further (see adaptations).

5.2 Regular forum for debate between staff, students and the education community.

Supervision support meetings

These are convened by a staff member who manages and plans the initial sessions to anticipate needs such as writing proposals, drafting ethics statements, organising familiarisation activities in the library and introducing students to the information technologies that may be available in the library and the Centre. As the year progresses, the focus of the meetings responds to the emerging needs of the students. The sessions are less formal than taught courses and sharing information and experiences is encouraged.

Regular subject seminars

These seminar series have regular meetings and are open to staff and students. This process helps to build collegiality or discuss ideas/papers important to thesis work and obtain comment from people other than the supervisor.

Public seminars

These provide an opportunity for visitors, staff and students to present their ideas and work, including work in progress. One valuable aspect of these seminars is that they provide an opportunity for staff and students to interact with ideas from other subject areas within the Centre and beyond. Recognising that many of our students will return to their home countries to senior positions within education, it is important that they develop this general overview of education.

Networking

We encourage students to read and critique each others work, to share ideas and papers, and to view the learning process as a cooperative venture. In addition, we encourage participation in social functions which we often organise, business meetings, and other university courses and seminars so that students broaden their networks. Our students should feel confident to use the international networks to tap into the expertise of others. Through involvement with personal email, national and international email lists, visitors to the Centre, presenting papers at national and international conferences, and writing for publications, our students are encouraged to extend their networks.

5.3 Teaching research methodologies to help students research processes

Students take this course either before they embark on their thesis (e.g. as a paper in a Masters programme), or while they are doing their research (e.g. auditing the course if they are enrolled in a doctorate). This provides a discussion of the theory of a variety of research methodologies and techniques.

5.4 Number of support mechanisms for the student development and learning

The change in focus from being a teacher to a learner can cause some anxiety for our students. Overseas students have the additional stress of having to adjust to a new culture. Some forms of support are low level, such as grouping students in their rooms according to interests in order to develop informal support mechanisms.

Writing assistance

The Centre employs a lecturer for a few hours each week to help students with their writing over and above the hours given by the Teaching and Learning Development Unit on campus. This is a more recent response because, first, we have a significant number of overseas students have English as a second, third or fourth language, and second, a number of our graduates having come through science degrees have some difficulty writing in a more discursive manner. We have found both groups benefit from this extra help. This language assistance has helped free supervisors from the mechanics of the students' writing leaving them time to discuss ideas.

Material support

Full-time students share an office with 2 other students. Each have their own desk and computer and access to the Internet, including the library catalogue, from their desk. Part-time students have access to computers. Computer support is available. Other equipment, such as tape recorders, laptops and transcribers are supplied as needed through a booking system.

5.5 Builds both independent researchers and a social community of researchers.

Having the students, particularly full-time students, housed in the same physical area as staff helps build a research community.

5.6 In summary

All students are expected to participate in the three core components:

- the regular supervision meetings with their supervisor(s),
- the paper in educational research methodologies (enrolled or auditing)
- actively participating in the supervision support meetings.

In addition, students are also encouraged to participate in the four supporting components, namely:

- regular subject seminars
- weekly public seminars
- the assistance in writing
- networking.

Students are also encouraged to take an active role in the Centre through the other activities that take place, such as social occasions.

6. Evaluation

Our model for supervision has been extended from the traditional supervision meetings and research methods class to include other components. From staff and student evaluations, we have modified the model and will continue to develop our supervision. A crucial part of the supervision process is the feedback that is provided formally through evaluation sheets and discussions in the supervision support meetings, and informally within the everyday activities of the Centre. Currently, the Centre sees three issues that need addressing in the near future.

6.1 Evaluation of supervision

We continue to grapple with the issue of evaluation of our model. The written feedback is not satisfactory for two reasons

- (i) students are not keen to write about their supervisor either while the process of supervision is still on-going or before marks are obtained. It is also a problem even after graduation because of the insular community they've entered.
- (ii) international students, mostly on scholarships, have returned home before we can talk to them about the processes fully. In addition, many of the international students with whom we deal think that criticism of supervisors is disrespectful.

We need to find more sophisticated means of evaluating, possibly through multi-evaluation techniques. For example, an external interviewer could speak with the students, the home country advisor could be used to speak with students on their return, different types of questionnaires or focus group interviews.

6.2 Resourcing part-time students

We also need to address the issue of being more inclusive of our part-time students doing research, many of whom are off-campus and some are overseas. In past years there have been offers to run supervision support meetings in weekends and/or in block courses, however, people are reluctant to take up the offer.

6.3 Supervisor evaluation

Lastly, we have not addressed the issue of supervisor evaluation by their colleagues and peers. While the marking of a thesis is only a small part of the possibility of colleague and/or peer review of supervisors, there are further avenues that could be explored.

7. Adaptation

A number of possibilities are being considered, and should be considered by others thinking of setting up similar models including:

- Extending the use of overseas advisers when international students are back in their own countries collecting data. We would need to have more formal processes in place to enable us to manage the procedure effectively. The use of 'home country advisors' is important because we do not always know the social context of the educational systems or other settings in which our students are working.
- Consider supervision at a distance as part of a distance education initiative with the provision of face-to-face components. For example, currently we have two part-time doctoral students who work in Hong Kong and come to the Centre for 2 - 3 months each year.
- Provision of more of these components of the model to part-time and off-campus students.

We believe that the key principles of this model can be used to guide other supervisory situations and programmes, and that they can be developed to suit other environs with different students and other disciplines.

8. References

Graham, Adele & Grant, Barbara (1993) *Postgraduate Supervision: Guidelines for Discussion*. Auckland, Higher Education Review Office, University of Auckland.

Begg, Andy; Beverley Bell, Vicki Compton & Elizabeth McKinley (1998) Supervision in a Graduate Center. In Malone, John A., Bill Atweh & Jeffery R. Northfield (eds) *Research and Supervision in Mathematics and Science Education*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Centre for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education Research (1999) *Student Guidelines*. Hamilton, Centre for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education Research (available from the above).

9. Contacts

Dr Alister Jones (Director)	a.jones@waikato.ac.nz
Dr Andrew Begg	abegg@waikato.ac.nz
Elizabeth McKinley	e.mckinley@waikato.ac.nz

Centre for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education Research,
University of Waikato,
Private Bag 3105,
Hamilton,
New Zealand

Chapter 8: The Alternative Calendar

1. Purpose

The primary purpose of the Alternative Calendar is to briefly summarise **first year** papers based on student opinion, providing useful information to supplement the University Calendar course descriptions in a fun, easily accessible format. First year papers are surveyed for two reasons. Students in second and subsequent years are likely to have more institutional knowledge and better access to "insider" information on their papers when they are making their decisions. Also, with over 250 first year papers at Auckland University, the task becomes too enormous when other undergraduate years are included.

The ultimate aims of the Alternative Calendar are to provide helpful information to new students and to raise awareness that students can and should hold university teaching staff accountable for the quality of teaching and learning.

The Alternative Calendar is also used to make students aware of the many AUSA and University services that support students socially, academically, financially and health-wise.

The Alternative Calendar has been published sporadically by the Auckland University Students' Association since the early 70's. In the 1990's it was published in 1992 and again in 1995, '96, '97 and '98. In 1995 Canterbury and Otago Student Associations published their own versions, and Waikato published theirs in '95, '96 and '97. Massey and Lincoln have not produced a similar publication in recent years.

2. Context

The Alternative Calendar is a *retrospective* rather than *prospective* publication and is published by AUSA and is therefore independent of the University, although it does require the cooperation of University staff and students in order to complete the surveys. In 1998 AUSA asked for, and was granted, permission to use the official University course prescriptions to precede each Alternative Calendar description.

In the 70's and 80's the purpose of the Alternative (or "Anti") Calendar was to make fun of the University system and lambaste poorly skilled teachers and unorganised courses. Today, the Alternative Calendar is produced in an environment of higher fees, crowded lecture theatres and increased awareness by students that as they are being treated as "consumers" then they should be given the same "rights". Consequently, the Alternative Calendar has taken a more serious bent, providing constructive feedback through its summaries.

As a staff member, already employed by the Student Association, produces the Alternative Calendar it is a relatively inexpensive exercise. Budget and expenditure for 1998 (1999 Calendar) is attached as Appendix i.

3. Principles and concepts

As stated above, one of the key principles behind the Alternative Calendar is to raise awareness that students should be able to hold the University accountable for the quality of its teaching and learning, and that they can do this



ALTERNATIVE CALENDAR SURVEY

AUSA is preparing an Alternative Calendar for 2000. The Alternative Calendar contains course descriptions of first year papers written from the perspective of students in the paper. We would like you to answer these questions for the 2000 Calendar. All responses will remain anonymous and individual forms will be confidential to AUSA.

PAPER # _____

1. What are some of the things you **LIKED** about this paper? (you might like to comment on teaching, assignments, course content, workload, readings, assessment, practicals/tutorials)

2. What are some of the things that could be **IMPROVED** in this paper?

3. On average, how many hours a week did you spend on this paper, both inside and outside the classroom? _____

4. What mark would you give this paper overall? (Please circle one)
A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D D-

in a publication that is student funded and administered.

One of the key concepts behind the Alternative Calendar is the simple nature of the surveys (fig. 1). Students are asked to offer their opinion on what they liked, what they think could be improved, and what grade they would give the paper. Students are urged to be critical yet constructive, and are usually more forthcoming about positive aspects of the paper than they are about the negative aspects.

For new or prospective students, the Alternative Calendar is primarily about discovering what past students thought of the course they are considering enrolling in, or for reading about the courses they were enrolled in. For some, it's a chance to exhibit their creative writing talents (a sample is attached as Appendix B).

For AUSA, the Alternative Calendar is an effective way to draw attention to quality teaching, as well as to provide a service to new students and thus raise the profile of the Association before these students even enter university.

For staff, the Alternative Calendar offers an opportunity to compare their papers to others. Feedback from staff suggests that changes are implemented as a result of Alternative Calendar reviews, as the students' view on the quality a paper is bought into the public arena, rather than hidden within a department or teaching team.

In these days of increased competition for student numbers, the Alternative Calendar may also be a tool to attract students to one particular department. Some departments, for example, photocopy good reviews and place them on noticeboards. One department last year bought advertising space next to its reviews (after they had been written, of course!).

4. Process

Critically, the Alternative Calendar must be introduced in an environment that is supportive to such publications. Students' associations have a culture of promoting alternatives and supporting independent initiatives. However, if the university and teaching staff are not willing to cooperate right from the beginning then it will be impossible to do properly.

4.1 Surveys

Before surveying begins, all Heads of Departments are asked to notify lecturers that a surveyor will be visiting their class, and asked if they have a preferred date and time. In a smaller University it would be possible to notify lecturers individually, however with over 250 papers this is nearly impossible.

Surveys take part in the first 10 minutes before of the lecture and should not be a significant interruption although they do take up some lecture time.

4.2 Write ups

Once the surveys are completed, they are compiled into course descriptions. Themes which are most obvious in the surveys are teased out into the course descriptions - not particularly scientific but surprisingly accurate. The grades and hours are then sorted out and an average is taken.

4.3 Feedback on write ups

As we rely solely on student comments for our data, factual inaccuracies sometimes occur. All write-ups are sent back to departments for comment prior to printing, and approx. 20% of write-ups are modified or changed with staff feedback. Factual inaccuracies are corrected, but comments, opinion and student quotes are rarely edited. The edited write-up is sent back to departments once again for checking.

4.4 Distribution

Distribution of the Alternative Calendar is perhaps the most important part of the entire process. AUSA enjoys the cooperation of the University Liaison Office, who distribute approx. 4000 copies of the Alternative Calendar, along with all the University information, to nation-wide Secondary Schools in mid-October.

On campus, the Alternative Calendar is available through departments, the Liaison Office, from the AUSA, and is distributed from the AUSA tent during enrolment. It is also accessible through the AUSA web site.

5. Implementation

The Alternative Calendar is now into its fifth consecutive year of publication, and anecdotal evidence would suggest that it is accepted by both staff and students as a publication that makes a positive impact on the first year teaching and learning environment.

5.1 Surveys

We are restricted in what we comment on in the Alternative Calendar by the information that is given to us by students. If every single student rants about a lecturer without giving us any information on assessment/difficulty/readings etc, then unfortunately that is all we can write about. Our goal is to keep the forms as open as possible in order to enable students to think more freely and laterally about their paper and the comments they make. We don't want to give students *another* university survey form.

5.2 Timing

To get the Alternative Calendar out by mid October, surveys have to be completed by the middle of September (allowing 1-2 weeks for layout, 1 week for printing and 1 week for the thing (anything!) that inevitably goes wrong.) With semesterisation, this gives students only 4-6 weeks to form an impression of their second semester papers. This is a major problem that may impact on the validity of the descriptions of the second semester papers.

5.3 Managing Grading

Just like lecturers, some students are hard markers. Although it may seem like a gross generalisation, Engineering students are typically very hard markers, whereas Arts students are 'easy' markers. A C grade in an Engineering paper, therefore, may not be entirely comparable with a C grade in an Arts paper. Nevertheless, this is the only rating mechanism we have, and in fact we receive no complaints about the grades which are allocated for each paper.

Occasionally, student comments are incongruent with a grade given. For example, students may have very few negative things to say about a paper, but the grade may work out to be a C-. In instances such as this, the Editor may act as a moderator by suggesting that the student comments do not match the low grade.

5.4 Student Culture

As Editor, I often struggle with the student culture that dictates that a paper deserving of a high grade is one where the students are given all the notes with the important parts already outlined. These lecturers use PowerPoint presentations (very good overheads will suffice) and perhaps videos and slide shows. Jokes, juggling and funny hats are good, as is finishing every lecture by telling students exactly what they will need to study for the latest assignment/exam.

In this instance, the Editor may point out these expectations, and perhaps poke a little bit of fun at students who aspire only to 'get good handouts'. When a student remarks that *"this*

lecturer created an inspirational learning environment which awakened such an interest that I pursued this subject in my own time", then I'll bungee jump off the library roof.

6. Evaluation

As Editor, I get both positive and negative feedback each year from academic staff about the publication. Negative complaints usually centre on the process, for example if the surveyors take too long, or arrive at an inopportune time. Occasionally academic staff members phone on behalf of colleagues to question a comment that they feel is too harsh or misdirected.

In general, however, feedback from staff is overwhelmingly positive. The majority of staff respect the integrity of the alternative calendar process and unfortunately very rarely offer bribes or other incentives. This year numerous academic staff have requested that their second year paper be surveyed - this illustrates a growing acceptance of the role of the Alternative Calendar.

More formal evaluation was undertaken by the AUSA publications review taskforce in 1996 and found: *"The Alternative Calendar is an excellent concept and provides an important service and excellent first exposure promotion tool to incoming members"* (Report of the AUSA Publications Taskforce 1996:3).

Students are continually coming into AUSA reception looking for copies of the Alternative Calendar, and the web site has a hit rate of around 20-25 visitors per week. If demand is anything to judge by, therefore, then the Alternative Calendar is popular among students. This year we will print an extra 2000 copies to keep up with demand.

7. Adaptation

The Alternative Calendar would be easy to adapt to any tertiary setting, providing there is a person or organisation prepared to undertake the task, and that the person or organisation is independent from the University. Student Association staff do not have University employment to protect, and are therefore not under threat from senior (or any) members of staff who do not like criticism of the type that sometimes appears in the Alternative Calendar.

Furthermore, the Alternative Calendar should be a fun and accessible document, and not become a formal or University public relations document, or have a patronising tone.

It is important, however, that any person who does undertake a project such as this has some understanding of the university system in order to facilitate communication. Some diplomacy skills are also required!

8. Contact

Nadine Metzger
Education and Advocacy Manager
Auckland University Students' Association
Private Bag 92019
Auckland

ph: 09 309 0789 x205
email n.metzger@auckland.ac.nz

alternative calendar online:
<http://www.ausa.auckland.ac.nz/staff/ECO/altcal/accounting.html>

Appendix A

Income and Expenditure, 1998 (1999 Publication) Alternative Calendar. (exclusive of gst)

Description		Debit	Credit
Photocopying	Survey forms	550.00	
Surveys	labour	1950.00	
Admin charges	postage, phone	53.80	
Printing	7000 copies	6019.00	
Design and Layout	contracted	1500.00	
Commission (advertising)		1334.00	
Total		11406.80	
Advertising			6670.00
Total cost less advertising		4736.80	

Appendix B Classic Quotes

- We are not vessels into which information is poured for regurgitation but individuals with varying needs
- I got to use the word "ejaculation" in a test for the first time in four years at Uni
- The lecturer said "um" 94 times in 30 minutes
- The lecturer explains stuff goodly
- This paper emphasises that University is not a vocational institution. Go you good Art thing, go!
- I got me some learnin'
- I sat through lectures with no clue as to what was happening
- Footrests and pillows should be provided and it would also help if they had a drinks trolley
- What could be improved? The question should be what could not be improved?
- I like to learn how English basic perform
- I loved the 10 min break. (I was crappin' myself when I thought it was a 2 hr stretch.)
- It would help if at least ONE thing made sense
- If the lecturer had any enthusiasm for this subject it was certainly not reflected in his lecturing style.
- The lecturer should concentrate more on the content of his lectures and not his acting style
- Please, lecturer, don't try to be so funny. Jokes have a limited role and you are no Seinfeld.
- I absolutely loved everything about this paper. Yes. Everything (*help, help, I have a gun to my head and they keep smiling all the time and I know I am going to die I just know it*)
- There is too much self importance put on books written by the lecturers. There are other experts around you know.
- A paper like no other. A mutated monster of calculus on a sadistic rampage to melt the minds of all in range of hearing. This paper is not for the faint-hearted, medium-hearted or most strong-hearted, but mostly for the insane who thought it was a good idea at the time.

Chapter 9: Class Representative System

1. Purpose

The purpose of the class representative system at the University of Waikato is twofold:

- All students must have ready access to a channel for airing and resolving relevant issues related to their learning
- Students must be fairly represented in forums where decisions that affect them as students of the University are made.

2. Context

The Class Representative System currently operates in an environment where membership of the students' association is voluntary.

In its present form, the system began operating in January 1998. Changes to the system, stemming from the imminent move by the Waikato Students' Union (WSU) to membership on a voluntary basis, have led to significant changes in the way the University receives representation from students.

The revamp of the Class Representative System was first initiated by the WSU in 1995. The Academic Audit Unit Report in June 1997 also highlighted the need for improvement and in late 1997 a sub-committee of the Academic Programmes Committee (APC) recommended to Academic Board and Council a new central policy defining the Class Representative System and how it should operate. This led to the creation of the full-time position of Student Representation Co-ordinator.

3. Key Principles and Concepts

The class representative system has a four-tiered structure for achieving student representation on University committees:

- Class Representatives
- Subject Representatives
- Boards of Studies representatives
- Academic Board and other University committee representatives

The class representative system operates in semesters A and B and Summer School and operates with flexibility both in terms of processes and numbers (of class representatives).

Class representatives are elected to ensure the flow of effective academic feedback and action regarding educational issues within the university community. The primary role of a class representative is to convey and facilitate the resolution of concerns and issues that are raised by the members of the class.

Central oversight and training and support systems are the function of the Student Representation Co-ordinator who ensures the class representative system is supported, monitored and reviewed.

4. Process

4.1 Class Representatives

Class Representatives have two specific functions:

- To liaise; and
- To work on committees

The general policy is that there should be at least one class representative for 100 students and most classes have a minimum of one representative. Policy related to the system is flexible and practical allowing the number and method of election of class representatives to vary. This flexibility is critical to the class representative system and acknowledges the diversity in the organisation and delivery of courses.

At the class representative level, interaction between students and their representatives, as well as between the class representatives and the lecturer, should be informal, on going and regular.

Topics of discussion include any matter that affects students' learning and their ability to achieve the learning outcomes that have been defined for the course. For example, common issues include:

- the quality of tutors
- lecture delivery
- assessment
- course content
- readings
- access to desk loan
- IT
- course materials
- teaching facilities
- timetabling

4.2 Subject Committees

The Subject Committee is a place for students to air concerns; a place for consultation with students; and the 'electorate' for student representatives on the Boards of Studies. The Subject Committees comprise all class representatives and lecturers of courses in that subject. The Subject Committee is normally convened and chaired by the chairperson of department or subject convenor. There is a Subject Committee for each subject - subjects are assigned to a subject committee based on the University Calendar regulations. The Subject Committee is a representative forum for all students taking a course in the subject, regardless of whether or not they are completing majors.

4.3 Board of Studies Representatives

Student representatives are elected to the Boards of Studies from the Subject Committees. There is some variation in the way Boards of Studies provide for student representation and for Maori and graduate student representation. As with the Subject Committees, it is necessary to ensure that some groups of students are properly represented at the Board of Studies level within each School.

4.4 Academic Board

The student members from each Board of Studies elect a representative to the Academic Board. These students form the 'electorate' (or appointing group) through which all student members of other University committees are appointed. There are currently eight student members of the Academic Board, including one Maori student representative, elected by the Maori student members of the Boards of Studies.

4.5 University Committees

All student representation, excluding the second student representative position on Council (currently held by the President of the WSU) is managed through the class representative system.

If student representation is included in the constitution of a committee, the student members are normally elected by and from the student members of the Academic Board. Because this can represent an unreasonable demand on eight students, some committees elect students from the Subject Committee level. This creates a larger pool from which student representatives are drawn. Members of the Subject Committees are canvassed annually to determine those who are interested in higher-level committee work.

5. Implementation

5.1 Student Representation Co-ordinator

The Student Representation Coordinator's role is to provide training and support for class representatives, student representatives and staff of the University.

This includes coordinating the election of class representatives and student representatives to Boards of Students, Academic Board and other University committees, running training sessions for class representatives each semester, taking part in induction programmes for new staff and briefing sessions for students representatives before each Academic Board meeting.

5.2 Student Groups

The WSU worked with the University to introduce the new system while other specific interest groups, such as the Waikato University Law Students Association and international students, assist the Student Representation Co-ordinator in their particular areas.

5.3 "Buy-In"

For the System to operate both staff and students need to "buy-in" into the process. Buy-in was achieved through staff and student input into the development and approval of the system.

Departments provide practical support for class representatives and the Student Representation Co-ordinator, especially in arranging class representative elections and ensuring those representatives are registered.

The Student Representation Co-ordinator is also a point of reference for staff of the University seeking assistance in gaining informal feedback from students wider than their subject or school.

6. Evaluation

Student motivation to participate in the class representative system has sometimes been considered low. Regular reviews including of the support systems will ensure that students (and staff alike) will come to view the class representative system as well-organised and rewarding. The system needs to be 'owned' by students for it to be effective and meaningful.

6.1 Initial Review

A survey of the Class Representative System was undertaken in October 1998. This encompassed class, Boards of Studies, Academic Board and committee representatives and found:

- Student Representatives
The committee work for student representatives needed to be balanced with the representatives' primary responsibility to their studies.

- **Class Representatives**
Class Representatives wanted more involvement at a School/Department level and needed more time to give feedback to classmates during lectures.
- **Information**
Channels of communication were often breaking down. Suggested ways of improving this included greater use of email and website, class representative newsletter, monthly meetings and closer ties with student groups.

6.2 Further review

A second review is planned for October 1999 encompassing the student body and staff.

- **Student Representation Co-ordinator**
The position of Student Representation Co-ordinator will be reviewed in November 1999.

6.3 Additional areas

- **Maori students**
The issue of Maori student representation and consultation was raised separately at Council. The Vice-Chancellor is now implementing recommendations from a working party.
- **International students**
Work continues with the International Centre to encourage International student involvement in the System.
- **Graduate students**
Concern has been raised about the lack of involvement from graduate students and strategies are being developed to deal with this.

7. Adaptation

Class representative systems in their varying forms operate at each university.

The System at the University of Waikato is different because:

- It operates in a voluntary student membership environment
- It was implemented in a voluntary environment, prior to current legislation
- The system is based on class representatives

For a similar system to operate elsewhere factors to be considered could include:

- Relevant academic frameworks
- The need to encompass all students
- The need for some central coordination
- The need to balance desired outcomes for the University with the desires of students
- The needs of interest groups eg. Maori students, International students
- The need to be inclusive of student groups on campus
- Physical location of a central office or point of contact
- Potential conflict of interest in Coordinator/advocacy role
- Changing student population and needs

Given the new legislative environment we operate in, in relation to students' associations, other factors could include:

- Future students' association referenda
- Legislative requirements for student representation to Council
- Potential of contracting a representative service

8. Contact

Keri Neveldsen
Student Representation Co-ordinator
The Gateway
The University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton
New Zealand

phone: 07 838 4466 ext. 6434
fax: 07 838 4554
email: student.reps@waikato.ac.nz
web: <http://www.rgty.waikato.ac.nz/asd/classrep/classrep.html>

Chapter 10: A Unified Student Service

1. Introduction

The difficult financial environment in which universities currently find themselves, means that we must achieve the best possible outcomes and value from our services. Hence the size and suitability of current management units within the University requires attention in order to ensure effective use of limited resources.

As universities compete for the recruitment and retention of students, it is essential that our student services enable students to succeed. At this time in the development of New Zealand universities, the challenge is especially important because: there is relatively open entry to most courses; the demographic diversity of the student population is widening hand in hand with equity requirements; and there is greater financial and career-related pressure for students. As the importance of student services has increased, Government funding per student has reduced and student tolerance of fee increases has also diminished.

Questions about effective delivery and cost efficiency are timely. Student retention and achievement, which might be regarded as the primary outcome indicators of student support services, are at stake.

2. Context

At the outset of this change process at Massey University, it was identified that the provision of student services was the responsibility of two separate organisational clusters within the university. At Palmerston North, these services comprise eleven different areas of delivery with varying arrangements for their administration and financial management. Service delivery was primarily to internal students, with head counts numbers of around 7600 full time and 1800 part time students.

Most services had recently separately undertaken planning exercises and self-audits, involving the identification of student needs and the role of their service in meeting such needs. Service delivery, however, was highly diffuse with no integrated organisational strategy for management and development. Separate plans resulted in an enthusiasm for an uncoordinated expansion of services and staffing, creating the potential for further differentiation and proliferation.

The result was that for students and staff, getting to know about student services was very complex. For example:

- each service had different hours
- each had a different administrative approach to dealing with student
- the services were dispersed widely around campus
- there was little systematic relationship between services so that students needed to start afresh with each service.

From an organisational perspective there was:

- no opportunity to coordinate services around the individual student
- a tendency for individual professional groups to derive their main identity and practice models from outside the university
- limited ability for coordination, research, and targeting
- limited cross fertilisation with regard to good practice
- duplication of administrative practices
- an inflexibility, especially with small sections, who were limited by the size of their infrastructure

In short, the complexity and uncoordinated nature of the services limited their potential. At the individual student level it was difficult to locate, access and use services. As most students have a range of

needs and support services should be able to deal with them comprehensively, there was clearly a mismatch between student need and service provision.

3. Changing Practice: Key Principles and Concepts

The proposal for change involved an extensive process of detailed discussion with individual service providers, academic and registry staff. The Student Association input was also important. Also influential were recent reviews in the area of student services and material from other Universities in New Zealand and Australia. At the same time the university was preparing for the visit of the academic audit unit and reports of such audits in Australia were available as part of this process.

It was proposed that a new Student Service function be developed using the following principles:

- fully integrated student services
- designed around individual student use
- the service to be accessible to all students
- the service to target the greatest areas of need
- these needs to be systematically identified
- a balance of one-to-one assistance with proactive programming
- service delivery to be matched to student use in terms of opening times and seasonal demand
- service integration to be matched by physical integration
- integrated administrative processes and procedures to be established
- staffing to be based on individual specialisation, peer support, and cross-service opportunities through team-work
- cost effective service provision to be pursued including buying in of services, as required

The principle that student services should be designed around individual students is one of the most important - services must fit the student rather than students fitting around the constraints of the service delivery eg Doctors' hours should suit students timetables rather than the Doctors. As much as is possible the students should experience seamless delivery at all points where they interact with the University.

A single student service was established from the previous professional groupings. Its purpose was defined as *'assisting students to be successful at Massey University'*. This enabled a sharper focus across student services in order to:

- assist students in their transition to University
- enable students to make the most of academic opportunities
- enable students to participate in the life of the University community

Other strategies include

- using student retention and success measures as key performance indicators, where appropriate
- targeting programmes so that limited resources are used to best effect
- targeting of first year students, through orientation to the university and learning support programmes, because attrition is highest in the first year
- linking all targeting to the systematic identification of students' needs

4. Process

Overall initial leadership was to be provided by a new Student Services Co-ordinator who would need to have:

- a strong customer service emphasis and understanding of feedback processes

- proven planning and project management skills
- ability to organise a complex set of programmes and to appreciate what will and won't work
- empathy for students and ability to gain cooperative commitment from a range of professionals within and outside the service.

Staffing structures were to be altered so as to enable staff to work in a team environment and contribute to the development of a set of inter-linked programmes, carefully planned according to the needs of target groups and the feasibility of delivery.

Staff would work in areas of specialisation on programmes and on a one-to-one basis. They will map percentages of total time to enable monitoring and planning.

Demands for service delivery would be matched by supply through:

- current part-time professional staff to be encouraged to work longer hours during semesters in order to meet increased student demand
- new operational part-time staff to be employed during semesters only
- 'buying in' of expertise for peak periods will be considered

'One Stop Shop' for student access is critical and involves training of receptionists in order to provide ease of entry. Also, emergency appointments and referral systems should be carefully constructed to enable appropriate sharing of expertise.

5. Resource Implications

There were significant efficiencies realised through the reorganisation of student services. Administration was streamlined as were facilities and publications.

6. Implementation

The integration of student services was managed in stages. Originally five service providers came under the Student Service umbrella, then seven, and further restructuring will go beyond the original proposal to achieve wider integration and seamless service provision.

The process has been slower than first anticipated due to a number of factors:

6.1 Physical Integration

Plans to create a one-stop-service shop for students, by physically integrating the services were delayed by wider restructuring of the university. This has meant that service integration will go ahead without physical integration in the first instance. Clearly this has diminished the effectiveness of integration achieved thus far, however it is expected that by the year 2000 physical integration will be completed.

6.2 Sub-cultures

Some resistance has been encountered, particularly in those service areas with strong affiliations to professional groups.

6.3 Budget constraints

Budget constraints have impacted on the ability to move through the process as planned, particularly regarding to physical integration.

7. Achievements to date

While physical integration has yet to proceed, there nevertheless have been significant gains, which have been evidenced by the following:

- a stronger emphasis on 1st year students
- students find it easier to pass between services
- significant drops in student waiting-lists for service
- new programming for international students has resulted
- a significant shift in mindset amongst staff
- a closer relationship between student services and academic sections
- more proactive programming in the majority of service areas
- increased levels of peer exchange between staff in different service areas.

8. Evaluation

Until physical integration is completed as planned, it will be difficult to achieve all the goals identified at the beginning. However, gains thus far have been significant and a new student-centred focus is evident throughout the various service areas.

9. Adaptation

This is clearly a track universities in similar situations either need to consider, or, are already considering, as student recruitment and retention are issues facing all institutions. The general principles could be adopted in other settings, though the details of implementation will vary.

10. Contact

Murna Thomson
Assistant Vice Chancellor (Support Services)
ph: 06 350 5215
email: M.C.Thomson@massey.ac.nz

Chris Collins
Director, Student Services
ph: 06 350 4311
email: C.W.Collins@massey.ac.nz

Chapter 11: Course Outlines

1. Purpose

The provision of consistent and complete information to students on the content of undergraduate courses (defined as equivalent to papers or the smallest administrative unit of learning in the qualification) and related information is considered to be an important part of the learning experience. It builds realistic expectations and an understanding of the context in which any particular course fits.

It is an opportunity for staff to provide information on learning outcomes and on the link between assessment and outcomes as well as the traditional lecture/practical schedule.

The course outline is a vehicle for providing information on key procedures and regulations such as the complaints procedure and assessment regulations. It is also a way of providing feedback to students on the results of previous course appraisals and the actions that arose from them.

2. Context

A policy had been in place for some time but was not being consistently applied. The academic audit report encouraged staff to emulate best practice. Rather than just distribute examples of good practice, it was decided to review the policy and template in order to provide staff with a better basis on which to develop good practice.

3. Key Principles and Concepts

The basic principle is to provide the student with full information on what they can expect from the course. The policy has required that all undergraduate courses provide an outline. More recently this has been extended to all levels.

The outlines can be revised at the beginning of each semester but should not be changed during the semester without approval of the chair of department and with the knowledge and consent of the students.

Some of the information contained in the outlines, apart from basic descriptive material, includes:

- The opportunities that the course will provide for developing knowledge, personal and interactive attributes
- How the assessment strategies contribute to and measure the above.
- The processes for monitoring and reviewing the course.
- Summary of recent course evaluation results and the changes that are planned or were actioned as a result.
- How the content and outcomes of the course are linked to current research activities.
- Health and safety matters
- Outline of the class representative system and complaints procedures.
- Reference to key regulations.

4. Process

A small group undertook a revision of the existing template for course outlines. The proposed policy and template was circulated for consultation. The revised policy and template was approved by Academic Board and promulgated in the Official Circular. An opportunity for training in some of the newer aspects of the template was provided.

The Academic Services Division on behalf of the Academic Programmes Committee (a sub-committee of Academic Board) undertook the ongoing management of the policy. Subsequently two

modifications have been made to the template. The effect has been to expand the coverage of the template and to include graduate courses in its scope.

5. Implementation

It was made clear that the policy was expected to be implemented for all courses. This did not seem to create significant problems mainly because it was an extension of an existing policy. Some staff welcomed the clarity that the outlines provide although others are reluctant to commit themselves to the detail expected and/or consider that too much detail is provided

The initial template has both compulsory and optional components but later versions have all sections compulsory.

Many academic centres are making the outlines available during the enrolment period and providing them as part of the information that goes to potential students who enquire about courses.

6. Evaluation

The Quality Assurance Committee has undertaken to monitor the implementation of the policy as part of its quality assurance role.

A check on the processes used for approving and monitoring course outlines has been undertaken along with some sampling of course outlines to evaluate uptake. It showed that accountability processes of various types are in place. One area that uses computers consistently has put the outlines on their Intranet.

No systematic survey of consistency of adoption or student reaction to the outlines has been undertaken although one is scheduled for later in 1999.

Training in some of the new components should have been available at the time the policy was promulgated but was not available until later in the year.

Some work is now required to identify good examples of layout.

7. Adaptation

The adoption of an approach similar to this would seem to be important in the present environment within the tertiary sector so that students are fully informed and are provided with the basis on which to evaluate whether the course has met its obligations to them.

8. Contact

N J Withers
Director, Quality and Planning
University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton

ph/fax: (07) 838 4090
email: neville@waikato.ac.nz

The details of the policy and guidelines are available on the University of Waikato web pages at http://quality.waikato.ac.nz/course_outline_policy.htm

SECTION 3

PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Chapter 12: Quality Assurance in a Dual Mode Institution

1. Purpose

Quality assurance has always been an important challenge for Massey University's extramural programme. From the inception of the extramural programme in the early 1960s, Massey University has had to demonstrate that the extramural programme achieves learning outcomes that match or exceed those of its internal study mode. This level of achievement has been demanded firstly by its extramural students, who seek to protect the value and standing of their hard-won qualifications, but secondly by Massey's fellow New Zealand universities that have always striven to maintain comparability of standards across the sector. The policies and systems now in place at Massey University for assuring quality within the extramural programme draw on best practice in international distance education. But they are also rooted in the history and culture of the institution itself.

2. Environment and Context

There are plenty of international examples available of excellent quality assurance systems for the provision of distance education. Over the past twenty or so years, large specialist distance education institutions have developed all over the world. These have often been ambitious national projects intended to improve the access of citizens to higher education. Most of these institutions have been well planned, tightly managed organisations, which have been able to benefit from the accumulating international knowledge of this mode. Quality assurance has tended to be an important element in the planning as well as the management of such institutions. Standards have been specified for the design, development and servicing of distance education programmes.

Dual mode institutions such as Massey University, where the distance education activities are carried out alongside the conventional campus-based teaching activities, pose a more complex challenge for quality assurance. In these institutions the quality assurance systems must, of course, be able to identify standards of product development and service that will bear comparison with any other provider. But they must also acknowledge that the principal agent in this type of institution remains the individual teacher. This individual is generally a fully tenured member of the academic staff who will be attempting to balance the demands of their distance teaching with those of their campus based teaching, their research and whatever management and community obligations they carry as well. These staff will expect to be consulted about any systems for quality assurance that are likely to be applied. They will insist on maintaining a close personal responsibility for their courses and their teaching. And they will expect any quality assurance systems to be responsive to their claims to academic autonomy and the demands of their subject for customised solutions.

3. Key Principles and Concepts

While the quality systems in place for the extramural programme are multi-faceted, they are all informed by a common set of principles and concepts:

- The foundation principle of the extramural programme is one of parity with the University's internal programme. This means that the curriculum, the means of assessment, and the learning outcomes obtained by students will, wherever possible, be identical between the two modes. The importance of this principle is perhaps seen most clearly in the fact that a Massey University academic transcript does not indicate in which mode a qualification has been achieved.
- A second key principle is that distance education, as with face-to-face education, should be a "didactic conversation" between teacher and student. The contribution of the individual academic teacher is therefore central to this process and should not be replaced by a set of "teacher-free" learning materials.

4. Process and Implementation

The “Massey solution” to this challenge is both an organisational response and a quality assurance response - the former poses its own challenge for the latter. This paper will attempt to identify the major steps in this organisational response, and develop these to indicate how the challenge of quality assurance is met:

4.1 Programme Approval

An important feature of the Massey model of distance education is that the papers and qualifications that are delivered extramurally are identical in terms of syllabus, assessment and credit to those delivered on campus. All extramural papers contribute to accredited, funded qualifications; they have been approved through the normal approval processes of the institution and of CUAP; they must satisfy the same criteria to obtain this approval as any other paper; and they are subject to the same processes of ongoing review.

4.2 Centralisation of support services

If a conventional campus institution wishes to offer a small number of papers by distance means, it is likely to prevail on its teaching staff to remain responsible for most aspects of the servicing of those courses. Distance education commentators have referred to this as the ‘cottage industry’ approach. It is an infinitely flexible, labour-intensive and error-prone process that will defy the efforts of management to assure its quality.

Institutions with larger distance education offerings will tend to relieve teaching staff of most of the administrative servicing requirements of distance education teaching. They will adopt a more ‘industrial’ approach to distance education and set up specialist units to relieve teaching staff of the burden of providing a range of administrative services for students. In Massey’s case these services include the following:

- providing information about the programme to the student market
- enrolling the students
- printing and dispatching study material to them
- managing and recording the flow of student assignments to and from markers
- making organisational arrangements for regional
- campus and block course components and communicating with students about these
- organising examination venues wherever there are students requiring this service
- providing a distance library service and making arrangements for students with special needs

These services are provided by central university service agencies such as the Centre for University Extramural Studies (CUES), the Enrolment Office of Student Affairs and the University Library. Each of these units has a set of key performance indicators for their services against which they must collect data and report. These KPIs include:

- measures of compliance with institutional management requirements (such as compliance with budgets, documentation of key policies, and employment and safety practices)
- measures of efficiency (such as the unit cost of key services, or measures of timeliness)
- regular reviews of all key processes which must be carried out within a three year cycle
- surveys of stakeholders for each of the services.

Wherever possible these services are required to indicate the level of service they are operating to, and to gather data on their compliance with these standards. In most cases, these standards need to be arrived at in consultation with the key stakeholders.

4.3 Standards for Teaching and Assessment

One of the distinctive features of distance education is that its processes are more accessible to monitoring and intervention than are those of conventional campus-based teaching. While it is difficult, and possibly unacceptable, for a team leader to directly observe a colleague's lecture room teaching, it is a straightforward matter for the same team leader to monitor the study material prepared by that lecturer for distance delivery. And while direct classroom observation can normally only provide feedback that might improve the next teaching performance, rather than the one that is being observed, this limitation does not apply with distance education. It is very possible to provide feedback and guidance that will lead to the improvement of a set of materials before its is ever distributed to students. This relative ease of monitoring and intervening has encouraged Massey University to develop standards for most of its key teaching and assessment activities.

Examples would include:

- standard requirements for initial advice to students at the outset of a course
- requirements for copyright compliance
- requirements for the presentation of study material including guidelines about formatting as well as for the maximum size of study packs
- requirements for the timeliness of assignment marking and turnaround
- for the use of a standard grading system

These standards are generally proposed by the unit providing the service, and then endorsed by the Board of Extramural Studies. This is a body representative of academic as well as administrative interests.

4.4 Monitoring of Performance against Standards

Developing and promoting standards will only ever be partially effective unless performance is monitored against these standards. The Centre carefully monitors each of the four examples provided above for University Extramural Studies. All draft sets of extramural course material are checked for compliance with the University's requirements for initial advice, for copyright compliance and for presentation and formatting before it is approved for printing and distribution. The fourth example, concerning the monitoring of assignment turnaround, provides data to enable the academic community to monitor its own performance. All assignments are centrally logged as they arrive at the University, and once more as they are mailed back to student after marking. This central record allows markers and heads of department to be reminded when assignments are taking longer than the maximum time allowed for marking, and for an annual report to indicate trends in marking performance.

4.5 Improving Teaching

Some of the most important aspects of quality are very difficult to quantify or to measure. The design of a set of extramural teaching materials is a case in point. If the institution accepts that there is no single model for effective teaching, and that academics should be permitted wide discretion in the way they interpret and teach their subjects, then the institution's processes of quality assurance will need to support and guide their efforts, rather than direct them. There is a range of support services available to provide that guidance to teaching staff as they come to plan and develop a draft set of materials. These include:

- a team of instructional designers who are able to advise on instructional design and to work through draft material with teaching staff;
- a set of handbooks and guidelines on principles of course design available to staff on both paper and the Web
- a regular set of training courses, both live and on the Web, supporting most of the major aspects of teaching and assessment
- sets of exemplar materials also available to staff
- a team of desktop publishers available to work with course writers to produce a high quality master draft.

To complement the advisory services, the instructional designers also provide a quality check at various stages of the planning and development process for a course.

These interventions need to be understood in the context of the size of the extramural programme and the management systems in place to cope with that size. In 1998 there were 1,100 papers offered in this mode, about 75% of which required the preparation, production and dispatch of packs of study materials for their students. Attempts to introduce a fixed cycle of revision for these sets of material have been only partially successful with academics in some subjects insisting on more frequent revisions than others. This problem has been addressed by an annual Materials Production Schedule that provides an entitlement to service for each department. This entitlement indicates the proportion of its courses that can be subject to major revision by the central Materials Production Unit for the upcoming year, but also requires this work to be assigned a series of submission deadlines to make the most efficient use of these scarce production resources. While primarily a management device, the Schedule also allows CUES to monitor both quality and quantity.

4.6 Feedback from Clients

As with most universities, Massey has introduced a standard instrument to measure student feedback on its courses. All extramural papers are subject to assessment every year with the results flowing to teaching staff and their department heads, with the expectation that this information will be shared with students. Surveying all 19,000 extramural students is a major logistical exercise and is carried out by mail.

Where possible students are also surveyed on their experience of the various extramural support services they have access to. For instance, the Extramural Regional Advisers who provide course and learning support advice to extramural students in the regions are required to survey students on a regular basis as to the usefulness of the assistance they have received. A second example is a series of student interviews planned by the Materials Preparation Unit of CUES during 1999 to seek feedback on the various models of instructional design and materials formatting presently in use. A third example, from a different unit this time, is the regular survey that the Distance Library Service carries out among student users.

The other important client group for the Centre for University Extramural Studies is teaching staff. Every year CUES carries out a survey of its academic clients, seeking feedback on each of its discrete services, and generating data that will show trends from year to year.

4.7 Moving Forward

Most of the quality assurance systems described above are designed to ensure that our teaching and support systems meet accepted standards. But it is also necessary to ensure that standards and practice are evolving to keep up with developments in technology and the national and international market for distance education. The management of innovation tends to require two distinct phases of quality assurance activity. The first stage occurs when early leaders are experimenting with new media and piloting these in their delivery of distance education courses. This process needs to be carefully monitored on an individual basis to ensure that all the normal quality and service expectations are observed. But very early in the developing use of this new medium, it will be necessary to move into a second phase and develop new policy, service standards and infrastructure to ensure that such developments match the quality of conventional media and modes. In a large and devolved university such as Massey, this second phase will pose a constant challenge for the management of the institution.

5. Adaptation

The development and refinement of these quality assurance policies and processes has been an evolving process. It is one that has been shaped by the academic culture of the institution, and over a process of many years, it has made its own imprint on that culture. Policies and processes that work very effectively at Massey University may not be immediately capable of implementation by another

university. Standards and systems that another university might find intolerable or unworkable, work at Massey because of the long-standing commitment of the University to extramural teaching, and the shared understanding among teaching staff of the special requirements of distance education.

6. Contact

Tom Prebble
Director of Extramural Studies, Massey University
Private Bag 11 555, Palmerston North

Fax 64 6 350 2268
Email T.K.Prebble@massey.ac.nz

Chapter 13: Conjoint Programmes – Policies and Procedures

1. Introduction

This paper reports on the introduction, development and operation of the conjoint teaching programme established by Massey University in conjunction with other New Zealand tertiary education institutions and other organisations.

2. Purpose

Conjoint teaching arrangements were first developed at Massey University in 1991 as part of an initiative to establish long-term strategic relationships between the University and other post-compulsory education and training institutions, particularly in the central region of New Zealand, in accordance with the University Charter. The Post Compulsory Education and Training (PCET) Relations Advisory Committee, established in 1989, assisted in the development of articulation agreements with partnering institutions.

Strategic criteria for the development of such agreements included:

- the possibility of attracting new student markets
- anticipated pipeline growth from conjoint paper offerings to Massey University internal and extramural (distance teaching) programmes.

Logistic criteria for entering into an agreement with a partnering institution included:

- ability of the proposed programme to be supported through University funding, student fees or inter-institutional payments
- the capacity for any proposed programme to meet the same quality standards applied to all other Massey University programmes and to put appropriate quality assurance processes and procedures in place
- manageability of University teaching staff time commitments.

3. Context

The context in which the conjoint teaching programme was established and developed was characterised by:

- increasing undergraduate enrolments
- capped Ministry of Education Funding
- polytechnics without capacity to be able to offer degree programmes

Since the time of the programme's inception in 1991 and in the years that followed to 1998, student enrolments in University undergraduate programmes generally increased. In the case of rapidly expanding disciplines increased enrolments meant the prospect of non-funded EFTS. Conjoint teaching partnerships provided opportunity to make tertiary education accessible to those who might not otherwise undertake university education and to promote students' continuation in degree programmes at a time when resource constraints might otherwise have restricted the University's capacity to achieve these objectives. Conjoint partnerships also benefited polytechnics in that they received a portion of EFTS funding that would not otherwise have been available to them. In recent years changing professional education requirements in other organisations have led to University-based qualifications at graduate level also being in demand. Consequently, conjoint partnerships have been established for the teaching of some graduate programmes to such organisations, with the establishment of the first such agreement at Massey University in 1995.

Over the period 1998-1999, EFTS in undergraduate Category A papers have stabilised or are showing some evidence of decline. Added to this is the prospect signalled in the *Tertiary Education in New Zealand: Policy Directions for the 21st Century - White Paper* that from 2000 all degree-granting institutions will receive EFTS funding for all students enrolled in any given year. These changing enrolment trends and likely changes to Government funding of tertiary education institutions must necessarily have an impact upon the University's conjoint teaching programme with polytechnics in particular. The extent to which attraction of new enrolments and pipeline growth may offset a possible diversion of EFTS from the University's internal and extramural programme with a consequent loss of potential funding becomes a critical question. Added to this should be consideration of the extent to which additional benefits, not initially anticipated, may offset some of the anticipated future costs of the programme's continuance. For example, the contribution of conjoint programmes to providing access to tertiary education for Maori, and educationally disadvantaged members of communities in some regions, should not be underestimated.

4. Key Principles and Concepts

The key principles underpinning the establishment, development and continuance of a conjoint teaching partnership include:

- The programme is consistent with the University's strategic objectives.
- Each partnering relationship is made explicit in the context of an Articulation Agreement signed by representatives of both institutions, to which a Schedule of Papers is attached in each year that the Articulation Agreement is operative.
- In the case of partnerships with polytechnics, papers proposed in any one year are first year (100-level) extramural papers that have proven previously successful and are currently offered extramurally.
- Sufficient papers can be offered each year to enable students to enrol full-time in a degree programme.
- Quality assurance processes and procedures are established that are consistent with those for parallel extramural papers.
- Direct outcomes of the programme are comparable to those evident in parallel extramural programmes.
- Prospective students comprise those who would otherwise not enrol in the University's extramural or internal programmes.
- In the case of conjoint arrangements with polytechnics, pipeline growth is possible and is evident subsequent to establishment of the programme.
- Benefits to both partnering institutions outweigh financial and other costs.
- Each agreement is subject to annual review by both institutions and a separate comprehensive review is completed in the final year of each agreement (usually every three years) prior to consideration of its renewal.

5. Process

The following paragraphs outline the process of establishing a conjoint partnership; the contents of the Articulation Agreements; the structure established to support the conjoint teaching programme, and associated administrative requirements with respect to quality control and funding.

5.1 Process of relationship establishment

Proposals for the establishment of conjoint partnerships with other institutions are usually initiated by Polytechnic or organisational representatives in discussion with senior University staff (e.g., Pro Vice-Chancellors, or the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic)).

Expressions of interest are then discussed with relevant Heads of Departments or their equivalent.

Upon agreement in principle being reached, an articulation agreement is drawn up using a template developed for this purpose by the PCET Committee. The draft is submitted to the PCET Committee by the Pro Vice-Chancellor for approval.

Representatives of both institutions then sign the Articulation Agreement.

5.2 The Articulation Agreement

This document addresses the following issues:

- Programme, possible credit from completed programme, expected student status (full-time or part-time)
- Obligations of the University with respect to: enrolment, library services, examination registration, staff visits to the partnering institution, material provision, staff assistance, staff appointment recommendations
- Obligations of the Partnering Institution in relation to: prospective teaching staff appointments, teaching plans, staff visits to the University, enrolments, support service provision, library collection maintenance
- International students including reference to: enrolment, permit requirements, fees payments, institution remuneration to the University
- Financial matters including funds payable to the University, administration of payment obligations, student fee charges
- Terms and Conditions with requirement for annual review and separate comprehensive review prior to renewal of the Agreement
- Inter-institutional communication responsibilities in relation to policy and operational matters
- Advertising and Promotion materials preparation
- Administration
- Variations and course of action to be taken in the event that either party wishes to amend the agreement, and
- Schedule of Papers to be offered (to be attached to agreement).

5.3 Structure Established to Support Programme

The initial infrastructural arrangements for the support of the conjoint programme with Polytechnics were designed to support the pilot phase of the initiative. As the programme expanded, these arrangements became overextended with problems associated with communication between the University and its partnering institutions and within the University. Consequently, a standing subcommittee of the PCET Committee was established to manage and report on the articulation agreements and associated University commitments. Members of the Conjoint Teaching Management Committee (CTMC) include one academic staff representative from each College appointed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor; two representatives from the Centre for Extramural Studies (CUES) and Student Affairs (with respect to enrolments), and the University Librarian's nominee. Conjoint arrangements with organisations or institutions other than polytechnics are managed by a Board of Studies established expressly for this purpose with a representative of the Board also being a member of the CTMC.

5.4 Administrative Requirements

5.4.1 Quality Control

Essential to the programme are quality control requirements made explicit in the Articulation agreement and in publications produced by the CTMC for use by administrators, teaching staff and students. These include the requirement that:

- Staff are appointed to teach in the conjoint programmes subject to the prior approval of the relevant University Head of Department or equivalent.
- Advertising and promotion material is submitted to the University by the Partnering Institution for approval.
- Early in the academic year teaching staff are invited to participate in an information day at the University during which they discuss the year's teaching programme, assessment, and course evaluation.
- Students meet University criteria for entrance.
- Approval of course changes is subject to prior approval of both institutions.
- With respect to each conjoint paper, at least one visit is made to the University by Partnering Institution teaching staff during the academic year in which the paper is offered. University staff makes at least one reciprocal visit to the Partnering Institution.
- University staff moderate assignments and set final student examinations.
- Partnering institutions establish and maintain a library collection sufficient to ensure that students' needs are met with advice from the University Librarian.
- The University extends library services to Partnering Institution staff teaching in the conjoint programme.

5.4.2 Funding Issues

Details are mutually agreed upon by both institutions, with associated administrative requirements including the expectation that:

- The University will be advised of all enrolments and any subsequent withdrawals.
- Partnering institutions will claim full EFTS funding for conjoint students where applicable.
- A proportion of full EFTS funding will be paid by the Partnering Institution to the University in accordance with the relevant Articulation Agreement. (In the case of institutions and organisations that are not tertiary education providers payment is to be made in accordance with the relevant Articulation Agreement).

6. Implementation

The following issues have impacted, and are likely to impact in the future upon the implementation of articulation agreements, particularly in the case of polytechnics.

6.1 Matters identified by the University

- Current strategic relevance, particularly in light of the possible outcomes of the Tertiary Education White Paper
- Introduction of competing programmes by Partnering Institutions
- Declining enrolment levels in light of decreased per EFTS funding
- Reduced funding received by the University relative to necessary resourcing commitments associated with the programme
- Changing Ministry of Education funding arrangements that may mean conjoint programmes constitute a diversion of potential Category A- equivalent funding to Partnering Institutions
- Sustainability of pipeline growth in light of an increasing number of degree providers, increased student fees, and changes to student fees and allowances payments
- Reduced funding to Departments contributing to the programme
- The high level of University staff commitment required and different obligations for few students
- Potential threats to copyright and course ownership
- Discontinuity of Partnering Institution teaching staff necessitating added commitment by some University staff to provision of teaching support

- Delays in communication of programme regulation and paper changes to Partnering Institutions caused by University approval processes contribute to discrepancies in information provided by Partnering Institutions and Universities.
- Quality assurance, which if inadequate will lead to alternative arrangements made for students and withdrawal of the paper as part of the conjoint programme offering.

6.2 Matters identified by Partnering Institutions

- Financial arrangements based upon full-funded EFTS in the event of non-funded EFTS and non-Study Right EFTS have prompted calls for adjusted financial arrangements
- Lack of opportunity to teach 200-level University papers (relating to University-established principles for the conjoint programme) threatens continuity of the programme as institutions attempt to retain and grow their respective market shares
- Restricted conjoint paper availability limits student choice
- Declining enrolment levels (not exclusively in the conjoint programme) place pressure upon limited resources
- Establishment and maintenance of adequate library collections is difficult in light of resource constraints.

In the case of agreements with other institutions and organisations, quality assurance, student withdrawal rates, and enrolment administration, are particular matters of mutual interest but any concerns have been resolved in the context of the Board of Studies established for each programme.

7. Evaluation

Evaluation of the programme comprises:

- Regular Departmental moderation of assignment marking and end of year examinations that are identical to examinations for parallel extramural papers.
- Submission of regular monthly reports by College representatives to the CTMC.
- Annual submission of end-of-year student enrolments by programme and paper in each institution, and EFTS funding received by the University to University Academic Board.
- Reviews as requested by the PCET Relations Advisory Committee or annual reviews, as in the case of graduate programmes offered for other organisations.

Notably, a review of the conjoint degree programme offerings available to a single polytechnic was completed in 1993 and a review of all conjoint programme offerings was completed in 1996. The review findings well illustrate the flexibility necessary in responding to changed conditions.

7.1 Review 1993

This review concluded that the conjoint arrangement between the University and one particular Polytechnic benefited both institutions. It provided the Polytechnic with opportunity for staff development, an enhanced public profile through association with a university, and experience in setting up university courses. For the University, the conjoint programme enabled better links to be established with a community outside of the University's direct catchment area. This review prompted revision of the teaching model, assessment processes and procedures, staffing appointment processes, and promotion protocols associated with the conjoint programme.

7.2 Review of the Conjoint Programme 1996

The review particularly focused upon trends, with the principal conclusions being that:

- The introduction of competing qualifications by partnering institutions is reflected in reduced EFTS.
- Few students during this period were full-time students. This pattern continues.
- Pipeline growth to internal and extramural programmes was less evident than expected but when combined with the percentage of conjoint students returning to complete additional conjoint papers, suggested a reasonable growth rate.
- In the event that enrolments exceeded projected EFTS, the conjoint programme proved a useful source of additional funding for University Departments.
- Examination results for conjoint students in the then Faculties of Business, and Social Sciences, largely exceeded those achieved by extramural and internal students and, in the case of some papers, conjoint student results significantly exceeded those achieved by extramural students.
- Commonly, administrative problems were associated with student failure to formally withdraw from conjoint programmes. This led to partnering institutions being financially penalised and students being academically penalised.

This review prompted more careful monitoring of EFTS and associated funding; regular review of examination results, and University facilitation of the development of improved administrative procedures at partnering institutions.

8. Adaptation

The success of the conjoint programme introduced by Massey University in 1991 must be viewed in the context of the changing tertiary education sector; associated changed patterns in enrolment; decreased Ministry of Education per EFTS funding, and associated changes in the strategic planning of the University and its partnering institutions and organisations. The principles and process of establishment, procedures for implementation, and associated infrastructure have provided the basis for successful programme development at Massey University. More importantly perhaps, they have signalled the essential agreed-upon areas that must be subject to review and if necessary, amendment, when the educational and, or funding environment changes.

Application elsewhere of these principles and processes in the establishment of conjoint arrangements with other institutions would:

- ensure consistency in the basis of negotiations with other institutions
- facilitate University and Partnering Institution academic and financial planning
- establish programme delivery expectations consistent with that of other University programmes
- promote equity of service delivery to students completing papers conjointly or as part of the regular University programme
- enable demonstration of quality assurance in accordance with the requirements of both partnering institutions, and
- provide a basis for consistent marketing and promotion of the conjoint programme.

9. Contact

Readers interested in further detail with respect to the establishment, development and maintenance of a conjoint degree programme are welcome to contact:

Professor G. Fraser
Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Chairperson, PCET
Massey University
Palmerston North

Dr Ruth Anderson
Chairperson, CTMC
Massey University
Palmerston North
Ph 06 350 5258

Chapter 14: Developing and Managing International Agreements

1. Purpose

New Zealand's history of multi-culturalism in tertiary education and support for a diverse student population makes it an attractive education destination. There is potential for expansion in international tertiary student numbers, with benefits both for individual institutions and for New Zealand, as a result of growth in education export services.

Lincoln University has a policy of developing strategic and operational linkages with international organisations that facilitate the development of teaching and research opportunities at the institutional level and at the level of individual staff and students. The development of linkages with other institutions is consistent with the University's wish to work within a collaborative academic and internationally focussed environment, while retaining competitive advantage and providing high quality teaching, learning and research.

At Lincoln University international students comprise an increasing proportion of enrolments and now represent 908 students which is around 23% of the student roll.

Key considerations for Lincoln University when entering into international agreements include:

- Financial robustness of the institution
- Quality assurance mechanisms and processes
- Benefits to the University.

2. Context

All international agreements have their own characteristics and require appropriate quality assurance processes. The University takes account of quality assurance processes relating to staff, programmes, teaching and learning. Quality procedures for international activities are mostly the same as those operating on the Lincoln campus. The monitoring carried out and the feedback from students should detect issues before they become major problems.

Lincoln University has entered into a number of different types of international agreement ranging from the University teaching its own subjects and programmes at an off-shore institution using its own staff, through to transfer of credit arrangements where students obtain credit for part or all of a completed sub-degree qualification obtained at an offshore institution transferred to Lincoln University to complete a Lincoln degree.

International agreements and relationships fall into the following categories:

- Articulation agreements with universities, polytechnics and other educational institutions, which provide an opportunity for programme delivery at the partner institution
- Agreements with tertiary institutions for the transfer, with credit, of students to the University. The principles underlying credit transfer are set out in the Calendar. Within that framework, credit schedules and precedent tables have been developed
- Student exchange agreements with overseas universities. These agreements provide opportunities for individual students to spend periods of one semester or more at an overseas university. Credit gained is transferred to a qualification at the home institution
- Postgraduate study opportunities at other institutions. The University provides an opportunity for its own students to study at research institutions or other universities while

- retaining registration at Lincoln University. House rules for external study determine the minimum period to be spent at the University
- Agreements with overseas institutions, normally universities, for the development of cooperative activities that may involve student exchange, staff development, research cooperation, or other activities
 - Agreements with overseas institutions for the delivery of academic programme material, that may or may not result in the award of a Lincoln University qualification.

3. Key Principles and concepts

Typically, agreements contain a requirement to evaluate the quality of the relationship at specific times or to carry out such activities as to ensure that the University is in no way compromised by the activities of an external party. For example, the articulation agreements that relate to undergraduate teaching include a statement of moderation practice that specifies the extent to which staff of the University are obliged to participate in the evaluation, assessment and examination of students being taught by the external institution.

Adherence to the standards specified by the University is achieved either by students taking major assessments and examinations set by the University, or alternatively, by subject examiners from the University check-marking a stratified sample of examination scripts submitted by the external institution. In the latter case, the University takes a major role in moderating the total examination process and final confirmation of grades, which is a responsibility of the University.

The admission of students *ad eundem statum* with credit follows established procedures. If an applicant's record conforms to an existing crediting arrangement, then the entitlement of the credit is determined by the admissions staff according to the credit schedule. If there is no precedent for the credit sought, then the entitlement is determined by the Academic Administration Committee, having taken the advice of admissions staff and relevant academic managers. In advising the Academic Administration Committee in these cases, the admissions staff will make an assessment of the qualification on which the application is based in order to advise the suggested credit maximum.

In the case of a major agreement with an overseas institution that may be providing an intake route for a substantial number of students, the same basic principles are applied, although the University may have had an opportunity to influence the nature of course work delivered by the external institution. The aim is to establish cooperative relationships that allow the University to influence academic delivery and quality parameters in those institutions with which the University has a recognised relationship. Initial and ongoing quality checks, including moderation and staff appraisal are required. These are reflected in written agreements.

For student exchanges with overseas institutions, the University expends considerable effort in ensuring comparability between subjects, to enable effective credit transfers to be applied. Typically, the University will identify specific credits that individual students should obtain, while allowing some selection of elective subjects. It is the responsibility of Academic Administration Committee to verify that these crediting entitlements meet the requirements of particular academic programmes.

With all forms of external academic agreements, the University strives to maintain an active dialogue with the external institution. This, together with the obligation to meet internal quality assurance requirements at some point during the course of study for an individual student, provides some assurance of the quality of the overall process.

The University maintains a requirement that a minimum of one third of an undergraduate degree programme, including all of the major or 300 level requirements, should be taken on campus at the University, or delivered by staff of the University, before a student is allowed to graduate. The maximum cross-credit available is one third of the degree requirement, with no more than two thirds in aggregate available by transfer of credit.

4. Process

The University supports external academic relationships that provide enhanced educational opportunities for individuals and promotes the overall business of the University. The University's international business is coordinated by an International Planning Group whose focus is on education-related international business involving the use of current academic programmes and short course programmes. In an operational sense all international education business initiatives are scrutinised, assessed for conformity with strategic objectives and responsibility assigned for project management.

Specific responsibilities for the International Planning Group are:

- Development of an international strategic plan
- Translation of the strategic plan into operational targets that focus on business generation
- Co-ordination of individual international education projects
- Monitoring of progress
- Promotion of an appropriate emphasis on internationalisation of academic programmes, the curriculum, research, service functions and trading activity.

5. Implementation

In terms of implementation of international agreements there are three areas that the University has found need careful management:

- Off-shore management
- Moderation agreements and processes
- Quality processes.

Offshore management can be either with an offshore presence, or alternatively indirectly, from the Lincoln campus. An offshore presence means that: a staff member has clear responsibility; the degree is clearly owned by the University; and there is the ability to mainstream into normal activities.

Implementation of moderation agreements and processes require particular care in terms of ensuring the quality of what is being taught by another institution after initial accreditation.

Quality processes need particular attention. For example:

- If an overseas institution teaches Lincoln University papers, there is a risk of differences in delivery or content and there is uncertainty about the quality of the teaching, particularly if Lincoln University is not involved in appointing the staff.
- If students from an overseas institution are able to receive full credit for selected papers taught at an overseas institution, there is a risk that the appropriate quality requirements will not have been met.
- Although credit agreements with offshore institutions are scrutinised thoroughly, adequate follow up in some cases may not take place. In addition, on-campus subjects change with time and it is important that subjects taught at other institutions keep in step.

6. Evaluation

The management of international agreements is a process which is being continually refined and modified as the situation demands. Reasons why the management of international agreements appears to be working well and why students are reporting a positive experience include:

- A University wide commitment which incorporates an international perspective in all its activities
- Appropriate off-shore management, with an offshore presence where required
- International student support services on campus
- Internationalisation of curriculum and programmes
- Development of an international strategic plan
- Clear lines of responsibility for managing international business.

Lincoln University's international agreements have enabled it to support its international students successfully. Large numbers of international students require a University wide commitment that incorporates an international perspective in all its activities:

- Teaching and learning
- Programme design and delivery
- Research
- An international student and staff profile
- Staff and student exchanges
- Service functions
- Consulting and project management
- A multi-cultural perspective.

In terms of implementing its international agreements, the University has found that provision of the following services and support for international students have been necessary:

- Orientation events and activities
- Student learning services which include English language tutoring
- An International Centre which provides academic administrative and pastoral support
- Off-shore graduation ceremonies
- An international week and other celebrations of cultural and national diversity
- Academic course advice

In terms of implementing its international agreements the University has found that, for staff, the provision of cultural awareness workshops plus professional development and communication while offshore has been necessary.

7. Adaptation

International agreements have been and will continue to be an important component of the way that Lincoln University does business. The University's approach to managing international agreements will continue to include a focus on:

- Communication and dialogue with offshore institutions which results in mutual trust
- Development of a long term relationship or a strategic alliance with off-shore institutions
- Appropriate offshore management.

8. Contacts

Roger Field
Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Lincoln University
email: fieldr@lincoln.ac.nz

Geoff Ormandy
Director, International
email: ormandyg@lincoln.ac.nz

Chapter 15: Reporting on the Completion of the First Cohort of Students

This contribution describes the procedures in place at Victoria University of Wellington (VUW) since 1995 for the review of new programmes. It also describes how those procedures have been adapted recently to meet the requirements of the Committee on University Academic Programmes' (CUAP) Graduating Year Review policy.

1. Purpose

Reviews after the first cohort of students has completed a new programme were introduced at VUW to ensure that all new programmes are monitored for quality of delivery and to ensure those programmes are achieving their intended purposes. In addition to their quality assurance role for the wider university and external audiences, the reviews also provide feedback to faculties and schools to assist them in improving the programme for future students.

2. Context

The broad context for the introduction of the reviews of new programmes was the increased emphasis on quality assurance in universities culminating in the establishment of the Academic Audit Unit. The increased expectations of students and increased external scrutiny from government and employers, together with their formal accountability and reporting expectations, were also influential. Programme reviews extended the existing quality assurance monitoring provided by, for example, student evaluations of individual courses, which were already required at least every three years.

In 1994 the Academic Board and Council accepted the recommendation of the Academic Committee that review reports would be required for all new programmes approved from 1995 onwards. The definition of 'new programmes' included discrete new programmes, major revisions of existing programmes and new majors within the generic undergraduate programmes.

In 1995 VUW began preparing for the visit of the Academic Audit panel the following year. After reviewing the trial Academic Audit report, the Academic Audit manual and the Tertiary Lead Group report, the Academic Committee identified for the Academic Board a number of matters which needed specific attention to better prepare the University for Academic Audit. Amongst those matters was:

"Review of programmes of study and individual courses (with a priority for new programmes/courses but extension to those ongoing) – including student input, feedback to staff and students, monitoring the resulting action etc."

The Committee reminded the Academic Board that as a result of its recommendation the previous year faculties should have set up mechanisms for reviewing new programmes and should be positioned to report annually to the Academic Committee on those programmes.

In practice, it was clear that schools and faculties required guidelines for the preparation of programme review reports. Those who had introduced new programmes in 1994 reported voluntarily to the Academic Committee in 1995 and from these reports the Committee developed guidelines for the mandatory reports required in future years. Those guidelines identified the key quantitative and qualitative information that should be provided in a programme review report.

3. Key Principles and Concepts

The programme review procedures developed at VUW are based on the principle of guided self-review. Programme directors and heads of schools are asked to reflect and report on the programme as provided compared with the programme as designed. In preparing their report they are expected to use a variety of feedback sources, including student evaluations, peer evaluations, external assessors' reports and employer, industry and professional comment.

4. Process

The Academic Committee is responsible for monitoring the reviews of new programmes and it provides a report each year to the Academic Board on the reviews it has received. The 1996 report to the Board included the reviews of nine new programmes and the 1997 report included five reviews.

The Assistant Vice-Chancellor Academic's Office advises faculty offices each year of the programmes due for review later that year. Heads of Schools are then notified of any programmes due to report to the Academic Committee the following February and provided with the template for the review report and a previous example (if required).

An innovation introduced after the adoption of the programme review policy by the Academic Board is that in parallel with the preparation of the Head of School's review, the Victoria University of Wellington Students Association (VUWSA) conducts a survey of graduating students utilising a questionnaire and focus group discussion. It reports to the Academic Committee on the results of the survey of students at the same time as the Academic Committee considers the report from the School.

Reports from schools are required to cover the following topics:

- staff teaching the programme - their qualifications and the extent and nature of their contributions
- teaching modes and assessment methods
- programme fees and external financial and other support available to the programme
- provision and adequacy of accommodation, library and computing resources
- overall student numbers and students' performance in the programme
- numbers of students admitted under non-standard entry provisions and their performance in the programme relative to other students
- comparison with similar courses offered by other tertiary institutions
- student evaluations of courses within the programme
- resolution of any issues identified during the programme approval process
- resolution of any issues arising during the delivery of the programme.

While the School report is largely based on quantitative information (and evaluative comment), the VUWSA report provides a complementary commentary based largely on qualitative feedback. The University relies considerably on the well-established student representation system to provide this informed commentary. If VUWSA was no longer able to provide this commentary the University would need to consider how else to gather this qualitative information from students.

Consideration of the School and VUWSA review reports by the Academic Committee frequently results in further enquires to the School and occasionally a request for a further review report the following year.

5. Implementation

Few difficulties were experienced in implementing the review of new programmes and programme directors and heads of schools have willingly complied with the policy because they have recognised that the programme review process provides them with valuable feedback on the programme as well as meeting internal and external accountability requirements.

Providing a template for the review reports assisted with the comparability of programme reviews and generally enabled the Academic Committee to gain the information it requires in order to fulfil its monitoring role for the Academic Board.

Three implementation issues merit comment. First, the number of new programmes being introduced (over 70 between 1994 and 1999) will make the review of new programmes a resource-intensive activity for schools, VUWSA and the Academic Committee in future years. Where programmes are also subject to review by the relevant professional body (e.g., Accountancy and Architecture) every

effort is made to ensure the reporting requirements align and do not impose an additional burden on the School.

Second, reviews to date have generally been undertaken of stand-alone programmes (most commonly new taught postgraduate degrees). Reviews of new majors within the generic undergraduate degrees will be more challenging because of the interdependence of the major with other components of the qualification taught by other schools or faculties.

Third, the responsiveness of some programmes, such as teacher education, to external changes may mean that before the first cohort has completed a programme it has already been revised and there is understandable reluctance to conduct a review of a programme no longer offered in that form.

6. Evaluation

Around 20 programme reviews had been completed at VUW by the time CUAP introduced its Graduating Year Review in 1998. The Academic Committee was satisfied that the implementation of the policy had proceeded smoothly and it had been able to identify generic issues affecting the quality of academic programmes from those reviews.

As a result of a recommendation made by the Academic Audit Unit in its review of CUAP, all new programmes approved by CUAP from 1997 onwards will be required to report to CUAP in November of the year following the first cohort's completion of the programme.

The existing VUW procedures have now been merged with the CUAP procedures to form one review process for all new programmes. There will be a transitional period during which the former VUW procedures are phased out and the new CUAP procedures phased in. VUW is pleased that the CUAP Graduating Year Review has focussed greater attention on the achievement of the programme goals as stated in the original proposal and monitoring of the achievement of the graduate profile, than was the case in the original VUW procedures.

The introduction of the Graduating Year Review by CUAP also included consideration of the sanctions to be applied where a review report raised significant concerns about a new programme. Depending on the severity of the concerns raised about the programme, CUAP may call for a further review report after a specified period of time. Alternatively, it may place the programme under review assessment and establish a review panel to report to it on specified issues. After considering these further reports and the institution's response to them, CUAP may withdraw accreditation from the programme where it considers there are grounds for doing so.

Neither the CUAP Graduating Year Review procedures nor the programme review procedures introduced by VUW in 1995 provide for reviews of existing programmes unless these have been the subject of recent major modifications. The VUW Academic Committee's 1995 recommendation that the review process be extended to existing programmes has yet to be fully realised.

At VUW individual papers within existing programmes must be the subject of student evaluation at least once every three years but the programme itself is only reviewed as part of the broader departmental review process which occurs on a 5 year cycle (at best). The template for Graduating Year Reviews would be readily adaptable to reviews of existing programmes as well as new programmes should an institution wish to put such a policy in place.

7. Adaptation

The development of CUAP's Graduating Year Review procedures was informed by VUW's programme review procedures and these procedures are now in place at all New Zealand universities. The Graduating Year Review policy is available from CUAP and VUW's template for review reports is available from VUW.

8. Contact

The VUW contact person for further information is:

Jenny Christie
Academic Officer
Victoria University of Wellington

ph: 04 495 5191
email Jenny.Christie@vuw.ac.nz

SECTION 4

EVALUATION

Chapter 16: Review Processes and Use of Key Performance Indicators

1. Purpose

A critical quality assurance mechanism is the periodic review of sections of an institution. Reviews are a means by which an institution can obtain feedback, including external input, on aspects of its operation. The two central purposes of review are performance audit and the identification of priorities for development and planning for the future. In addition, review systems provide an opportunity to:

- Evaluate efficiency and effectiveness
- Ensure accountability
- Ascertain achievement of objectives and aims
- Audit processes and systems.

Review activity is typically focused on the following critical components of the University:

- Academic programmes
- Academic divisions that deliver teaching, research and extension outputs.

Note that the nomenclature used by Lincoln University is different to that used in other New Zealand universities. A degree, diploma or certificate is referred to as an (academic) *programme*, while the constituent material is aggregated into components called *subjects*. Academic staff responsible for delivering subjects, that make up programmes, are located in disciplinary groupings that are called (academic) *divisions*. Note that until 1997, these groupings of academic staff were called departments at Lincoln University. The programmes are not necessarily aligned to a particular division and in all cases go across a number of academic divisions.

2. Context

Over the period 1991 - 1997, the University reviewed each academic division. This meant that on an annual basis, several divisions were reviewed each year. The reviews were based on the peer review method, involving both internal and external membership, usually including at least one overseas reviewer. Typically, a review panel consisted of six or seven members, of which a minimum of two were external members. The terms of reference included:

- the appropriateness of disciplinary focus
- the relevance of division's objectives and goals
- the quality and appropriateness of academic and research programmes and curricula
- the availability of staff expertise
- the interface between staff and internal and external communities
- the adequacy of dedicated facilities
- desirable developments for the future.

Also over the 1991 - 1997 period, all major academic programmes were reviewed. These reviews were concerned with:

- appropriateness of the goals, aims and objectives of the programme
- structural and curriculum development aspects of the programme
- the appropriateness of advice to students
- the quality of delivery of constituent subjects
- the extent to which graduates/diplomates are equipped by the programme for progress into further study or employment, as appropriate.

By the end of 1997, all divisions and major programmes had been reviewed and implementation of recommendations was either underway or complete. This heavy programme and divisional review schedule was taxing for a small institution. In addition, the use of both divisional and programme reviews resulted in duplication of effort, as some matrix elements were reviewed twice. For instance, the review of the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture was undertaken soon after the review of the Division that taught much of that programme; while these two reviews had different foci, many of the variables (eg. staff, subjects) were components of both. As a result of these concerns and other institutional developments, the University reviewed its review mechanisms during 1997, with particular focus on mechanisms for programme and divisional reviews.

The result is that review activity from 1998 onwards is built around the collection, monitoring and analysis of key performance indicators. Key performance indicators are supported by other quality assurance activity including self reviews, internal reviews, client surveys and external reviews. Although it is not expected that divisional or programme reviews will occur on a cyclical or regular basis, poor performance will prompt an intensive review focused on specific objectives.

3. Key Principles and concepts

Key performance indicators enable the University to plan, monitor and evaluate its activities. They are often used for benchmarking, and are critical for objective performance evaluation and review. The performance management framework currently in place at Lincoln University is captured in the Annual Report and the Statement of Intent.

Performance needs to be assessable at all levels in the organisation:

- Council needs to assess institutional performance by monitoring a small number of macro-level key performance indicators that identify the critical components of institutional performance. These need to be components of external communications on performance and need to be focussed clearly on the University's mission and goals.
- The Vice-Chancellor needs a disaggregation of key performance indicators in order to trace the effects on the institution as a whole of movements in the principal business unit/product performance. Performance indicators at this level need to be related closely to strategic direction.
- Managers of both academic and non-academic divisions need to be able to track the performance of their management unit as a whole as well as to measure the performance of each component of the unit.

The University has come up with key performance indicators that relate to both programmes and divisions and tracks these on an annual basis. The University can use key performance indicators to:

- Compare the performance of programmes or divisions with each other; and
- Track performance of programmes or divisions over time.

4. Process

The University conducts an annual review of institutional performance of all programmes and all divisions. This is used to target improvements in effectiveness and efficiency. The review, which takes place towards the end of the year, looks at actual performance over a number of variables and some key performance indicators.

For divisions, the annual review looks at actual performance using the following variables:

- EFTS (raw and weighted)
- EFTS (postgraduate, undergraduate, subdegree)
- \$ Expenditure
- \$ Income
- Full time academic staff
- Subjects (postgraduate, undergraduate, subdegree)
- Supervisions of thesis and dissertations
- Publications (total and “premium”)
- Space
- \$ Research
- \$ Resource, including repairs, maintenance, rental, insurance, depreciation.

For programmes, the annual review looks at actual performance using the following variables:

- Destinations of graduates (employment, further study etc)
- Demand
 - total enrolments and trends
 - first year enrolments and trends
 - retention and trends
- Student demographics
 - intake quality and trends
 - entrance qualification and trends
 - geographical origin and trends
- Academic performance
 - % clearance and trends
 - completions and trends
- Financial
 - delivery cost and trends
 - income and trends
- Course experience questionnaire

Analysis of key performance indicators relating to programmes may result in a decision to seek further information and conduct a substantive review. This report is then submitted to Academic Board. The University has retained its practice of reviewing all academic programmes on completion of the first graduating cohort. This practice may involve limited or substantial change to programme structure and forms. The existing process will require little modification to meet the recently imposed CUAP requirement for completion of a Graduating Year Review.

5. Implementation

The process for the annual review of all programmes and divisions is as follows:

- Data relating to each variable is collected from institutional managers to enable the key performance indicators to be derived
- Individual variables and key performance indicators are analysed and a draft report is written, which includes recommendations
- The resulting draft report is distributed among senior managers for comment and verification

- The report is finalised and recommendations acted upon/incorporated into planning for the following year
- The results of the annual review of all programmes and divisions are re-visited during planning exercises in the following 12 months.

A small team of managers carries out the annual review of all programmes and divisions and input is sought from Divisional, Finance, Works Registrar, Human Resources and Research Managers.

The entire annual review of programmes and divisions can be completed in less than one month. Ideally, the review should be completed before the budget setting process for the following year, but after the majority of indicators are available for the current year.

The process of reviewing programmes and divisions should be triangulated with other reviews and related quality assurance activity the University may undertake during the year. These include:

- Reviews of individual subjects
- Research related reviews
- Professional accreditation of programmes
- Student evaluation of subjects and lecturers
- Student satisfaction survey/course experience questionnaire
- Student exit survey
- Employer survey.

6. Evaluation

The review process implemented in 1998, whereby all programmes and divisions are reviewed annually, has resulted in:

- Completion of an “annual review” and report at end of 1998
- Incorporation of recommendations contained in the report into 1999 planning activities of division, corporate and programme managers
- Review of one programme during the early part of 1998 by an external consultant and implementation of recommendations during the second half of 1998. ie. within a 12 month period a degree was reviewed, recommendations made (and accepted) and the degree was successfully re-launched with a new name and structure
- Review of one programme during the early part of 1999 an external consultant with the objective to agree recommendations and implementation by year end.

7. Adaptation

The review process implemented in 1998 is proving to be appropriate to the needs of the University. This is not to say that at some time in the future, the University may revert to a more cyclical review process of programmes and divisions.

Reasons why the approach of annually reviewing all programmes and all divisions appears to be working well includes:

- A strong culture of reviews which exists in the University as a result of the cyclical review activity 1991 - 1997
- The explicit linking of objectives to key performance indicators and measurement
- The use and selection of appropriate key performance indicators which are supported by other mechanisms including client surveys
- Staff and management involvement across the University

- External input into programme reviews
- Ownership of the annual review report by all managers as a result of their involvement
- Active investigation of benchmarking processes to augment review findings
- Fast response to adverse performance indicators.

8. Contacts

Lincoln University
PO Box 94
Canterbury

ph: 03 325 2811
fax: 03 325 2965

Roger Field	Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Lincoln University email: fieldr@lincoln.ac.nz
Roger Smyth	Academic Registrar, Lincoln University email: smythr@lincoln.ac.nz
Elizabeth Bean	Project Manager email: beane@lincoln.ac.nz

Chapter 17: Getting and Using Feedback from Employers

1. Purpose

In 1995 and 1996, the University of Otago conducted its first Employers' Surveys. The purpose of the surveys was to find out what attributes employers believed were important in their employees, and to what extent these attributes were found in Otago graduates. The results of the surveys provided programme planners and teachers with valuable insights to assist them in decision making and priority setting. They also served as a springboard to exploring ways of strengthening links between the University and employers of its graduates.

On 9 and 10 September 1998 twenty-six University staff met for lunch with approximately one hundred human resource managers and executives from leading organisations in Wellington and Auckland. The purpose of the meeting was to obtain employers perception of how well Otago graduates meet their needs, and to explore ways in which the University could assist in such areas as developing generic skills in students. This initiative was a direct response to the findings of the Employers' Surveys.

2. Context

The University of Otago, as with other universities in New Zealand and elsewhere, has refocussed its approach to quality by the development of a quality advancement programme. This approach recognises a wide range of parties with an essential interest in the University and its programmes, including students, graduates and employers.

Since 1995 the University of Otago has conducted a wide-ranging programme of stakeholder surveys involving large samples of the University's current undergraduate and postgraduate students (Student Opinion Surveys), recent graduates (Graduate Opinion Surveys) and the employers of our graduates (Employers' Surveys).

The Student Opinion and Graduate Opinion Surveys are conducted on an annual basis and the Employers' Survey on a four-year cycle.

3. Key Principles and Concepts

The University of Otago's 'Strategic Directions' includes the following statements:

- To ensure that staff, students and, where appropriate, employers, professional associations and other related agencies are involved in programme planning, development, and monitoring.
- To strengthen links with professional associations, major employer groups, the public sector, the Dunedin community and other cities where the University has a physical presence.

3.1 Employers' Surveys

The Employers' Surveys set out to answer three key questions:

- What are the most important attributes that employers attach to successful employment in their organisations?
- To what extent do University of Otago graduates in employment demonstrate these attributes?
- What improvements to courses at the University do employers see as being most important?

A key concept was the deliberate decision to locate those employers who were very much aware of Otago graduates rather than to contact a random sample of employers.

3.2 Employer Meetings

The objectives of the meetings were to:

- Create higher employer awareness of the quality of the University of Otago and its graduates
- Help develop close rapport between those responsible for recruiting graduates and senior University staff
- Obtain employer views on how the University might most effectively follow up the findings of the Employers' Surveys of 1995 and 1996 to ensure ongoing improvements in the quality of graduates produced by the University of Otago

The meetings were seen as a significant step towards enhancing the University's understanding of the employment needs of New Zealand's major organisations and to developing closer relations between employers and senior University staff

4. Process

In the early 1990s, UK employer surveys reported response rates of less than 10 percent. Building on suggested new approaches, Dr Phil Meade, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) at the University of Otago developed surveys showing response rates showing 77 percent.

4.1 Employers' Survey

A research consultant Dr Robert Andrews was employed to undertake the Otago study (formerly, he worked with Dr Meade on the Griffith Employers' Survey). Secretarial and data analysis support was also provided. The brief was to undertake an employer survey similar to the study implemented at Griffith University but with modifications to suit the Otago environment.

The project was a research-based task that required the input of information from relevant departments, the development of a master survey questionnaire that was then customised to meet the requirements of the specific courses targeted, and the use of a telephone approach to obtain employer participation.

The master survey questionnaire contained two groups of attributes common to all courses, grouped as "life-long learning skills" and "other work related skills". It was then individually tailored to take account of "programme specific skills" based on the objectives for each of the nominated courses. The analysis of and reporting on the data and results obtained were presented in a manner which facilitated both the preparation of the University's documentation for its Academic Audit (August 1996) and improvements at course and departmental level.

Responses were received from 77% of the 246 employers surveyed. Three reports were produced: a final project report, summary reports for each relevant course, and a summary report for employers.

4.2 Employer Meetings

A senior administrative staff member was assigned responsibility for organising the meetings. Secretarial assistance was also provided. The responsibilities of this staff member included: liaising with employers and University staff, preparing supporting documentation and information packs, booking venues and making catering arrangements, and coordinating flights and accommodation for University staff.

Leading employers were contacted by telephone and advised of the proposed meetings. Care was taken to explain the purpose of the meetings, and to ensure that the appropriate personnel within each of the employer organisations were invited.

The Vice-Chancellor sent letters of invitation attaching information pack that included a Summary of the 1995 and 1996 Employers' Surveys and background information about the University. The

Vice-Chancellor was joined by other members of the senior management team and Heads of Departments from departments who had significant numbers of graduates employed by the employer groups represented at the meetings.

5. Implementation

5.1 Employers' Surveys

Special effort was made to ensure appropriate employer contacts were made in each of the organisations surveyed. The consultant followed up each of these contacts by telephone to advise them of the survey and its purpose and to make sure they were the appropriate person to receive the form. A number of difficulties were experienced in putting the theory of "pre-contact with employers" into practice, the main one being that of obtaining accurate up-to-date information on employers of graduates.

When the consultant made contact with employers, a number of other relevant matters emerged. Some employers were not aware that their employees had graduated from a particular University, while others said that it was not their practice to appoint any "new" graduates, but to give preference to persons already employed and with experience. The employment practices adopted by employers, including their job selection criteria, also clearly influenced employer perceptions.

5.2 Employer Meetings

Difficulties (as for the Employers' Surveys) were experienced in putting the theory of "pre-contact with employers" into practice, the main one being that of obtaining accurate up-to-date information on employers of graduates. Not everyone responded to the Vice-Chancellor's invitation and some people had to be followed up to obtain confirmation of attendance. This information was vital for determining numbers for lunch, and organising seating plans. Seating at the luncheon meetings was organised so that where possible, two Otago people were seated at a table with a group of employers relevant to their discipline areas.

After each of the luncheon meetings the Otago representatives completed a feedback form and participated in a general discussion, at which notes were taken, about the outcomes of the meetings.

6. Evaluation

The following formal evaluations of the survey instrument and meetings have taken place:

6.1 Employers' Surveys

At the completion of the initial round of surveys, the consultant was asked to prepare a project statement commenting on the process and any problems or difficulties encountered.

Dr Meade presented a paper to the Eighth International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education in 1996 entitled, "Measuring Graduate and Employer Satisfaction in Higher Education" which contained analysis of the survey instrument and results.

6.2 Employer Meetings

A Working Party prepared a report on the Employer meetings. The notes from the post-luncheon discussions with Otago staff were used as a resource document for the report.

A discussion document was prepared on "Graduate Attributes and the Requirements of Employers".

7. Adaptation

The University of Otago Employers' Surveys have built on the experiences of pioneers in this field and the model has the potential for successful adaptation in other educational contexts. Similarly, the practice of hosting employer meetings or focus groups could be adopted by other institutions.

The following reflections and conclusions drawn from the evaluations may be of use in considering whether or not to implement a similar process elsewhere.

7.1 Employers Surveys

The Employers' Survey is a 'blunt' instrument that helps identify key trends. It relies on the perceptions that employers provide of skills important in employment, and their rating of the extent to which these skills are evident in Otago graduates.

The methodology appears to be highly effective in identifying key successes and failures of the University experience from the perspective of employers. The surveys opened up communication channels between the University and its major stakeholders.

There was evidence that employers appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback and assist the University to improve.

The results provided University programme planners and teachers with valuable insights for curriculum development.

The University was able to triangulate the results of these Surveys alongside the results from its Student Opinion and Graduate Opinion Surveys.

Careful protocols have been established to manage the interpretation of stakeholder survey data.

Conducting an Employers' Survey is both a labour intensive and costly exercise and for these reasons the University has chosen to run it on a four-yearly cycle.

Strong leadership and the development of good links with both academic and non-academic departments within the institution is an important success factor.

7.2 Employer Meetings

The employers' response to the luncheons was enthusiastic and the meetings were well attended. Some of the organisations that could not attend supplied comments for discussion and requested information about any follow-up.

The University representatives were unanimous in thinking the exercise of considerable value, and believed that the comments and suggestions from the diverse group of employers were very much in unison. It was generally thought that to ignore their suggestions would be to disadvantage future graduates.

The increasing range of generic qualities being sought in graduates indicated that the University should plan its programmes to foster communication, numeracy and information technology skills within the teaching, learning and assessment of all disciplines. The participants reinforced the findings of the Employers' Surveys that teamwork, the development of communication skills and learner-centred application of knowledge needed to be encouraged.

The employers stressed that they wanted graduates with scholarship *plus* skills and qualities they had acquired and developed outside the classroom. They saw these personal attributes as important for graduates' ability to fit into the work culture, do the job, develop ideas, take initiative and responsibility and ultimately help organisations deal with a changing work environment.

8. Contact

Dr Phil Meade
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
University of Otago
PO Box 56
Dunedin

ph: 03 479 8303
fax: 03 479 8642
email: phil.meade@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Chapter 18: More Comprehensive Evaluation of Teaching Systems

1. Purposes

A new evaluation of teaching system was proposed in 1997 for the University of Auckland. The system introduced since comprises teaching portfolios, and an array of feedback, development and assurance processes. Together these mechanisms and processes are intended to help monitor, report on and improve the quality of teaching, and the quality of papers (semester length units of study) and courses (programmes of study leading to an award). Features of the new system are a much-enhanced role of student feedback, teaching portfolios and the planning of evaluation.

2. Context

The Quality Office and the Centre established a Working Party in January 1997 for Professional Development (CPD). It was representative of Faculties, academic staff union and students. Its task was to review the effectiveness of the existing student evaluation of courses and teaching (SECAT) system. It consulted with staff and students, produced an Interim report in June 1997, and published its recommendations in October. There followed a period of two years of extensive consultation and advocacy before the University Council adopted new *Protocols for the Evaluation of Teaching* (University of Auckland, 1999).

The Working Party considered in detail the pattern of student input to teaching during the past decade. Item banks had been developed by the CPD so that staff could construct their own version of a SECAT. The SECAT operation ran smoothly, and came to be used by many staff in ways that were consistent with its original formative purpose; teaching improvement. Increasingly, however, numerical scores were being used as comparable indicators of teaching ability. A key problem here was that SECAT items had been developed iteratively, and while they enjoyed high face validity, they had unknown construct validity. Indeed, the data storage methods used prevented retrospective factor analysis that might have helped determine item or scale reliability.

The Working Party noted the increasing use of global scores in personnel decisions, little feedback to the students, increasing resistance by students to participation, and a rising degree of over surveying. They concluded that the validity and reliability of the SECAT could not be guaranteed for summative purposes. They then recommended that the use of SECATs be discontinued and that the CPD implement a broader-based approach with a variety of methods that, together, would help monitor and improve teaching and learning, papers and courses, and assist with personnel decisions.

3. Key Principles and Concepts

The first principle of the new evaluation of teaching system is that the quality of teaching is a multi-dimensional construct. This ruled out the new system providing a single numerical indicator of the quality of teaching based on student feedback. It meant that the quality of teaching must be evaluated using multiple sources and forms of data, and interpreted provisionally in terms of the theory used to specify the constructs used.

The second principle is that the evaluation of teaching systems is an organisational research and development strategy that warrants a rigorous methodology. Teaching portfolios and profiles were recommended as a means of making better use of information gained from student and peer input. The planning of evaluation by individuals, Departments and Boards of Studies was recommended as a means of involving staff and students, ensuring that multiple types of data are collected from a range of sources and triangulated, and both using and developing peer professional judgement.

The third principle is that summative and formative evaluation purposes are both legitimate and strategically vital in a large and research-led institution. This means that, despite the legal and administrative complexities involved, a code of appropriate practice is needed that reflects adult and organisational learning theory. How data is to be ordered, collected, analysed, stored and reported for

a range of evaluation purposes has been codified in the *Protocols for the Evaluation of Teaching* (University of Auckland, 1999).

The fourth principle is that while there are common fundamentals to good teaching, there are sound reasons why pedagogy may vary in particular circumstances. This matter was clarified in another policy; *Effective Teaching* (University of Auckland, 1998a). The crucial implication here is that the interpretation of student feedback data requires a substantial degree of professional judgement to triangulate it with other data, and to apply it in practices.

The fifth principle is institutional policy coherence. The evaluation of teaching system has to cohere with the philosophy, pedagogy and practices used in another domain of systematic evaluation in the University; the *Assessment of Student Learning* (University of Auckland, 1998b). Just as students should receive effective feedback on their learning, so should they receive summaries of the feedback they have provided, and how it will be used to improve the quality of teaching, papers and courses.

The importance and values of these five principles, along with other policies concerned with equity and students' rights, were reiterated by the adoption of the *Protocols* by Senate (1.3.99) and the University Council (15.3.99). Adoption also marked the boundary between policy making and policy implementation. The Teaching and Learning Committee established the Evaluation of Teaching Sub Committee to monitor, report on and further improve the evaluation system.

The Working Party stressed that Fast Feedback should be the most commonly used method of making use of students' perspectives. They commissioned the development of the modest yet standardised Learning Improvement Strategies Questionnaire (LISQ); to monitor the quality of papers. They suggested that the Students Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) instrument be used sparingly to profile teaching abilities. It was also suggested that Faculty Boards of Studies trial the use of the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) to monitor and improve courses of study.

It was also envisaged that there would be substantially less use of University-wide questionnaires, although standardised instruments would remain an important part of the approach when comparative and diagnostic data were required. It is intended that student feedback would be highly valued in broader evaluation processes designed by individual academic staff, departments and boards of studies. The system will also provide for the development of instruments that are custom built for specific teaching and learning settings, e.g. clinical teaching, executive programmes, etc. As data builds up, each of these instruments can be validated and standardised for summative purposes.

4. Process

The new evaluation of teaching system coheres with other related organisational learning systems. The Reviews of Departments include evaluations of teaching, papers and courses. The Course and Regulations Committee also considers the quality of teaching, student assessment and evaluation in papers and courses during curriculum approval and liaison with external agencies. The Quality Committee helps all parts of the University prepare for, and respond to, the process of external audit.

The *Protocols* locate responsibility for the quality of information concerning an individual's teaching with individual academic staff members. When academic staff are asked to report on the nature and quality of their teaching, they are expected to prepare a profile using data in their teaching portfolio. In order to minimise the time required to prepare teaching profiles for different purposes, the recently revised appointment, continuation, research and study leave, continuation and APR processes all use the same categories of evidence.

Summaries of evidence concerning the quality of teaching typically include data collected using Fast Feedback, the SEEQ, and Peer Review. Fast Feedback techniques gather information on how students are experiencing aspects of teaching or a course, usually with a view to immediate improvement. The SEEQ is an internationally standardised and diagnostic instrument designed to profile a teacher's teaching abilities on eight scales. It also offers advice to support improvement related to each of the scales, and comes with a lecturer's self-rating version. Peer Review uses similar processes to those used in the peer review of research, and can provide critical feedback as requested from colleagues on curriculum, teaching, course design and assessment.

The *Protocols* and other University policies and practices locate responsibility for the quality of papers with Heads of Departments, and the quality of courses with Faculty Boards of Study. Among other methods, two standardised instruments are used to help monitor, report on and improve the quality of papers and courses. As indicated above, the LISQ was standardised to indicate areas most in need of improvement in a paper. It provides measures of the extent to which:

- students are motivated by the teaching
- their understanding is deepened
- the physical environment encourages learning
- assessment methods measure learning fairly
- teaching is taken seriously.

Two open-ended items collect qualitative data to assist with interpretation. The Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) measures the quality of a course of study on five scales (good teaching, clear goals and standards, appropriate assessment, appropriate workload, generic skills) plus an overall satisfaction scale. Trials of the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire are being conducted.

5. Implementation

The SECAT Working Party Report has been debated and applied unevenly since late 1997. The implementation of the Report was achieved incrementally through both formal and informal processes. Early adopters moved ahead of the formal decision process. About 30 teachers, acknowledged as excellent, for example, quickly used the SEEQ to 'prove' how good they are at teaching in their applications for promotion.

Three Faculties trialed components when evaluating an innovative Summer School in January 1998. Others tested components in Second Semester 1998 or deferred action until 1999. One Faculty partially replicated the work of the SECAT Working Party with its own internal study and report, before, in 1999, moving to general adoption. It has decided to add a Faculty Fast Feedback mechanism whose results may not be used in personnel processes.

Formal University adoption began in early 1998 when the Teaching and Learning Committee resolved to recommend the recommendations of the Working Party. Scrutiny of the proposals in the committees of the University was slow, intense and rigorous.

In May 1998, the Education Committee commissioned trials of the proposed components in Faculties and Departments, and in August, called for a report from the CPD on outcomes. The CPD provided a range of briefing notes, workshops and seminars on request throughout 1998, assisting with policy development, advocacy, planning and trials. One particularly significant innovation was to provide one-page histograms summarising item and scale distributions, and qualitative feedback by open-ended questions. Feedback in this format proved helpful in the debriefings of teaching teams, and as overhead masters for reporting back to students.

In sum, policy development continued unevenly in a context of provisional permission, plural cultures, multiple decision structures and ambiguous authorities, until the *Protocols* were formally approved. Three challenges encountered were the need to clarify responsibilities, encourage the use of teaching portfolios and trigger the planning of the evaluation of teaching, papers and courses. The *Protocols* are proving helpful in all three areas.

The *Protocols* locate responsibility for administering any departmental evaluations with the HOD. They also indicate that this responsibility must be discharged in a way that is consistent with Faculty operational plans and University policies concerning the evaluation of teaching. Support from the CPD typically includes supplying evaluation instruments, analysis and feedback of data in the form of overhead masters, interpretation and advice, and follow up professional development on request.

The *Protocols* also indicate that the evaluation of teaching must be planned and managed in order to:

- minimise the imposition on students involved in the evaluation of teaching
- encourage fast feedback and peer review as the most commonly used processes
- maximise the validity of data collected
- maintain the reliability of evaluation processes and instruments used
- safeguard rights guaranteed by legislation, including the right of academic freedom
- protect the privacy of individual teachers
- ensure that data are collected and used in an ethical manner.

The intention of encouraging planning was to embed four routines in the life of Departments. First is the cycle by which papers, courses and individuals are to be evaluated. Second are the standard methods of ordering and administering surveys. Third are the standard methods of ensuring the participation of students. Fourth are the methods of reporting the enhancement of teaching, papers and courses.

Academic staff are invited in the *Protocols* to contact the Evaluations Office, initiate the evaluation of their own teaching and to develop a teaching portfolio. In doing so, they are encouraged to:

- consult with their HOD,
- consider the Departmental Evaluation Plan and administrative procedures, and
- use the *Evaluation of Teaching Manual* and the *Evaluation of Teaching Handbook 1999* available from the Evaluations Office.

Finally, it should be noted that the *Protocols* indicate that students may request the evaluation of a teacher, a paper, or a course, through the appropriate Staff-Student Consultative Committee, who may then relay the request to the HOD for consideration.

6. Evaluation

As noted above, the monitoring and evaluation of the new system is the responsibility of the Evaluation of Teaching Sub Committee. They will refine their criteria and process in the months ahead. Only indicative data can be offered here.

The CPD reported the patterns of adoption across the University in mid 1998. Fast Feedback and Peer Review mechanisms were increasingly in evidence but were yet to become the most common forms of evaluation. However, the overall level of surveying fell over the same 1997-1998 period and the total number of SECATs, LISQs and SEEQs ordered first semester in 1997 was 1793. In the same period in 1998 the total was 916, down 48.9%.

The CPD also reported that, by the end of 1998, about one half of all Departments were planning the evaluation of teaching for 1999. Staff - Student Consultative Committees then in existence were more frequently discussing the evaluation of teaching and the assessment of students' learning. Feedback to students was reported to be still limited but rising steadily in quality, and the number of complaints was falling. Some Faculties had established a Teaching and Learning Committee, or its equivalent, or had directed Boards of Studies to coordinate teaching improvements in Departments.

The publication of the new Human Resource (personnel) policies in late 1998 triggered a resurgence of interest in teaching portfolios. The acceptance of the new evaluation of teaching system appeared to be accelerated as staff became aware of the advantages of the more detailed feedback they would receive, and how it might be related to personal career advantages.

In early 1999 there were indications that many more Departments were developing Evaluation Plans that were likely to improve the quality and timing of feedback to students. An additional factor was some Departments were facing enrolment and financial crises, and were particularly aware of how the perceived quality of their teaching, papers and courses was affecting student retention.

Some academic staff were not given real opportunities to be involved in the new evaluation system until 1999. The invitation to participate in trials of the new system was not always being passed on or being facilitated by HoDs. On the other hand, the University had been experiencing political, financial and structural turbulence in the period, and only gradual and continuous improvement could have been anticipated. Hence, given the right of academic staff under the new *Protocols* to self-initiate evaluations in confidence was apparently not widely known or being exercised, the CPD issued a revised *Evaluation of Teaching Handbook 1999* to all staff. This triggered a surge in demand for support from individual academic staff.

7. Adaptation

This case study suggests that other universities attracted by the potential benefits of a comprehensive evaluation of teaching system might wish to consider the following:

- effective change management in a university requires clear decision systems, with known phases,
- large-scale change in a complex organisation needs sustained support from senior management,
- policy proposals need to cohere with institutional mission and other policies,
- policies require regular reviews that compare practices and outcomes with objectives in order to prevent goal displacement and to revise objectives,
- evaluation policies will need both pedagogical and methodological rigour to be credible in a research-led university, and
- the negotiation of protocols must involve staff, management, unions and students, and reconcile a range of legal, administrative, pedagogical and methodological principles.

8. References

New Zealand Academic Audit Unit (1998) *The University of Auckland Academic Audit Report*, Author, March.

University of Auckland (1999). *Protocols for the Evaluation of Teaching*, Teaching and Learning Committee, March.

University of Auckland (1998a). *Effective Teaching*, Teaching and Learning Committee, Draft Policy, November.

University of Auckland (1998b). *Assessment of Student Learning*, Teaching and Learning Committee, Draft Policy, November.

9. Contact Details

Reynold Macpherson
Director, Centre for Professional Development
University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019
Auckland, New Zealand.

Phone 64 9 373 7599 extension 4504
Fax 64 9 373 7474
Email r.macpherson@auckland.ac.nz

Chapter 19: Colleague Evaluation of Teaching

1. Purpose

Colleague evaluation of teaching (and other aspects of academic work) is an established component in the Victoria University promotion procedures. The purpose of this is to provide information about aspects of teaching that are less visible to students. Colleagues are well placed to provide information on activities such as the integration of research and teaching and course design.

2. Context

For almost ten years Victoria University promotion and probation procedures have required applicants to provide information on their performance in the four areas of teaching, research, administration, and community service. This information comes from several sources including the applicant, the Head of School, students (through the evaluation of teaching) and colleagues

With reference to the contribution of colleagues, applicants for promotion are required to nominate colleagues to provide formal reports on the applicant. If they are applying for a minor promotion ie within a grade, they are required to nominate *one* colleague, if they are applying for a major promotion ie senior lecturer or associate professor, they are required to nominate *two* colleagues.

The current system has operated largely unchanged since the introduction of more systematic student evaluations in 1988/9. From the outset, evaluation of teaching performance for promotion purposes required information from the four sources given above.

The colleague report invites comment on all four areas as appropriate. Specifically the instructions are:

"You are invited to comment on the applicant's teaching performance and where you have particular knowledge on the applicant's performance under the other three headings."

3. Key Principles and Concepts

Although a key indicator of teaching quality is student satisfaction, any attempt to define the complexity of teaching activities must take account of information from other sources. These include the teacher themselves, the Head of School, and peers. Evaluation of the quality of research by colleagues is widely accepted in academia. Less common is the practice of exposing teaching to the scrutiny of individuals other than students enrolled in the course.

Increasingly, the wider issues associated with the use of peer review as a means of promoting effective teaching (rather than simply auditing it) are being discussed (e.g., England et al, 1996). In addition, examples of peer review programmes are appearing with greater frequency in the literature (e.g., American Association of Higher Education peer review initiative, 1998). Significantly many of these are primarily formative, whereas the current practice at Victoria University is primarily summative.

4. Evaluation of Teaching Performance: The Process

The teaching component of the promotion application consists of several sections. The applicant provides information for the first section themselves. The categories are:

- A summary of teaching responsibilities (undergraduate and postgraduate)
- Information on other teaching duties (eg., course coordination)
- The development of teaching (ie., initiatives undertaken)
- Any external recognition of the applicants teaching (eg., speaking invitations)
- A personal evaluation of performance and development as a teacher.

The student contribution comes from teaching evaluations and is summarised in the University Teaching Development Centre (UTDC) teaching performance profile (TPP), which records all previous personal teaching evaluation results. Applicants for promotion are expected to provide a representative record that includes evaluations from the current and previous two years.

The Head of School is required to provide an evaluation of the applicant's case for promotion. This evaluation should take the following into consideration:

- the candidates teaching, research and administrative achievements. The Head of School/Department is expected to take account of the views on teaching performance of the Colleague nominated by the applicant, and attach the Colleague's statement.

Colleague evaluation of teaching provides the final element. In an attempt to ensure that the evaluation is systematic, each nominated colleague receives a set of guidelines. Included is a list of seven roles of the University lecturer. These were originally developed as a result of a Training Needs Analysis of the Professional Training of Lecturers (Milliken, 1990). Subsequently, these have been refined and extended through further consultation with the University community (Hall, Milliken, Turner, and Klijn, 1993).

The roles used in this context are:

- Subject expert
- Course designer and manager
- Communicator
- Assessor
- Motivator of Learning
- Academic adviser
- Research supervisor

Accompanying each role is a brief description and a number of competency statements (Appendix 1). It should be noted that the list of competency statements is an abbreviated version of those developed by the UTDC in consultation with university staff.

5. Implementation

The procedure requires that Heads of School/Departments ensure that nominated colleagues receive the guidelines before preparing their reports. However, there is no measure of whether this is universally done.

The instructions state:

"While it is very important that you comment on the positive aspects of the applicants work, avoid the temptation to provide a report which exaggerates the merit of the case."

The selection of colleagues by the applicant themselves (potentially) results in an overly favourable report. Indeed it has been the perception of the Appointments Committee that this does occur. Unfortunately the weight placed on colleague evaluation is compromised if their objectivity is questioned.

Currently the process of colleague evaluation is almost entirely summative. There is no evidence to suggest that colleagues use this process to reflect on their teaching with a view to improving aspects of their practice. The University is currently considering ways to incorporate a more systematic use of peer review into the improvement of teaching quality. This may be a feature of the forthcoming Teaching and Learning plans (ref. VUW Strategic Plan).

6. Review and Development

Victoria University is conducting a review of the procedures for the evaluation of teaching. A key part of this is the need to further develop a systematic process for peer review. To this end a working paper on the use of peer review particularly in terms of enhancing teaching has been circulated for discussion (Patrick and Willis, 1998). The results of this consultation will be incorporated into future promotion procedures.

7. Improvements

To fully recognise the need to provide adequate support for any system of peer review the following improvements are proposed.

- Training of colleague evaluators in areas such as providing feedback, observational skills, and understanding of course design principles.
- A requirement that a discussion occurs between the reviewer and the reviewed to encourage reflection and improvement.
- Selection of peer reviewers from a pool. This would seek to avoid a tendency for staff to nominate colleagues who advocate rather than evaluate. This would have the added advantage of assisting the School to manage the workload of peer reviewers.
- Require peers to provide evidence through documentation or data that supports their evaluation.
- Improve practice by working with individual schools and departments. This will facilitate the circulation of good practice
- Assist in the development of a supportive climate for peer review links can be made to the University mentoring programme.
- Encourage Schools/Departments to showcase good practice (identified by peers) though staff seminars.

Though a comprehensive and systematic approach to peer review it is hoped that the institution will develop a culture of continuous improvement.

8. References

AAHE (1998). Peer review website. *AAHE Teaching Initiatives: Projects and Lines of Work: The Peer Review of Teaching*. (<http://www.aahe.org/>)

Hall, C., Milliken, J., Turner, I., & Klijn, F. (1993). *Key Roles of the University Lecturer at Victoria University of Wellington*. University Teaching Development Centre: Victoria University of Wellington.

England, J., Hutchings, P., & McKeachie, W. (1996). *The Professional Evaluation of Teaching*. American Council of Learned Societies, Occasional Paper No. 33.

Milliken, J. (1990). *The Professional Training of Lecturers at Victoria University of Wellington: The Results of a Training Needs Analysis*. University Teaching and Research Centre: Victoria University of Wellington.

Patrick, R. and Willis, D. (1998) *Peer review of teaching: a discussion paper*. UTDC: Victoria University of Wellington.

9. Contact

Deborah Willis
Director
University Teaching Development Centre (UTDC)
Victoria University of Wellington
PO Box 600
Wellington
New Zealand

ph: 04 463 5790
fax: 04 495 5284
email: deborah.willis@vuw.ac.nz

Appendix 1

Guidelines for Colleague Evaluation Of Teaching

To assist you with your evaluation, descriptions and examples are given below of some of the key teaching roles and skills that lecturers at Victoria University are expected to perform. The descriptions given are a guide to help you think systematically about the applicant's teaching performance. You are not expected to comment on every role or skill, and you may go beyond the list if you think that other important qualities should be mentioned.

Key role: Subject expert

This is the role of achieving and maintaining expert knowledge and skills in a chosen subject area or areas. The Lecturer should be able to:

- Evaluate latest developments in their subject;
- Integrate different theories and research findings relevant to their teaching.

Key role: Course designer and manager

This is the role of designing an academic course and of planning for, managing and evaluating the human and material resources required. The Lecturer should be able to:

- Design and update courses and sections of courses;
- Determine the human, material and financial resources needed to support a course;
- Select or develop appropriate teaching resources;
- Supervise and train tutors, laboratory demonstrators and other support staff;
- Maintain good working relationships with colleagues and students in a course;
- Introduce innovations to a course where appropriate.

Key role: Communicator

This is the role of exchanging information, knowledge and ideas to maintain positive working relationships and promote student learning. The Lecturer should be able to:

- Speak and write clearly to convey ideas and information;
- Stimulate enthusiasm for learning and scholarship in others;
- Use non-racist and non-sexist language in communications and interactions.

Key role: Assessor

This is the role of planning an assessment programme for a course, writing valid assessment tasks, marking student work, and providing constructive feedback to students. The Lecturer should be able to:

- Plan an assessment programme for a course;
- Write valid questions with clear and unambiguous instructions;
- Provide constructive feedback to students;
- Specify criteria for grading student work as A, B1, etc;
- Provide clear guidelines to tutors on marking.

Key role: Motivator of Learning

This is the role of providing conditions which stimulate students to think and learn, and which encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning. The Lecturer should be able to:

- Structure learning situations to stimulate student thinking;
- Help students to develop flexible learning strategies and to evaluate their own learning;
- Identify the individual needs of learners and the barriers to learning experienced by students;
- Set assignment work which promotes student reflection and thinking.

Key role: Academic adviser

This is the role of giving students accurate information and advice in a way which reconciles their own goals with University regulations. The Lecturer should be able to:

- Pinpoint the relevant regulations applying to a personal course of study;
- Help students build a coherent course of study;
- Advise students on sources of information and assistance available in the University.

Key role: Research supervisor

This is the role of encouraging and guiding students towards the successful completion of a research project. The Lecturer should be able to:

- Negotiate clear guidelines for the supervisor-student relationship;
- Advise on a range of research methodologies;
- Direct students to appropriate resources;
- Write a clear and detailed examiner's report;
- Conduct an oral examination if required.

Colleagues are asked to consider only those roles which they are directly able to assess. This source of information and the requirement that the report is attached to the application does ensure that peer input goes directly to the Appointment Committee.

Chapter 20: Quality Matrix

1. Purpose

The Quality Matrix was developed during the initial cycle of quality audits conducted by the Australian Committee for Quality Assurance in Higher Education during 1993 during which attempts to compile an institutional quality portfolio highlighted difficulties presented by different faculty and departmental contexts, practices and traditions. This difficulty was also found during the 1995 pilot audit of the University of Auckland where the Academic Audit Unit comment that;

'The audit panel found evidence of quality and of good quality assurance practices, but an absence of a coherent and comprehensive quality management system'. The auditors also observed that, 'The lack of consistent monitoring means that the University is largely unaware of where practice is in need of improvement'

Resulting from this, the University's Quality Committee endorsed the use of the Quality Matrix (a model of the Quality Matrix is attached as appendix 1) to assist schools and departments to review their current quality assurance measures, and to plan further enhancement of their processes.

This option was preferred over alternatives, such as developing an omnibus questionnaire to elicit information about the selection and use of current quality practices, which might alienate departments through requiring them to respond to many questions which were irrelevant to their particular context. Also, a questionnaire approach may indicate that departmental process have to *comply* rather than *cohere* with institutional processes. In comparison, the Quality Matrix approach seeks to facilitate departmental discussion and participation through valuing their efforts in monitoring and enhancing quality through self-evaluation and growth.

In short, the matrix was introduced as a tool for guiding continuous improvement, that is, to assist University achieve the notion of a 'Learning Organisation'.

2. Context

The initial objectives of the Quality Matrix were to provide a structure for responding to the criticisms raised by the 1995 Pilot Audit and assist with preparation for the 1997 Audit. An additional objective was to use data derived from the Quality Matrix to facilitate the identification and dissemination of examples of good practice throughout the University. The Quality Committee recognised that quality had to be embedded as an ongoing consideration, rather than being periodically resurrected in the form of an 'event' prompted by an external agenda. Thus, it was envisaged that the Quality Matrix would be evaluated, refined and progressively extended over a three to five year period. Given the wide-ranging nature of the first audit round, it was important that all departments should complete the first four rows of the matrix, that is, 'Planning Papers and Courses', 'Teaching Papers and Courses', 'Assessing Students in Papers and Courses' and 'Evaluating Papers and Courses'.

3. Key principles and concepts

The Quality Matrix process requires departments to describe and question existing practise and to identify and articulate immediate plans for improvement, including the introduction of new initiatives. A crucial aspect is that all of the proceeding should be based upon data relating to existing practice. In effect, the matrix asks departments to describe:

- What do you do?
- How do you know that your approach is effective?
 - What data do you collect?
 - What sources, methods and staff are involved?
- What changes have you made and what benefits have resulted?
- What do you plan to do in the immediate future?

Thus, the choice and justification of a particular approach or methodology is rightly left to the people involved, that is, the members of the department or unit.

One of the principal benefits of the quality matrix occurs through its inherent flexibility in the selection of particular topics or foci for any given round of the matrix review process. For example, an institution may initially select, as the basis for its five year review cycle, an overarching range of topics spanning the entire teaching and learning field. The institution could then select just two or three of these topics for detailed examination during an annual review. Such areas are represented on the vertical axis of the matrix. The horizontal axis is then used to present the different stages of review or development. Each cell therefore captures data, outcomes or activities associated with a distinct stage of the self-review process.

The benefits of the above cyclic approach include:

- a reduction in annual review workload and resource requirements
- the potential for greater flexibility in the review process
- the clear presentation of audit as a planned and coherent process
- the Quality Matrix provides a 'Snapshot' of current quality assurance practice, that is, in a manner which respects disciplinary differences
- the progressive compilation of faculty or departmental review portfolios for use in planning and other applications
- the potential to engender greater departmental ownership of the review process
- the opportunity for departments or units to use the process in local reviews, for example, as a precursor to a retreat
- over the longer term, further analysis of the matrices could be undertaken to elicit examples of excellent practice developed for particular teaching/learning purposes or contexts.

4. Process

The Director, Quality and members of the Quality Committee developed both the format matrix and the administrative processes. Copies were offered to departments in both hard copy and electronic formats.

The following summarises the key stages and process followed in launching and implementing the matrix:

- memo from Vice-Chancellor to all Deans, HoDs, Registrars etc
- lunchtime briefing meeting convened for all Deans and HoDs
- copies of the matrix made available to all departments
- HoDs asked to arrange completion of the first four rows of the Quality Matrix within an overall period of six weeks.
- HoDs advised that Director, Quality available to assist departments
- recommended that departments adopt a two phase approach
 - all relevant cells are completed by the inclusion of key words or phrases
 - using the cell reference numbers as a guide, a brief paragraph or description of contents of each cell is written as an attachment to the matrix.
- recommended that first draft of phase one should be undertaken by a meeting of three or four experienced staff (estimated at one hour)
- recommended that first draft of phase two should be undertaken by each of three or four experienced staff completing the descriptions of a single row of the matrix (estimated at one to two hours each)
- draft matrix and descriptions then discussed at the next scheduled departmental meeting
- revised document forwarded to Director, Quality for compilation and further analysis
- information discussed and acted upon by members of Quality Committee

A feature of the Quality Matrix process is that it actually incurs very few costs and is also easy to administer. The major load is that placed upon the internal consultant (Director, Quality) in attending a

wide range of meetings and to provide feedback (formative evaluation) of draft departmental submissions.

5. Implementation

Despite responding to questions etc during the one-hour briefing meeting for Deans and HoDs concerns were expressed at the extent of the additional workload (a maximum of five to ten hours for an entire department!). A second concern arose through failure to appreciate that completing the matrix is as much about identifying strengths and innovative practice as it is about articulating quality assurance processes.

Several departments initially considered that the matrix could not possibly apply in their 'unique' context or was inappropriate for their particular culture. Without exception, all such concerns were satisfactorily addressed. In fact, implementing the matrix process across the University served to highlight the importance of informal meetings with staff in their departments and addressing their particular concerns. Subsequent cycles of the matrix should serve to raise the focus from concern with process issues to consideration of pedagogical and staff development matters etc.

6. Evaluation

The utility of the Quality Matrix was clearly established through a comprehensive review of submitted matrices and accompanying descriptions. However, the process is still being developed and refined to suit the University of Auckland context; in the Australian context the process proved to be extremely helpful in encouraging departments to engage in a review of the completeness and coherence of their processes. For example, one head of department commented that completion of their matrix had;

"Highlighted not so much what we do, but rather, what we don't do! - I have already implemented several new initiatives"

Aggregation of individual departmental matrices into a composite faculty matrix can provide an insight into differences in departmental approaches, especially in the case of highlighting isolated examples of innovative practice. To expand upon the previous point, it was only through faculty level aggregation that one faculty realised that only one of their departments undertook an analysis of overall student assessment load when planning new papers.

To summarise, the above examples also illustrated:

- the wide variation existing even between cognate disciplines
- that the success of the matrix process is dependent upon the effort made by individual departments in completing their matrix
- that the matrix process is an evolving process
- departments benefit from initial support, that is, access to a form of internal consultancy
- that Heads of Department (HoDs) should be encouraged to use a participatory approach to the matrix exercise
- that the matrix process needs to be based upon the notion of 360° feedback, that is, every effort should be made to 'complete the loop' by providing feedback, discussion of implications, outcomes etc.

A second phase of evaluation was also undertaken whereby several HoDs were interviewed by the Director, Quality. Interviews were conducted with i) ardent supporters, ii) impartial completers, and iii) trenchant critics, as to their perceptions of the utility of the process and how it might be made more convenient and useful for their personal and departmental needs.

The interviews confirmed that the process was worthwhile and also yielded many suggestions for simplifying the process, including;

- improvements to the layout of the matrix (compare attachments one and two)
- clearer and more descriptive 'prompts' to assist with the matrix
- improved briefing, communication and support
- no department had followed the recommended approach to compile their departmental matrix (requires further investigation)

7. Adaptation

There are key common factors associated with the successful adaptation and use of the Quality Matrix, specifically; communication and ownership.

In terms of communication, inculcating a sense of ownership is an important aspect, as there appears to be a general reluctance to accept imported techniques. It is also crucial that both the immediate and long-term benefits to the department be clearly articulated. Where possible, appropriate case studies should be described. The alternative is for the Quality Matrix to be dismissed as being but another example of the growth of intrusive and bureaucratic reporting requirements.

Ideally, institutional arrangements for use of the matrix should be developed through an iterative process to ensure that it effectively reflects both the context and field of study. For example, the form of publicity and the means of providing briefings and feedback may vary between institutions. Opportunities should therefore be sought to address:

- a meeting of the senior management group
- a meeting of the University Senate or Academic Board
- a specially convened meeting of Deans and HoDs
- faculty meetings or equivalent
- departmental meetings
- meetings of staff or student associations

As has already been outlined, the flexibility of the process supports its application in a number of non-academic settings, for example, within university counselling or student accommodation services. Moreover, the same matrix could be independently completed by different stakeholders to reflect their different perspectives of the same process.

8. Contact

Although the University of Auckland matrix was developed during the period of my appointment as the University's initial Director, Quality I remain quite willing to respond to any requests for further information. My address in Australia is:

Mr Bill Jelks
7 Queensbury Road
Padstow Heights
New South Wales 2211
AUSTRALIA
phone: 61 2 9771 2472

Requests for information may also be directed to:

The Director, Quality
Office of the Vice-Chancellor
Central Registry
University of Auckland
Private Bag 92019
Auckland

Appendix 1:**Model Matrix for Student Services (Academic)**

Aim: Establishing the range and effectiveness of academic support initiatives and practices

Specific Aspect or Focus	What do you do?	How do you monitor this?	Have your practices changed in the last year and if so, how?	What are the outcomes?
<p>Student Services (Academic)</p> <p>Topics for comment include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessibility of academic staff 2. Provision of academic advice 3. Attention to equal opportunity 4. Feedback on written and other student work 5. Mentoring or support programs 6. Discipline based student organisations 7. Provision of study/work space 8. Referral services to other 9. University sources of support 10. Other (you are invited to add aspects not covered above) 	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4

SECTION 5

ABSTRACTS

Chapter 21: Teaching and Learning Plan

1. Abstract

In 1995/96 the University developed a set of key policy documents of which the Teaching and Learning Plan (TLP) was the first to achieve Senate approval (28 February 1996).

1.1 Purpose

The TLP states that "the purpose of the Teaching and Learning Plan is to provide guidance for academic Divisions, Schools and Departments as they undertake the planning of teaching and learning activities," (TLP, 1996, p28)

1.2 Key Principles and Concepts

The TLP is based on statements of the 'four dimensions of quality learning', which are:

- skills and attitudes
- understanding
- ethical and social implications
- lifelong learning

The TLP defines 13 goals each supported by objectives and performance indicators.

1.3 Implementation

The TLP was well received by staff especially directly involved in preparation for audit. It was seen as a helpful resource for staff and students preparing for Audit. Not all the University's policy documents were accorded the same favourable reception when first implemented. Since the Audit the TLP has continued to be an active influence through the expectation that proposals submitted to the Board of Undergraduate Studies and the Board of Graduate Studies will state how the new course or programme will respond to the TLP's four dimensions of quality learning.

1.4 Evaluation

No formal evaluation of the impact of the current influence of the TLP has yet been carried out.

1.5 Adaptation

The four dimensions of quality learning and the goals of the TLP are probably sufficiently generic to be of interest to other similar institutions. However, concerns about achieving a sense of ownership would almost certainly preclude direct use elsewhere. It is difficult to contemplate a teaching and learning plan that has not grown out of discussion within the institution itself.

2. Contact:

Professor Chris Heath
Director, Higher Education Development Centre
University of Otago
PO Box 56
Dunedin

ph. 03 479 8439
fax. 03 479 8362
email: chris.heath@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Chapter 22: Joint Academic Grievance Committee

1. Abstract

In September 1992, a seminar entitled 'Helping students with problems' identified the lack of any institutional mechanism at the University of Canterbury that could deal *informally* with student complaints with respect to staff actions. During the next five months, an informal group of staff and students reviewed grievances and mediation systems at institutions and developed the model outlined as follows.

Where communication between student and staff had broken down, a new procedure should:

- offer support for a student making an approach to staff
- permit someone to act as a go-between
- preserve the anonymity of the student if that is at all possible
- provide information to the student as to possible methods of resolution
- offer advice when it is clear that a student's expectation is unreasonable

Academic Board approval led to the establishment of a Joint Academic Grievance Committee (JAGC) - joint in the sense that it comprises members drawn from the of University and the Students Association. Membership of the JAGC is:

- three members of the academic staff elected by the academic staff
- three members of the academic staff nominated by the University of Canterbury Students' Association
- three members of the University of Canterbury Students' Association
- one member elected by the Academic Administration Committee (the University's committee of Deans).

The activities of the JAGC are guided by two complementing terms of reference relating to casework on the one hand and policy on the other:

- to seek the resolution of all grievances pertaining to academic matters held by students against staff
- to foster a climate of behaviour in the University in which grievances do not arise

The aim of the JAGC is to achieve informal resolution of matters at a low level if possible thereby avoiding the more formal and stressful procedures of appeal to other committees. Confidentiality and privacy are of prime importance, and in each case, the name of the student is known only to the contact who is handling the case and the staff member and/or Head of Department. All reference to any particular case - for example at meetings of JAGC - is made in ways that protect the confidentiality of the student, staff member and department concerned. In all of its activities, the JAGC endeavours to carry out its duties in accordance with the rules of natural justice, and with fairness a primary concern.

2. Contact

Secretary
The Joint Academic Grievance Committee
Registry
University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800
Christchurch

ph: (03) 366 7001
email: j.cockle@regy.canterbury.ac.nz

Chapter 23: Postgraduate Administration and Management

1. Abstract

There are a number of elements that collectively contribute to an effective and efficient administration and management system for postgraduate research programmes. The following are five examples of practices and procedures that are generally based upon those used for the doctoral programmes at Massey University. These practices have been in operation for a number of years and together with other information and processes are all included in a Doctoral Studies Handbook.

1.1 Centralised Doctoral Administration and Management System

The operation of a single committee or group that is empowered to administer and manage doctoral programmes across the university has the advantage of providing a consistency of programme administration and management and enhanced quality assurance. Such a committee should:

- have constitution that provides for representation from all academic units and include student members, and clearly defined terms of reference and accountabilities
- have overall responsibility for ensuring the smooth progress of doctoral candidates and maintaining the highest academic standards.
- develop and implement orientation programmes for postgraduate students and supervisors including programmes designed to develop generic skills

The committee should monitor the progress of each individual student from registration to examination and, if necessary, act as a mediating body if disputes or difficulties arise in the PhD process.

1.2 Provisional and Full Registration

The operation of a two-stage registration process for PhD students involving a provisional registration phase leading to, normally after one year, full registration. This process enables the careful consideration of the performance and capability of individual candidates for PhD awards.

Criteria for provisional registration may include the level of previous academic achievement (eg. first or second class Honours or Masters), availability of supervisors and the adequacy of financial and other resources.

Criteria for full registration should be based on the assessment of the skill of individual candidates in terms of the knowledge of the literature in the field of study, ability to design and interpret research tasks and the satisfactory completion of course work.

1.3 Statement of Expectations

It is imperative that at the start of any study, both student and supervisor agree on a clear set of expectations and commitments for each other. This agreement should cover both the standards of academic performance and the arrangements for adequate contact between the student and the supervisor.

When establishing the standards of academic performance, consideration should be given to the following:

- methodological skills
- written and oral skills
- preparation of literature reviews
- development of research proposal
- research skills

When establishing the arrangements for contact between the student and the supervisor consideration should be given to the following:

- frequency, length and location of meetings
- turnaround times for feedback
- contributions by the supervisor including the role of any co-supervisor

1.4 Supervisor - Student Relationship

Supervision is often said to be the key to success in a PhD. The professional relationship between a student and their supervisor(s) is critical and dynamic. Whatever the relationship, clear guidelines must be established. Regular monitoring will ensure that as a student needs less and less direction, the relationship changes to reflect this independence.

Numerous publications outline the features of successful supervision and specify the responsibilities of supervisors and students. If the system requires or allows more than one supervisor, it is vital that the role of each supervisor is made clear. This approach does require the development of a partnership relationship and if successful can result in very satisfying outcomes for all parties.

1.5 Examination of Research

A structure and process to ensure quality assurance at the examination phase is critical. The Massey system requires both a Thesis Assessment Report and a compulsory oral examination. Three examiners are required at Massey; a internal independent academic, a New Zealand examiner and an overseas examiner. An independent Doctoral Research Committee makes these appointments and considers that an independent examiner and an overseas examiner greatly enhances the assessment of research. The Doctoral Research Committee also appoints an independent Examination Convenor who should be a senior academic experienced in research and PhD supervision. Their task is to manage the examination process once the Thesis Assessment Reports are returned and to convene the oral examination. The Convenor also has the task of facilitating a consensus of the examiners on the overall examination result.

Invariably, oral examination assists the student by providing transparency and confirmation that the student understands the discipline and the context in which their work fits.

2. Contact:

Professor Ken Milne
Director, Graduate Studies
College of Sciences
Massey University, Palmerston North.

ph. 06 350 5100
fax. 06 350 5620
email: k.milne@massey.ac.nz

Chapter 24: Equal Employment Opportunities

1. Abstract

The University of Auckland concluded an Equal Employment Opportunities review in July 1997, an Equal Educational Opportunities review in May 1998, and a Foundation Studies review in August 1998. It has now drawn up Action Plans and areas are required to report on them regularly. This process is under the oversight of Professor Dame Anne Salmond, PVC (Equal Opportunities).

1.1 The EEO Action Plan

The objectives in the EEO Action Plan (May 1998) are:

1. To ensure that all documentation, communication and training regarding EEO reflects best practice, and emphasises the benefits of EEO to the University.
2. In the design, development and review of all staff management systems (including appointments continuances, promotions and leave),
 - i. Ensure that barriers to full participation identified by EEO groups in the EEO Review are examined, and given serious consideration; and
 - ii. Implement 'best EEO practice', involving people with expert understanding of EEO at all stages (eg. by representation on committees, or on groups which design systems, programmes or training procedures).
3. In producing EEO plans for the University, the Library, Faculties, Registries, Departments, Centres and Schools
 - i. Ensure that barriers to full participation identified by EEO groups in the EEO Review are examined, and given serious consideration; and
 - ii. Build 'best EEO practice' into the planning process.
4. To develop EEO monitoring and reporting systems for the Library, Faculties, Registries, Centres, Schools and departments which are comprehensive, efficient and effective.
5. To ensure that the University's data basis include data for monitoring and reporting on EEO performance, and that regular EEO report from the data bases are produced for committees and managers.
6. To ensure that best EEO practice is followed in the establishment, processes and reporting of University committees and working parties.
7. In the design, development and review of all training programmes for supervisors, managers and participants in appointments, promotions and performance and development reviews
 - i. Ensure that barriers to full participation identified by EEO groups in the EEO Review are examined, and given serious consideration; and
 - ii. Implement 'best EEO practice', involving people with expert understanding of 'best EEO practice' at all stages (eg. by representation on groups which design, develop and offer training programmes).
8. To ensure that the EEO function within the University is adequately resourced.
9. To ensure that the University follows best EEO practice in the employment of senior managers.
10. To ensure that EEO working structures within the University are comprehensive, effective and efficient.

1.2 The EEdO Action Plan

The objectives in the EEdO Action Plan (July 1998) are:

1. To cooperate with the Ministry of Education in establishing a standardised system of EEdO performance indicators for tertiary education institutions.
2. To review the University's outreach programme in Northland, and its relationship with Northland Polytechnic.
3. To improve the University's strategic planning of its academic outreach programmes in general and its relationship with Manukau Institute of Technology in particular.
4. To improve the University's outreach to West Auckland.
5. To improve the University's outreach to under-represented groups of student through more effective use of school visits, and fostering better relationships with schools.
6. To improve the University of Auckland's marketing outreach to under-represented groups of students.
7. To improve financial advice and assistance to students from under-represented groups.
8. To improve pre-entry and selection processes for students from under-represented groups.
9. To improve access to and participation in the University's programmes for students with disabilities.
10. To improve the operations of the Student Learning Centre.
11. To review and improve the operations of the *Wellesley Programme*.
12. To review and improve the operations of *New Start* and *Stepping Stones*.
13. To establish a Foundation Board of Studies for EEdO, and improve EEdO structures in the University.
14. To improve the EEdO performance of Faculties.
15. To improve the EEdO performance of Departments.
16. To improve the reporting structures and accountability systems for EEdO at the University of Auckland.

2. Contact

Professor Dame Anne Salmond
AVC (Equal Opportunities)
Office of the Vice-Chancellor
Central Registry
Auckland University
Auckland

ph: 09 373 7999 ex.t 4774
email: a.salmond@auckland.ac.nz

Chapter 25: International Linkages - Universitas 21

1. Abstract

The University of Auckland has been developing an infrastructure to identify and advance the widest range of relationships and opportunities with other comprehensive, research-intensive universities, scholarly academic and professional societies, international governments and inter-governmental organisations, research organisations, trusts and foundations, and alumni of the University to achieve its international objectives. As critical part of this activity has been the commitment to *Universitas 21*; an international association of 16 kindred universities.

The purpose of Universitas 21 (U21) is to establish a small, organised, rationally structured and highly effective network of research intensive universities, capable of achieving the kind of practical outcomes that none of the individual members would be able to achieve independently or through traditional bilateral alliances. Offering its members operational links around the world, the network functions as a loosely-coupled system through which international competitors may derive substantial benefits from organised, targeted collaboration.

1.1 Context

The context of universities in New Zealand requires a major review of the nature and role of universities especially with regard to assuring NZ's economic future as a knowledge-based society while also fulfilling social responsibilities relating to equity and quality. The University of Auckland considers that it must be recognised as offering a research-based education of international quality and therefore seeks to position itself formally in relation to other research-led, comprehensive universities.

Universities around the world appear to have responded to internationalisation in a number of ways, four of which are:

- Elite conservatism - having an elite tradition with global recognition, a university considers it need not respond substantively (e.g. Oxbridge and Ivy League);
- Opting out - a university may feel secure in serving a defined regional or other constituency and feel able to restrict its aspirations to this focus while ignoring global trends
- Replication - this strategy seeks the benefits of a multi-campus approach accessing mainly the lower end of the higher education market. The home campus may therefore lose significance.
- Networking - this is the Universitas 21 strategy of maximising the capabilities of a network of autonomous institutions of similar standing and kind.

1.2 Key principles and concepts

- Competitors collaborating
- The triumph of the network

1.3 Characteristics of Universitas 21

- Dispersed - a network with every node the centre
- Segmental - discretionary participation
- Collegial - within the limits of proper competition, promoting the interests of other networked partners
- Synergistic ~ collaboration promoting mutual interests
- Kindred - a no 'league tables' approach

1.3 Process

The functions of Universitas 21 can be summarised as follows:

- The Positioning Function
 - expressing international engagement
 - asserting a measure of emancipation from national higher education regulatory frameworks
 - creating a generic quality 'brand' of considerable commercial significance
- The Quality Assurance Function (Investing substance into the idea of a U21 University)
 - research intensive
 - creating significant intellectual property
 - comprehensive
 - attracting high quality students
 - producing graduates who are internationally mobile and successful
- The Benchmarking Function
 - external impetus for continuous improvement
 - predominantly process oriented
 - highly susceptible to academic discipline or sub-discipline focus, or focus on specific administrative or management functions
- The Inter-operability Function
 - structured arrangements for staff and student mobility
 - mutual accreditation of courses and curricula
 - cooperative multimedia coursework development and access on the basis of restricted licence arrangements
 - cooperative research and research-training programmes
 - U21 joint promotional materials
 - U21 facilities for international promotion and programme delivery

1.4 Implementation

Currently, Universitas 21 operates by means of an annual meeting of Vice-Chancellors and Presidents and a standing secretariat based at the University of Melbourne.

It is now moving out of its formative period by means of a series of projects undertaken by sub-groupings of members and submitted for action by the whole network. Projects include:

- The Universitas 21 Profile

A Universitas 21 profile will represent a descriptive summary of the salient qualities of current U21 members providing a simple, defensible basis for differentiating member universities from others characterised by a less developed or less comprehensive involvement in research and/or in research-enriched teaching and learning.

- Global Capability of the Universitas 21 Network

This project is collecting, standardising and aggregating resource and performance data relating to the network as a whole, focusing on the combined range, scope and performance characteristics of U21 as a means of identifying for potential clients the added value of working with the network.

- Student Mobility within Universitas 21

This project is developing an enabling framework for student mobility between member universities. A protocol has been drafted and will be presented in 1999.

- Professional Portability of Universitas 21 Qualifications

This project is developing and promoting international courses and curriculum materials, and exploring ways and means of broadening the basis of professional recognition through international collaboration in curriculum development and delivery. International recognition of accountancy qualifications from U21 universities is an initial focus project.

1.5 Evaluation

Quality assurance and benchmarking are, as can be seen from the above, major features of the network. The disciplines imposed by these activities will, to an extent, provide clear evaluation of the member universities and of the network as a whole.

1.6 Adaptation

The choice of a network strategy with every member feeling in the centre is precisely to ensure adaptability in a complex and dynamic sector that requires strategic alliances, symbiotic partnerships and competitors collaborating. It can be argued that the network is the most adaptable of organisational forms.

2. Contact

Dr Chris Tremewan
Pro Vice-Chancellor (International)
University of Auckland
Private Bag 92019
Auckland

email: c.tremewan@auckland.ac.nz

APPENDIX A

Nomenclature

The following abbreviations are used in this report.

AAU	Academic Audit Unit
AU	The University of Auckland
AVC	associate or assistant vice-chancellor
CEQ	Course Experience Questionnaire
CU	University of Canterbury
CUAP	Committee on University Academic Programmes
DVC	deputy vice-chancellor
EEdO	Equal Educational Opportunity
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
EMS	extramural studies
EO	Equal Opportunity
HE	higher education (no precise distinction is made between higher, tertiary and postsecondary education)
LU	Lincoln University
MU	Massey University
NZVCC	New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee
OU	University of Otago
PGSF	Public Good Science Fund
PVC	pro vice-chancellor
VC	vice-chancellor
VU	Victoria University of Wellington
WU	University of Waikato

APPENDIX B

Template for contributors

1. Purpose

The reasons the practice was introduced

2. Context

Salient features of the context within which it was to be used

3. Key principles and concepts

The key principles and concepts underpinning this practice.

4. Process

The details of the practice: process, structure, administrative requirements, cost, etc.

5. Implementation

Aspects of its implementation that are not evident from the above, including acceptability to those affected, unexpected snags, etc.

6. Evaluation

What evaluation of the practice has been carried out, with what results and what changes? Did/Does it work?

7. Adaptation

Thoughts about its general applicability and its adaptation and implementation elsewhere.

8. Contact

Details of contact person or group.

APPENDIX C**List of Authors**

Ruth Anderson	Massey University
Elizabeth Bean	Lincoln University
Chris Collins	Massey University
Penny Fenwick	Victoria University of Wellington
Roger Field	Lincoln University
Grahame Fraser	Massey University
Margaret Harrison	University of Canterbury
Chris Heath	University of Otago
Kim Hope	The University of Auckland
Bill Jelks	on behalf of The University of Auckland
John Jennings	University of Canterbury
Penny Love	University of Otago
Elizabeth McKinley	University of Waikato
Reynold Macpherson	The University of Auckland
Phil Meade	University of Otago
Nardine Metzger	The University of Auckland
Ken Milne	Massey University
Margaret Morgan	University of Otago
Judith Nathan	Massey University
Keri Neveldsen	University of Waikato
Geoff Ormandy	Lincoln University
Tom Prebble	Massey University
Dame Anne Salmond	The University of Auckland
Roger Smyth	Lincoln University
Murna Thompson	Massey University
David Towns	University of Canterbury
Chris Tremewan	The University of Auckland
Deborah Willis	Victoria University of Wellington
Neville Withers	University of Waikato