THE PROFESSION OF TERTIARY TEACHING:
CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL DEBATE ON ACCREDITATION

David Woodhouse
(Editor)

New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit

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

May 2001

The Academic Audit Unit Series on Quality
(ASQ)

The Series is produced under the editorial guidance
and oversight of the AAU's Publications Committee.
The current members of this Committee are:

    Mr Neville Blampied

    Dr Ann Trotter

    Dr David Woodhouse

The Profession of Tertiary Teaching:
Contemporary International Debate on Accreditation

Contents

Introduction

In the first cycle of audits of the NZ universities carried out by the Academic Audit Unit (AAU) in the period 1995 to 1998, the AAU investigated the existence and effectiveness of the universities' quality systems across the whole spectrum of academic activity. The AAU publication 'An audit perspective, 1995-1998' (AAU Series on Quality, Number 2) provides an overview of the quality systems across the sector, and their effectiveness.) Within this broad scope, the systems pertaining to academic staff proved to be a topic of particular emphasis in each university. There are several reasons for this. The principal reason is the centrality of staff to the university and its activities and achievements. Another reason is the great range of relevant functions in the area of staff relations. Thirdly, many systems for academic staff appraisal and development are still growing and changing.

The last reason brings to the fore the concept of Continuing Professional Development (CPD), which is increasingly being provided and required by professional associations in areas such as engineering, accounting, medicine and quality assurance. It raises questions about the training of academic staff for their teaching role, the extent to which this role is a profession, explicit CPD requirements for this profession and so on.

These issues are receiving increasing attention in a number of countries. For example, a Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) has been established in the UK to collate information on all aspects of learning teaching and assessment, and promote the outcomes of a range of UK initiatives in these areas. The LTSN's material is presented in 24 discipline areas, which are being maintained by different UK universities. Information may be found at www.ltsn.ac.uk.

In 1995, the University of Otago was the first institution in New Zealand to provide a postgraduate qualification in tertiary teaching. The University now provides tertiary teachers with access to a range of formal, transferable, professional qualifications from Postgraduate Certificate to Doctoral studies.

In Australia, the federal government has established and funded national teaching awards, administered by the Australian Universities Teaching Committee (AUTC). There are six Teaching Awards categories with a monetary prize to the winner in each 'to further develop their skills'. The AUTC itself is a national committee with a brief to identify emerging issues in teaching and learning. In addition to the Awards. it administers a grants programme to identify support, and disseminate effective teaching and learning methods. Information may be found at www.autc.gov.au.

In its third cycle of audits (beginning in 2002), the AAU is planning to audit again, in more depth, the quality assurance procedures that relate to all staff matters, from appointment to

the institution through appraisal, development and promotion, to departure from the institution.

This collection of invited articles addresses a variety of topics that are related to the issues of preparation and professionalism of academic staff. Graham Webb (Director, Centre for Higher Education Quality, Monash University, Australia) defines some relevant terms and then opens up the whole question of accreditation of university teachers, rehearsing some of the arguments for and against it. Liz Shrives (Director of Educational Development, Policy and Standards, RED Centre, University of Surrey, UK) describes the accreditation process of the UK Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA), taking the reader through from its leadership role in the early nineties to its place in the context of the more recently established Institute for Learning and Teaching (ILT). Sally Brown (Director of Membership Services, Institute for Learning and Teaching, UK) sets out the role of the ILT as a professional body for those who teach and support learning in higher education. SEDA recognises training programmes, and Cedric Hall (Professor of Education, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand) spells out his ideas on the essential components of a qualification for university teaching, underpinned by a model of teaching and learning, and set in the context of qualification approval in New Zealand universities..

Wellington   David Woodhouse
May 2001   Director
                                                                 Academic Audit Unit

Chapter 1: The Accreditation of University Teachers: An Interested View[1]

Graham Webb
Director, Centre for Higher Education Quality, Monash University, Australia

> "It is ironic that academics – the professionals who nurture all other professionals in every field of human endeavour – continue to eschew professional qualifications for themselves." (West, 1998, p147)

An Interested View

"An interested view" is an indulgence that requires explanation. As a young lecturer in the mid 1970s I completed a tertiary teaching qualification that sparked an interest in the theory and practice of university teaching that has continued throughout my career. I remain deeply interested in the area. It also highlights the fact that this paper is written from a particular (or 'interested') perspective. I wanted to draw attention to this, and to the fact that there are few, if any, 'disinterested' views concerning the accreditation of university teachers. Many academics see accreditation as an unwelcome challenge to their understanding of what their career is all about, some see it as a signifier for all that has 'gone wrong' with universities, while others feel vulnerable and personally threatened by moves to have their teaching performance held accountable.

On the other hand, every year I encounter university teachers entering the profession who are angry that there is no thorough and systematic induction into the complex art and science of teaching. I also encounter experienced teachers struggling to adapt to new teaching and learning environments. While they have developed technique and some understanding of teaching in a conventional setting, their lack of basic educational understanding hampers their attempts to develop and change. Unlike other professions, the training they acquire tends to be voluntary and *ad hoc:* it is not part of an on going, systematic and formal professional development programme. Before reading on, I invite you, the reader, to examine your own initial emotional response to the accreditation of university teachers: your own 'interested view'.

What is accreditation?

The answer to this apparently simple question is far from simple. The Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) Discussion Document on Accreditation (Webb *et al* 1997) drew distinctions between registration, recognition and accreditation. *Registration* implies that a professional body holds the right to register those practitioners permitted to practice. On the other hand, a professional programme (such as a certificate or diploma programme) may be *recognised* by a professional body and those completing it may be automatically admitted to the profession or may have to apply for professional status independently (and the professional body may or may not have the

right to define who is able to practice). The HERDSA Discussion Document referred to *accreditation* as: "The formal acknowledgment of professional status achieved by individual University teachers" (p 2). It assumes that a body charged with the responsibility for accreditation maintains a record of individuals meeting the requirements. That is not the same as a register as it does not preclude those who are not accredited from practicing. It may or may not be a step towards registration.

There are generally a limited number of recognised pathways that individuals can take to gain accreditation, the two most common being completion of a recognised course (such as a certificate or diploma) or presentation of a portfolio. There may also be different levels of status that might range, for example, from pre-accreditation level (eg tutor/demonstrator) to normal or full level of accreditation, to advanced or distinguished professional status.

What is the case in favour of accreditation?

Those who favour accreditation point to the considerable change that has occurred in the practice of university teaching and the lack of any formal training and professional development process to ensure that teachers are adequately equipped to teach. Such changes include both 'massification' (the fact that there are now far more students to teach) and 'diversity' (the fact that the student body is far more diverse in terms of, for example, age, gender, socio-economic background, ethnicity, disability, part-time/full-time status, domestic and international on-campus/international off-campus status, distance/on-campus status etc).

There has been movement from 'teacher-centred' methods and course structures to 'student-centred' and more flexible approaches to learning. New ways of working are also developing which emphasise team-based course planning, development and delivery, together with a greater degree of technology integration. Lecturers now routinely work with other academics, short term contract academics, educational developers, instructional designers, multi media producers, directors and technicians, copyright people and many others. There is greater emphasis on the development of students' 'generic skills' (such as communication, problem solving, team work, self-management etc) through engagement with the 'content' of the programme which in turn has supported the adoption of alternative approaches to teaching such as problem and case-based learning, especially in professional areas.

It is argued that to ensure public confidence and accountability in terms of the quality of teaching at university, similar accreditation requirements should be required as for teaching at any other level, or for practice in any professional area. The need to ensure public accountability and confidence in university teaching standards relates especially to providing evidence of quality assurance in order to secure government funding, and the increasing pressure from students (especially fee paying students and their parents) for quality assurance and standards in the teaching they are have worked and saved to pay for.

It is noted that accreditation for research is widely accepted in terms of the normal 3 year PhD credential, and that a teaching credential which constitutes the equivalent of half a year of full-time study, is not an onerous imposition, for such an important aspect of the academic job. Further, as universities are in the business of formally accrediting the

performance of their students, they should have no hesitation in accepting the need to formally accredit the performance of their teaching staff.

Those proposing accreditation also point to the discourse of university teaching that has emerged over the past 30 years. Where concerns about 'teacher training' programmes of the past may have been legitimate, the practice side of university teaching is now informed by

> "at least a dozen highly reputable internationally refereed journals with university teaching as their focus. Almost every discipline has at least one major journal which has teaching of that subject area as its focus and there are dozens more educational journals accepting articles on a multitude of topics concerning teaching in higher education. This extensive literature includes internationally recognised contributions concerning learning theory and practice. A number of foundational books have developed ideas associated with reflective practice, deep and surface approaches to learning, lifelong learning, self direction for learning, problem based learning, action research, adult learning theory and the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching." (Webb et al. 1997, p5).

There are also many international conferences, electronic discussion groups and lists, discipline specific teaching interest groups, news-sheets, institutional and national teaching development grants and awards, and so on. Nonetheless, it is still true to say that in terms of the profession as a whole, there has been a failure to utilise this extensive discourse knowledge in the development of practice. This is a key weakness and one that has particular significance as new teaching technologies are more widely taken up, often uninformed by the values or empirical research findings of the development discourse. It may be argued that measures in place to equip new or long-serving lecturers with the skills necessary to teach in the new environments are inadequate, consisting as they do of a voluntary few days of induction and other occasional voluntary workshop opportunities. University teaching is thus cited as being one of the few remaining, non-professional, professions.

Such views suggest that accreditation and the professionalisation of university teaching should be developed because it is the right thing to do from a values perspective. Universities need teachers who are knowledgeable in the discourse of university teaching, skilled in the practice of university teaching and take an on going scholarly approach to their teaching through systematic, continuing professional development.

Why has accreditation not developed so far and what are the fears?

It is interesting to speculate on reasons why accreditation has not developed until recently. Despite the fact that universities have been predominantly teaching organisations throughout their long history, the research ethos that started to dominate and define universities in the late 19th century has remained remarkably influential. Research was seen as the hallmark of success and often rewarded by diminution of teaching duties. We talk of 'teaching load' but never 'research load.' Most academics bemoan the fact that we have too much teaching and administration, and never enough time for research. Career progress, until comparatively recently, lopsidedly reflected achievement in research in comparison with achievement in teaching, or leadership and management. While many universities have taken major policy and practice steps to correct the notion that research is the only thing that matters, many staff still believe this to be the case.

Associated with this view is a tradition of disciplinary or professional identity. Many university academics see themselves first and foremost as 'biochemists' or 'historians', that is, trained and skilled in the area of biochemistry or history, rather than as university teachers. University teachers have long held themselves separate from primary, secondary or further education teachers, with the research aspect of the job endowing a sense of difference and superiority. The fact that teachers at all other levels have to be qualified to teach thus, perversely, further underlines the status difference of the university teacher. University teachers are proud to announce to colleagues that they 'know nothing about education' . . . 'don't know the first thing about teaching (but I am a good teacher anyway)' . . . and . . . most tellingly, 'I do not teach, I profess.'

Most of the fears associated with accreditation can be linked back to these views. It is claimed, for example, that 'teacher training' is demeaning, trivial and ineffective. My own perspective on this is to put far greater weight on the views of those who have recent experience of a higher education graduate certificate or diploma course, than those who have not. Having worked with a number of such courses over the past decade, including seeing evaluation evidence from staff taking the courses, I have found their views to be overwhelmingly positive with regard to the experience. While there have been few formal studies of the effectiveness of such courses on producing 'better teaching', again, the evidence has been of improved teaching in terms of, for example, both student and self evaluation. And as to initial and on going professional development being 'demeaning', it is perhaps time to put to rest such vestiges of arrogance associated with the notion of the 'god-professor', together with the associated lack of accountability and internal tension produced by such views.

Other arguments against accreditation are that it detracts from research and ignores disciplinary differences. The argument that any concentration on teaching will detract from research is both true and false. Basically, any and all the resources that the university uses for purposes other than research could be said to 'detract' from research. That is true. However, the real point is that universities have to systematically and carefully decide what their priorities are, moreso now than has ever been the case before. They then have to allocate resources appropriately. The same applies to individual workloads. Accreditation should not become an 'extra' imposition on already stretched staff, but part of the formal negotiation of workload. Initial and ongoing accreditation activities need to be clearly on the table in terms of workload allocation. Simply saying 'there is no time to do anything more' is not an acceptable position from staff, nor is failure to systematically

define priority areas and ensure fair workload allocation, an acceptable position from university managers.

The 'disciplinary difference' issue is a serious and interesting one (it is actually a site for much constructive debate on Graduate Certificate in HE courses). One observation I would make based on over 20 years of experience in this area, is that university teachers are often very surprised by the amount that they learn from colleagues in other disciplines. For example, in a recent evaluation of a Graduate Certificate course a young Law lecturer said that one of the best aspects of the course for her was working collaboratively with an Engineering lecturer on a project of mutual interest. There are many generic educational principles, issues and paradoxes that can be introduced at a general level, for teachers to translate in their own areas. There is also major and very fruitful development of cross and inter-disciplinary studies. That having been said, however, there will always be interesting and important teaching issues arising from the teaching context – be it disciplinary, professional, epistemological or values based, and it is important that professional development programmes and accreditation processes recognise and utilise these.

Who accredits . . . who is accredited?

The HERDSA Discussion Document outlined six bodies that could undertake the accreditation of university teachers and discussed four models for how accreditation might work. This pre-dated formation of the Institute of Learning and Teaching (ILT) in the UK (Chapter 3). The ILT now has responsibility for accreditation matters in the UK, is accrediting graduates of recognised courses and has a 'fast-track' portfolio submission process. After some discussion, ILT recognised all those who had graduated from Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) courses and SEDA proved to be influential in determining the initial and eventual criteria for successfully completion of such courses (Chapter 2).

There are now many graduate certificate and diploma programmes offered in Australasia, and a number already have or are seeking SEDA accreditation. In the absence of a New Zealand or Australian accreditation scheme, it seems likely that a growing number of Australasian academics will be able to take SEDA/ILT accredited courses, or accredited distance courses from the UK or elsewhere.

The 'who' question not only applies to 'who would accredit' but also 'who is accredited.' It is most likely that accreditation would be introduced as voluntary at first, with perhaps a requirement that new staff entering the profession would need to gain accredited status. Existing staff would be given a number of years to gain accredited status, and as in the UK, a 'fast-track' portfolio option may be made available for a number of years to establish the process (and help fund the accrediting agency!). New university teachers required to gain accreditation would normally do so by taking an 'in-service' course rather than have to qualify before gaining employment. Engagement in the course would be written into the contract of employment/ probation (just as is presently the case with new staff completing PhDs) and a process for gauging equivalence or recognition of prior learning would also need to be in place. All of this is currently practiced in a number of Australian universities.

'Who' also relates to the level at which accreditation is necessary. Again, the UK experience is interesting in that four levels of professional practice are recognised: to teach (perhaps a tutor taking a limited and pre-devised number of teaching sessions); design (devise those sessions prior to teaching); develop (the full spectrum of developing learning objectives, planning, teaching, assessing and evaluating) and, lead (play a major role in significant programme and professional development).

Conclusion

At the time of writing it is hard to predict what will happen in terms of accreditation in New Zealand or Australia. HERDSA, the Association of University Staff (AUS) in New Zealand and the National Tertiary Employees Union (NTEU) in Australia have held seminars and/or prepared briefing papers on accreditation. HERDSA floated a 'half-way house' attempt to recognise programmes that did not get off the ground. It seems that HERDSA is concerned about of the possibility of conflict and division that a move towards accreditation might raise within its membership. Similarly, unions see a good proportion of their members reacting negatively to accreditation and may well regard any move towards accreditation as an employment rather than professional matter. This is interesting, as another perspective would see a move towards professionalisation as perhaps the only way of maintaining the integrity of the academic profession. For example, casualisation of academic labour continues at a pace, and so too does fragmentation in terms of economies of the division of labour. I mean by this that there is a discernible trend, most acutely observed in the emerging very large distance and Internet based universities, to divide the teaching process into: planning and course materials development; teaching interaction; assessment, evaluation and quality assurance. Completely separate groups may then be responsible for each part of the process, and the reflective practice model of planning and preparing, teaching, assessing, evaluating and feeding back for improvement, is at best modified, and at worst, lost.

In Australia, although the West Committee Report (West et al., 1998) suggested that with more funding it would be possible to "encourage institutions generally to appoint new academic staff on probation until they have completed a qualification in teacher training" (p 147), there has been no follow up. That stands in contrast to the rapid movement that took place in the UK following the Dearing Report (Dearing, 1997), where both the academic staff union and SEDA (the professional body) played important roles in the development of an accreditation system. So, perhaps one of the most significant lessons to learn from the UK experience is that when the time is right, things can happen remarkably quickly.

Notes
[1] Much of this paper is taken from Webb *et al.* (1997) referred to throughout as "the HERDSA Discussion Document" (on the Accreditation of University Teachers).

References

West, R. et al. (1998), *Learning for Life. Final Report. Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy*, Canberra: DEETYA.

Webb, G., Bond, C., Boud, D. & Lublin, J. (1997), *The Accreditation of University Teachers: A HERDSA Discussion Document*, Canberra: HERDSA Inc.

Chapter 2: SEDA: supporting the professional development of academic staff through accreditation

Liz Shrives
Director of Educational Development, Policy and Standards, RED Centre, University of Surrey, UK

Background

In 1991 the UK Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) developed and launched a national scheme for the training and qualification of teachers in higher education. The context of this development was taking into consideration two forces current at that time. There was a new and increasing emphasis on quality and accountability and an emerging movement towards the sector adopting national vocational qualifications. The quality agenda being met by a process of Quality Assessment was requiring institutions to engage in self and peer assessment of the educational provision. It was undertaken on a subject basis and included the observation of teaching. At the same time the development of national vocational qualifications was moving at a rapid pace and a possible move was that education would in due course follow other professions and be bought into the framework.

The development of the Teacher Accreditation Scheme began in 1990. A group formally known as The Standing Conference for Educational Development (SCED) established a working group to share their induction programmes for new teaching staff. The differences of institutional culture and style, along with a number of logistical impracticalities, made the sharing of programmes unrealistic. The group went on to identify and explore what they saw as the desired outcomes of an induction programme. As Carole Baume one of the originators of the scheme, reflects,

> "Two sets of answers emerged: new lecturers should know about their
> institution and about their roles; and new lecturers should have attained
> some definable level of competence in teaching". (Baume, 1996)

The group felt that some consensus might be possible on the latter of these issues and proceeded to explore a standard of competence for teaching of new University teachers. The notion of accrediting achievement of the standard was a logical development to this but the group dismissed awarding accreditation to individuals as unwieldy and unmanageable for a small association like SCED. The alternative approach was to **recognise** courses of training for new staff and **accredit** teachers who successfully completed those courses. The development of the scheme progressed and a pilot was launched in 1992.

Recognition

The Teacher Accreditation Scheme recognises programmes of training and development for teachers in higher education. A programme is recognised it if:

- ° requires teachers to demonstrate achievement of each of the specified objectives of the scheme in a way which reflects each of the values of the scheme.
- ° involves an appropriate mix of self-, peer- and tutor-assessment
- ° is externally examined and/or moderated
- ° has a procedure for dealing with appeals against accreditation decisions
- ° has a regular reviewing mechanism.

Accreditation

The eight **objectives** that each accredited teacher must demonstrate are designed so that they can be adapted to particular teaching roles and particular institutional missions. For accreditation, teachers should have:

1. Designed a teaching programme from a course outline, document or syllabus;
2. Used a wide and appropriate range of teaching and learning methods effectively and efficiently, to work with large groups, small groups and one to one;
3. Provided support to students on academic and pastoral matters;
4. Used a wide range of assessment techniques to assess student work and to enable students to monitor their own progress;
5. Used a range of self-, peer- and student-monitoring and evaluation techniques;
6. Performed effectively the teaching support and academic administration tasks involved in their teaching, in their department and in their institution;
7. Developed personal and professional coping strategies within the constraints and opportunities of their institutional setting;
8. Reflected on their own personal and professional practice and development, assessed their future needs and made a plan for their continuing professional development.

Values

For accreditation, teachers must also show how each of the following values and **principles** underpin their work:

1. An understanding of how students learn
   All teaching and academic administration should be informed by an understanding of how students learn and the conditions and processes that support student learning.

2. A concern for students' development
   Helping students to learn must begin with a recognition that all students have their own individual learning needs and bring their own knowledge and resources to the learning process. Work with students should empower them and enable them to develop greater capability and competence in their personal and professional lives.

3. A commitment to scholarship
   At the base of professional teaching is an awareness and acknowledgment of the idea and theories of others. All teaching should be underpinned by a searching out of new knowledge – both about the subject/discipline and about good teaching and learning practice. All teaching should lead to students developing a questioning and analytical approach.

4. A commitment to work with and learn from colleagues
   Much of an academic's work is carried out as part of a team made up of teaching staff and academic support staff. The colleagueship and support of peers is as important as individual academic excellence.

5. The practising of equal opportunities
   Teachers must be concerned that students have equal opportunities, irrespective of their disabilities, religion, sexual orientation, race or gender. So everything that teachers do should be informed by equal opportunities legislation, by institutional policy and by a knowledge of best practice.

6. Continuing reflection on professional practice
   Teachers should reflect on their intentions and actions and on the effects of their actions. They try to understand the reasons for what they see and for the effects of their actions. They thus continue to develop their understanding and practice and therefore inform their own learning.

The SEDA values provide a purpose and direction for teaching and must demonstrably underpin the practice of teachers gaining accreditation. This means that teachers must do more than demonstrate such skills as course planning, teaching and assessment. They must additionally show how their work as a teacher is informed by the values. One of the SEDA values requires teaching to be underpinned by a concern for student development. This suggests that it is not good enough for a teacher to know the content and to be able to articulate it clearly. Good teachers also structure the material in a way, which helps the students develop their understanding and skills and, monitor their teaching with reference to how far the students do develop their skills and understanding.

In April 2001 there were 67 SEDA recognised programmes and 2,500 individuals accredited through the schemes. The programmes cover the diverse range of higher education institutions within the UK and some overseas universities, reflecting the wide spread uptake of the scheme.

Staff developers

Once the teacher accreditation scheme had been established there was an emerging demand for the recognition of the outcomes and the process of development for the leaders of programmes and staff who were more widely involved in the role of educational and staff development. In 1994 the SEDA Fellowship Scheme was launched. This scheme is also based on a defined set of objectives and values but for this scheme they must be

demonstrated within the context of specialist topics, chosen by the individual. The specialist topics required a developer to show particular areas of staff and educational expertise. The scheme identifies staff and educational developers as having a different set of required skills from teachers in higher education, although there is undoubtedly considerable overlap, particularly when considering that most staff and educational developers have been teachers of students at some time in their career. However, a continuum can be recognised from the development of a teacher to becoming a developer. This is focused around the notion that teachers develop to the stage where they become innovators in their own practice then start to work with colleagues to extend those innovations. It is at this point where the role of the developer can be identified. To support this process an Associate Fellowship scheme for new or part time specialist staff or educational developer was launched in 1996 with a sub-set of the Fellowship objectives. As well as forming a professional qualification in its own right the Associate Fellowship forms an intermediate qualification to the Fellowship.

Support and allied staff

As the interest in professional development and the accreditation and recognition of professional development activities increased, interest arose within SEDA to develop a scheme for support and allied staff in higher education institutions. Given the wide variety of roles of staff in this area, this scheme took on a different format and approach to the Teacher Accreditation and the Fellowship Schemes. Rather than try to identify the full range of competences and values associated to all the roles encompassed in this area this scheme is designed around the distinctive features of doing these jobs within a University rather than another type of organisation. The scheme has attracted administrators, librarians, technicians, support staff and managers.

Dearing and the ILT

In 1997 the government commissioned a National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, chaired by Sir Ron Dearing, to make recommendations about the purposes, shape, structure, size and funding of higher education and how it should develop to meet the needs of the UK over the next 20 years. One of the recommendations made by the Committee (NCIHE, 1997) was to establish an Institute for Learning and Teaching, which would serve as a professional body for teaching in higher education. It is interesting to note that this was intended to be an Institute for Learning and Teaching and not an Institute for Academic Practice: this reflects Dearing's concern to improve the current balance of effort applied to teaching compared with research. The Committee made recommendation that there should be an accreditation of teaching in higher education along the lines of the SEDA Teacher Accreditation Scheme.

Following the report SEDA collaborated with the Association for University Teachers (AUT) to encourage the development of the new scheme and a subsequent report (The Booth Report) has been used to inform the developments within the ILT. SEDA was involved at the beginning within consultation groups and has moved to gain ILT accreditation for all SEDA recognised programmes.

PDHE

Following the establishment of the ILT in 1998 a question mark was raised about the long-term future for SEDA's teacher accreditation scheme. A working group was convened with members invited from across SEDA to consider the potential development and direction of future accreditation activities within SEDA. The proposal from the group was to develop an overarching framework for accreditation. This was named the Professional Development in Higher Education Scheme (PDHE).

The Aims of the PDHE Framework are to:

° To promote reflective practice and professional development in HE
° To meet a recognised and growing need for professional development in HE
° To support staff and educational development by raising the standards of professional and continuing professional development through SEDA recognition
° To provide a recognised award for professional developmental activity
° To develop understanding of the wider contexts in which HE functions
° To complement other professional, vocational or academic qualifications already held or currently being pursued
° To collaborate with other agencies and professional bodies in the design of these schemes wherever possible
° To build bridges between the different categories of HE staff.

Within this framework there would be two stages of recognition. There will be an initial meta-level of recognition where new and distinctly different schemes will be proposed to the PDHE Committee for recognition against the framework criteria. Once recognised at the meta-level the scheme will become a named award within the PDHE framework and a committee established for that award.

Once the named award has been approved then individual groups, providers and institutions may apply to have their programmes recognised.

Within the PDHE Framework, all named awards will need to meet the following requirements to be recognised:

A) Possess the following underpinning Core Values:
Participants must be able to demonstrate a commitment to:
1. the experience of students
2. the learning experience of staff
3. the specific requirements of HE
4. the pursuit of high quality
5. continued and informed reflection on and the improvement of personal skills and professional practices
6. team working
7. working effectively with diversity

B) Demonstrate the following Core Outcomes:

Participants must demonstrate

1. Reflection on their own personal and professional needs, and in particular their continuing professional development
2. The ability to use interpersonal, organisational and coping skills
3. The ability to use their specialist knowledge and skills appropriately in the HE context

C) Specify a rationale and aims for the award (informed by the Frameworks general aims)

D) Demonstrate that there is a recognised need for the award

E) Have consulted with the target audience/s and appropriate professional bodies and organisations

F) Establish quality assurance guidelines

G) Contain a statement, as appropriate, on its relationship to occupational standards and levels.

It is hoped that this will enable SEDA to respond to and support the increasing requests for the recognition of specialist courses that are being developed to meet local needs within institutions and organisations that are not best served by the broad scope and focus of the ILT accreditation scheme. The first scheme to be recognised within the framework is the 'Embedding Learning Technologies Scheme', which is being run as a pilot during 2000/2001. This particular scheme has been developed in response to the major investment made in the UK to develop technology based teaching and learning materials and the fact that teaching in this context requires a range of skills incorporating both technological and pedagogical aspects.

It is envisaged that the SEDA PDHE scheme will be able to support the demands for subject specific pedagogical training and development programmes and the role of other specialists that are developing within the sector. There has been interest from a number of groups, including geography teachers and teachers who work with students who have specific learning needs, to develop named awards within the scheme in the near future.

Conclusion

The SEDA scheme has always been and will remain an entirely voluntary scheme run by a voluntary organisation. Within this context the schemes have been remarkably successful both within the UK and internationally where schemes have been recognised in Universities in Australia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Sri Lanka and New Zealand.

The main reasons for the success of the schemes are identified in Baume and Baume (1996) who claim that the pressures of external accountability to increase the quality of teaching and learning in UK higher education have influenced the demand for accredited programmes. The existence of a nationally recognised programme for the initial training of teachers within an institution has gone a long way towards aiding the accountability and quality assessment process. Additional reasons are cited from the feedback of Programme Leaders who comment on the flexibility of the scheme enabling then to tailor their programme to the specific needs of the institution but still enables them to gain accreditation. Programme Leaders also value the process of development that programme leaders receive prior to accreditation and the developmental approach, against a potential confrontational approach, of the accreditation process.

The climate of higher education in the UK is facing a number of challenges, one of them being that since the conception of the ILT the accreditation of learning and teaching practices is now on the national agenda. The role for SEDA within this area may be diminishing as the success of the ILT gathers momentum. However, in considering the success of the original Teacher Accreditation Scheme and the responsiveness of SEDA in identifying and addressing the needs of colleagues within the sector, it is appropriate that SEDA continues to play an important role in the recognition, development and accrediting of standards. This is particularly with respect to the increasing diversity of teaching, learner support and developmental roles currently emerging in the sector. Watch this space!

References

Baume, C. & Baume, D. (1996), 'A national scheme to develop and accredit university teachers', *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 1 (2)

Dearing, R. (1997), *Higher Education in the learning society*, London: National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (NCIHE) http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ncihe/index.htm

SEDA (Current) World Wide Web source at http://www.seda.demon.co.uk

Chapter 3: The Institute for Learning and Teaching and UK approaches to Accrediting Teaching

Sally Brown
Director of Membership Services, Institute for Learning and Teaching, UK

Why is Accreditation needed in Higher Education?

Good teaching in higher education is too important to be left to chance. The characteristics of excellent teachers include being good at putting ideas across to groups of students, motivating them to learn, fostering student engagement, communicating well in all kinds of learning contexts, recognising the diversity of students and helping them to become independent learners who are able to engage in a lifelong approach to learning and self development. (National Teaching Fellowship Scheme 2000).

Some successful teachers may have a natural affinity for the role, but all are likely to benefit from support and training in approaches to curriculum design, delivery, assessment and evaluation. Until recently, the expertise and experience of those who teach and support learning in higher education has rarely been formally recognised. Only in the last twenty years or so have significant numbers of universities sought professional accreditation for this aspect of the academic's role, although professional training courses for university teachers have been running in some for many years.

This paper looks at some of the reasons why those who teach and support learning in higher education in the UK are coming to believe that their profession requires accreditation, and outlines the role of the Institute for Learning and Teaching (ILT) in promoting a recognition of the professionalism of the role.

What is the ILT?

The Institute for Learning and Teaching was established as a result of recommendations in the Dearing Report to establish a professional institute to: accredit programmes of training in higher education; commission research and development in learning and teaching practices and to stimulate innovation (Dearing, 1997 Recommendation 14).

Launched in June 1999, the Institute for Learning and Teaching is a professional body for all who teach and support learning in higher education in the UK. The ILT aims to enhance the status of teaching, improve the experience of learning and support innovation in higher education.

Many would argue (Kahn, 2000) that there is a growing need for greater professionalism in learning and teaching in higher education, particularly in the context of the substantial and far reaching changes that have affected every aspect of academic life in the last twenty years.

The CEO of the ILT, Paul Clark argues

> "the creation of, and the requirement to adhere to, explicit standards of professional competence in teaching or the facilitation of learning is now, and will continue to be, a requirement in higher education." (Clark, 2000)

He further suggests that the establishment of a professional body in which the membership is fully involved in the creation and maintenance of standards is the most appropriate way forward for the academic community.

> "The model of professionalism that the ILT is seeking to implement on behalf of teachers and learning support staff in higher education has the following objectives:
> 1. To establish standards of performance in teaching and learning facilitation through a) the recognition of achievement by individuals and b) the accreditation of staff development programmes provided by institutions.
> 2. To establish standards and implement mechanisms for Continuing Professional Development for teachers and learning facilitators;
> 3. To provide relevant information, advice, case studies or verified research results to the practitioner/member in support of reflective practice and professional development;
> 4. To create communities of common interest (both virtual and real) amongst the membership to stimulate innovation and to support CPD;
> 5. Within a reasonable period of time, to pass control over policy formation in the areas of regulation and support to the membership."
> (Clark, 2000 op cit)

Teaching is rarely the only occupation of an academic in UK higher and yet it is the most public aspect of the work, in that students, parents, employers and other stakeholders often focus on that part of the academic's role. Increasing expectations by funders of value for money, accountability and the assurance of quality in learning and teaching (Brown and Holmes, 2000) add to pressures for more transparent ways in which to accredit the teaching function.

How the ILT approaches accreditation of teaching and learning support in higher education

The ILT is currently involved both in accrediting programmes on learning and teaching for academics run by UK institutions and in admitting individual members who can demonstrate their expertise in five broad areas of relevant experience. These are:
- teaching and/or supporting learning;
- designing and planning learning activities;
- assessing and giving feedback;
- developing effective learning environments/student support systems;
- being reflective about their own practices, leading to continuously improving practice by undertaking personal development.

These areas were the subject of substantial consultation in the planning stages prior to the establishment of the ILT and have achieved broad consensus across the UK higher education sector.

By the initial entry route, which is available until September 2001, teachers and supporters of learning can apply to join the ILT by providing a summary of professional experience under these five headings, accompanied by two appropriate references. Prompts are provided for guidance, enabling a broad range of staff to apply successfully for membership, including academics, learning support staff and senior managers, including Vice Chancellors and Principals. The consultation exercise made it clear that staff who are centrally and directly concerned with student learning and who work in such areas as library user support, IT centres, learning resources centres, studios and laboratories would also be eligible to apply, and the five broad areas make this possible.

One very reassuring aspect of the application process is the number of members who tell us that the reflection required to put together an application is in itself valuable. One very senior academic from a prestigious London institution indicated that, although the process took him longer than he had expected, it made him think about his teaching in a way that he never had done before and he found this very useful. Others have told us that the self-evaluation necessary to complete the task caused them to reconsider their current roles and, in some cases, to apply for better ones.

Those who have completed successfully one of the increasing number of programmes of learning and teaching in higher education which have been accredited by the ILT only need to complete a simple application and provide evidence of their award, once their institution has registered with the ILT. At the time of going to press, 74 UK programmes at 67 institutions have successfully been accredited by the ILT and 27 are in the pipeline. Most of these have been directly accredited by the ILT while others have been accredited by recognition of previous accreditation processes by SEDA, the Staff and educational Development Association.

The ILT is not currently accrediting programmes for university level teaching outside the UK, nor is it admitting individual applications from abroad, but this situation is likely to change in 2001.

Beyond Accreditation: Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

As part of the ILT's commitment to improving the experience of learning, members will be expected to undertake CPD to remain in good standing. In this way, those involved in facilitating student learning will undertake to keep themselves abreast of new developments in learning and teaching in the same way that they continuously update their professional knowledge and practice. In December 2000, the ILT circulated to members and other interested bodies a consultation document developed by a working party which includes representatives from a number of subject and professional bodies. The consultation process aims to ensure that ILT requirements articulate with members' ongoing CPD requirements, rather than lead to additional demands on their time

As well as having the opportunity to engage in CPD, members are also able to benefit from the growing collective knowledge of the membership as they participate in ILT co-ordinated activities and as they access the organisation virtually. Working closely with staff of the Generic Learning and Teaching Centre, part of the UK Learning and Teaching Support Network which is co-located with the ILT, research and good practice in learning and teaching in higher education is being collated, digested and made available via the website. This will also provide opportunities for Special Interest Groups to be developed and discussion groups to be initiated and supported.

It is important that ILT membership is seen as being compelling rather than compulsory. Membership of the ILT is voluntary; therefore the Institute needs to convince individuals that there are powerful personal and professional reasons for doing so. Those considering joining the ILT are encouraged to do so in order that they can:
- ° gain recognition for experience and expertise in supporting student learning;
- ° become a member of a professional membership body, with the kudos of accredited status;
- ° be recognised by students, institutions, peers and external scrutinisers as having a strong commitment to student learning;
- ° have the opportunity to shape the direction of this developing organisation.

The tangible benefits of membership include access to the ILT Website, including, from January 2001, areas restricted to members, with networking opportunities and members' forums, as well as focussed digests of current research on learning and teaching. There are two issues per year of the ILT international journal, *Active Learning in Higher Education*. The journal has the explicit aim of improving practice in higher education learning and teaching, and contains articles, case studies, accounts of innovations and work in progress and reviews, both topical and scholarly. There are also three issues per year of the members' newsletter containing members' information and updates. There are discounts and priority booking at ILT events, including the regionally distributed seminars and the annual conference in York in June. There are also members discounts on a growing range of goods and services, including books in the ILT series.

Support from institutions

Many institutions across the UK are demonstrating the value they place on the ILT by including references to ILT membership in their Learning and Teaching Strategies, with a large number including targets or goals for the number or proportion of members of their staff they intend to encourage to join. This was indeed the most common item mentioned in institutional Teaching and Learning Strategies in 2000 according to research undertaken by Graham Gibbs at the UK Open University Centre for Higher Education Practice.

Many institutions (around 80%) are backing this encouragement with support in the form of payment of processing fees, annual membership or both and by providing internal workshops for staff on putting together a successful application. In a number of institutions, senior staff are demonstrating their commitment by completing their applications themselves, to encourage other staff to join. Some institutions are going further, by providing financial incentives for successful applicants or by linking membership to

appointment or promotion, and many are encouraging those new to teaching in higher education to undertake an accredited programme leading to membership eligibility.

From vision to practice

What does the future hold for the accreditation of university teaching? As the ILT establishes itself fully in the sector as a positive and valuable force, the option for UK academics of not joining the ILT may well soon seem unthinkable to many. Students, parents, those with a responsibility for the assurance of quality in higher education and potential employers may well wish to see that those who teach and support learning are not just highly professional in their approach to teaching, but are able to provide evidence of their professionalism through accreditation.

In due course, it is possible that to be taken seriously as a teacher/learning facilitator in higher education, practitioners will be required to demonstrate their capabilities not just in their subject specialisms but also in the practices of teaching. In the UK, membership of the ILT is currently recognised by many as a mark of good professional standing, demonstrating their experience/expertise and their commitment to valuing learning and teaching in higher education. With more than 4000 applicants at the time of writing representing almost all Higher Education institutions, and with every reason to believe that this number will continue to grow rapidly, the ILT has moved a long way in less than two year's of existence. We look to take this further forward in the years to come.

References

Brown, S. & Holmes, A. (2000), 'Making internal audit work in higher education' in Brown, S. & Holmes, A. (eds) *Internal Audit in Higher Education*, London: Kogan Page.

Clark, P. (2000), *The ILT: the Challenge and the Opportunity*, Open Lecture, The Open University, 22 February.

Dearing, R. (1997), *Higher Education in the learning society*, London: National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (NCIHE) http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ncihe/index.htm

Kahn, P.E. (2000), 'Promoting the development of professionalism in learning and teaching in higher education', paper presented at *the SEDA conference "Reaching Out"*, Coventry, UK.

National Teaching Fellowships Award (2000), 'Characteristics of Excellent Teaching' in *Criteria for the National Teaching Fellowships Scheme* at http://ntfs.ilt.ac.uk

Warren Piper, D. (1994), *Are professors professional? The organisation of university Examinations*, London, Jessica Kingsley

Institute for Learning and Teaching, Genesis 3, Innovation Way,
Science Park, York YO10 5DQ
Phone 01904 434225   Fax 01904 434241
E mail sally.brown@ilt.ac.uk

Chapter 4: A Qualification in University Teaching: Structure and Issues

Cedric Hall
Professor of Education, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Introduction

In 1996 I co-wrote a paper which outlined the possible structure and content of a post-graduate certificate in university teaching (Hall & Kidman, 1996). At the time of writing this paper, I was Director of the University Teaching Development Centre (UTDC) at Victoria University of Wellington (VUW). The general goal of the UTDC at this time was:

> "To assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the education that students receive at Victoria University of Wellington, through the provision of staff development in teaching, research into higher education, course and teaching evaluations, and other practical services." (UTDC, 1993, p9)

It probably goes without saying that in my role as Director of the UTDC I supported the idea of a qualification in university teaching. In 1997 I changed roles – I moved from staff developer to teacher and academic manager, taking up the position of Professor and Head of School of Education at VUW. From being an adviser to academic staff on teaching, learning, course design, assessment, evaluation, and supervisory practices, I found myself in the position of putting into practice the ideas that I had encouraged others – lecturers and academic managers – to consider. While this change in role reinforced many aspects of my earlier thinking on the need for a qualification in tertiary teaching, my beliefs have been tempered by the competing (and increasing) demands that I see being placed on academic staff which seriously limit their capacity to engage in such a qualification. I will discuss these later.

This paper is in three sections: first I will list what I see as the main professional development needs of academic staff; secondly, I will give a personal view on what I would like to see contained in a tertiary teaching qualification; thirdly, I will focus on the key contextual issues that make it hard for academic staff to engage in such a qualification. The views presented here draw on my earlier work in academic development, my knowledge of the literature on teaching and learning, and my current experiences as a teacher and academic manager.

Professional development needs of academic staff

The professional development needs of academic staff can be divided between those areas which focus on meeting the educational needs of students, those which focus on becoming more expert in the use of information and educational technologies, including on-line and distance modes of delivery, and those which focus on meeting the growing diversity of academic staff roles. These broad areas clearly overlap but provide a helpful classification for listing some of the main development needs for tertiary teachers.

Meeting the educational needs of students:

My interactions with students, both as a teacher and as a head of school, lead me to conclude that students particularly value:

- ° ***content:*** content that is well selected, relevant and up-to-date;
- ° ***information:*** clear information about a course, its objectives, its content, the assessment requirements, and constructive feedback on work;
- ° ***engagement:*** delivery that is engaging, whether through lectures, seminars, tutorials, on-line learning, or other methods;
- ° ***interaction:*** the opportunity to interact with other students in class or on-line, and through networks which the course directly or indirectly encourages;
- ° ***assessment:*** tasks which are relevant, interesting, fair, and which promote understanding;
- ° ***support:*** access to lecturers, tutors and other persons who can provide support and clarification when blocks occur and more information is needed. Approachable teachers are a must.

This list shares a lot in common with seven principles which Chickering and Gamson (1987) identified from a distillation of 50 years of research on teaching and learning in higher education. According to these writers, good practice:

- ° encourages student-faculty contact
- ° encourages cooperation among students
- ° encourages active learning
- ° gives prompt feedback
- ° emphasises time on task
- ° communicates high expectations, and
- ° respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

From the perspective of academic staff development, the above items and principles give clear signals as to the professional skills and knowledge that teachers need in order to help students achieve their educational goals. These include:

- ° skills in all facets of course design, including ways of relating the broader goals of university education (generic skills, ethical values, etc.) to the particular content of a course;
- ° greater understanding of the factors which affect the way students approach their learning in the context of the particular course(s) taught by a teacher; and more generally, a greater appreciation and understanding of the literature on learning and teaching;
- ° delivery and assessment skills and strategies which promote student interaction and involvement/interest in the subject;
- ° teacher skills in a variety of instructional modes (eg. experiential learning, problem-based learning, co-operative learning) as appropriate for different contexts (eg. lectures, seminars, on-line learning). A pre-requisite for this is a willingness to try new methods, experiment and innovate;

- ° diagnostic and advisory skills so as to assist students to achieve their learning goals and to direct them to appropriate sources of information and help on matters relevant to their learning and welfare;
- ° inter-personal and other supervisory skills to facilitate successful completion of research projects by students;
- ° a range of evaluation skills, including the selective use of different techniques as appropriate to the context (eg. formal university questionnaires, peer observations, fast feedback techniques, focus groups);
- ° teaching skills for part-time teachers (eg. facilitation, laboratory demonstrating, assessment).

Becoming more expert in the use of information and educational technologies:

The need for academic staff to develop their skills and confidence in the use of information and educational technology is obvious. The selective and creative use of technology in education provides a means of both increasing the access of students to higher education and enhancing the quality of the educational experiences provided. It also increases the potential for academic staff to tailor different modes of instruction – eg. on-line or web-based learning, lectures, tutorials, laboratories – to match the different goals and content of a course as well as the particular needs of students. Increasingly, academic staff are being asked to operate in dual-mode contexts: face-to-face and on-line. The ability of teachers not only to teach in both contexts but also to harmonise the two, is taking on greater significance.

The professional development needs of academic staff in the use of information and educational technology can be classified under three main activities:

- ° using technology (eg. multi-media presentations) to enhance traditional teaching activities (lecturing, tutoring, demonstrating, etc.);
- ° designing, selecting and managing computer and web-based resources for use by students;
- ° designing, developing and delivering courses in the context of distance and/or on-line delivery.

The second and third of these also require that academic staff become competent in the use of a range of web tools and software to enable them to design and deliver resources and courses.

Meeting the growing diversity of academic staff roles:

The work of academics is not just changing – it is also expanding. In addition to their traditional teaching and research roles, academics are now being asked to be managers, entrepreneurs, negotiators and external consultants. Some of this is to help foster the public relations and enterprise functions of the university in the current competitive environment. However, the increasing demands being placed on universities – more students, a greater commitment to strategic planning, and greater accountability – have meant that staff are also having to respond more often to requests for information and to implement procedures for monitoring their various activities (eg. performance appraisal,

evaluation of teaching, reports on new courses). Staff who take up managerial roles (whether major or minor) also have the task of ensuring that these monitoring procedures are properly implemented and that "quality" is maintained or enhanced in all activities which support the principal objectives of the university. The New Zealand context also requires that managers and staff have an understanding of their institution's particular interpretation the Treaty of Waitangi and what this means for meeting the educational needs and aspirations of the Maori community. On a similar tack, staff development programmes will need to continue to address a range of EEdO concerns, such as making provision for supporting the needs of disadvantaged groups on campus.

In summary, in order to meet the increasing diversity of academic roles, the future focus of professional development should include:

- ° assisting staff to develop strategies for dealing with change, including a range of self-management skills (eg time-management, goal setting), the upgrading of qualifications, and career planning;
- ° assisting staff to develop management skills (eg strategic planning, negotiation, finance, human resources) with particular focus on people in key administrative positions such as heads of schools and programme managers;
- ° assisting staff to develop the enterprise skills (eg writing proposals, negotiation, teamwork) needed to help universities compete for resources and funding;
- ° assisting staff to address, as appropriate, the educational implications of the Treaty of Waitangi in respect of the content and teaching of their courses;
- ° assisting staff to provide a climate that promotes the University's commitment to EEdO principles and practices;
- ° assisting staff to expand their repertoire of research skills (basic and applied), including the preparation and presentation of proposals, the development of a wide range of approaches to research, the analysis of data, and the writing of research reports.

Components of a postgraduate certificate in university teaching

This section outlines a possible minimum professional qualification in university teaching. The content is not dissimilar to programmes offered in some Australasian universities (eg. Griffith and the University of Otago) but is put together in a way that reflects my personal view of what I think should be implemented.

The qualification would take the form of a postgraduate certificate which is equivalent to 60 NQF credits or 0.5 of a full-time one-year programme. The programme could be undertaken during the first two years of a lecturer's appointment, but entrance would not be restricted to this group. The programme could also be offered to teachers in other tertiary institutions provided they met entrance requirements for postgraduate study.

Graduates of the certificate would be able to upgrade to a full postgraduate diploma (an additional half-year of full-time equivalent study) by completing complementary papers from the university's MEd programme. They could even go further and obtain an MEd by completing a thesis in an area of relevance to tertiary teaching.

The following sub-sections identify how such a certificate might operate.

Educational philosophy/principles: The programme would be designed and delivered according to principles of open learning and reflective practice. Apart from attendance at scheduled workshops and seminars, lecturers would be free to negotiate a timetable and focus which would embed the certificate firmly in the lecturer's own teaching context. The face-to-face components of the course would be strongly supported by on-line resources, including course information, communications, course materials and course activities.

Structure of the programme: The programme would comprise two papers: one would involve the development of a portfolio of the lecturer's work, including a major written assignment demonstrating the lecturer's understanding of the literature on teaching, learning and assessment; the second paper would involve the conduct of research on an aspect of the teaching-learning context of the lecturer.

Paper one would comprise:

- **Reading:** participants would need to critically study a selection of the literature on curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment in higher education. They would be expected to prepare a written assignment (eg. about 4000 words) which demonstrated their ability to understand and analyse the literature and link this analysis to their own context. This would be included in a portfolio of the lecturer's work (see below).

- **Workshops/seminars:** participants would be expected to contribute actively to workshops and seminars covering topics such as course design, teaching, student learning, assessment, classroom management, evaluation, research supervision, and educational and information technology. An important component of such workshops would be the sharing of ideas between participants to encourage the trialing of new ideas in their own fields.

- **Professional development plan:** participants would need to establish and implement a professional development plan based on discussion between the lecturer, the lecturer's head of school, and staff teaching in the certificate. The programme would be subject to ongoing revision to meet the lecturer's changing circumstances. While the professional development plan would not itself be the subject of assessment for the certificate, it would assist the lecturer to identify the objectives and activities that would be part of the portfolio. It would also provide a framework for assisting the lecturer to engage in professional development activities that were not part of the certificate programme.

- **Portfolio**: participants would prepare a portfolio of their work covering the design and delivery of a course, or major module within a course. The portfolio would include the course/module outline, teaching materials and handouts, a selection of lesson plans and lecture notes, assessment tasks and performance criteria, evidence of analyses of student learning and understanding, evaluation of teaching using a range of formal and informal procedures, and a short statement identifying the institutional and wider community influences on the curriculum of the course or module. The portfolio would also include a critical reflective analysis (eg. about 4000 words) of the key teaching,

learning and assessment issues that the lecturer identified as being important for the course and students under scrutiny (see "reading" above).

Paper two would comprise:

• **Proposal:** the development of a proposal for a small scale research or development project based on an aspect of the lecturer's teaching. The focus could be on the teaching-research nexus, course design, student learning, assessment, teaching strategies, evaluation, or the development or use of technology in teaching. The proposal would be refined through discussion with the course team and the lecturer's head of school.

• **Literature review:** a short (selective) review of the literature relating to the topic.

• **Data collection and analysis:** the collection and analysis of information and data relating to the research or development.

• **Project report:** The preparation of a report (eg. about 8000 words) which covered the stages involved in conducting the research and/or development. The report could form the basis of a later publication for the lecturer.

Graduate profile/objectives: graduates of the certificate would be expected to have demonstrated all of the following:

° competence in university teaching covering a range of classroom and other situational contexts relevant to their work;
° the ability to critically analyse literature on teaching, learning and assessment in relation to their own context;
° the ability to analyse student learning and evaluate their own teaching;
° the ability to research their own teaching-learning context;
° the ability to communicate clearly in different media appropriate to their own teaching context;
° knowledge of ethical issues and requirements appropriate to teaching, learning and research in their subject;
° an understanding of the institutional and wider community influences on the teaching of their subject.

Issues to be resolved

The final section of this paper identifies what I believe to be the major issues which make it difficult for academic staff to undertake such a programme. I list these problems under three (overlapping) headings: financial pressures; staff workloads; and compulsion and rewards.

Financial pressures: External pressures from the wider community, the growing international interest in certification, demands from students for better teaching, and the influence of academic audit and other review procedures, have all increased pressures on New Zealand universities to put more resources into training programmes for their teachers. The award of a qualification for such training gives recognition and force to policies which emphasise quality in teaching. However, the kind of programme described in the previous section probably represents much more of a commitment of staff time than

most universities are willing to afford in the present economic climate. The pressure to make a profit – to operate as a business – is pervasive: the government places pressure on institutions through its funding regime and other accountability demands; in turn the senior management of these institutions puts pressure on the various operational units of the institution to operate more efficiently; and the heads of these units put pressure on their staff to undertake more work in order to balance the books or return a profit.

It should be noted that at Victoria University of Wellington, all schools are expected to live within their budgets and return a surplus. Heads of schools have been delegated financial responsibility (and accountability) to achieve this. While a head of school might be willing to encourage a staff member to voluntarily commit their "spare" time to a qualification in tertiary teaching, only a limited amount of "work" time would be made available for this. If a staff member engages in a qualification, the head of school still has to ensure that all of his or her teaching duties are fulfilled (this would require relief time for the staff member) and that the staff member is relatively free of administrative duties in order to have the time to undertake the necessary study and complete the assignment work. The picture is complicated by the fact that some schools have much more favourable enrolment figures than others; schools which do not operate a surplus are far less able to squeeze funding from their budgets to support the training of their staff than schools which have stronger enrolments. It is also somewhat anomalous for a school which is in deficit to set aside funding to enable a teacher to obtain a qualification in university teaching when at the same time the school is facing the prospect of reducing its staffing levels to meet budgetary constraints.

The message from the above is very clear. If staff are to undertake a qualification in university teacher – to become accredited – central university policy and central allocation of funding is needed to encourage staff in this direction. While I have no doubt that many senior managers would like to encourage staff in this way, it would be low on their list of priorities given their financial accountabilities.

Staff workloads: My experiences over the past four years indicate that the teaching and administrative loads of staff have generally increased although it is clear that this has not been the pattern for all staff. If new staff were to undertake a qualification in university teaching, their particular load would increase significantly. A postgraduate certificate in university teaching would require approximately 600 hours of work in order to match its credit rating (60 points). If a staff member takes two years to achieve such a qualification, they would need to put in 300 hours each year over and above their normal work. The structure of the certificate proposed in this paper does allow for overlap with a lecturer's normal duties in that the development of some of the materials for the portfolio would have to be undertaken anyway. However, the savings would not be huge as participants are likely to put more time into the documentation of their work when it is to be formally assessed (as part of the portfolio) than if this were not the case. They would also develop documents which they would not otherwise prepare.

Given that the qualification would be undertaken principally by staff in their first few years of university teaching, one needs to recognise that additional pressures exist. Such staff are in the process of developing courses for the first time – this requires more effort and

time than subsequent modifications. The School of Education at Victoria University of Wellington in fact makes an allowance for new staff in its teaching allocations: new staff receive 75% of a normal teaching load. However, this effectively prohibits the School from providing relief time to the staff member to undertake a teaching qualification – further relief time would need to be paid for by increased use of casual teaching or by requiring other staff to take a higher load.

The outcome of all of this is that new staff would need to invest a lot of their own spare time if they were to pursue a teaching qualification. How many staff would want to do this? My discussions with probationary staff of the School of Education over the past four years indicates that most would not have the time or would not see that such a qualification was in their best interests. Competition for their spare time comes from their families, the need to establish momentum in research (for which there are usually greater rewards), the need to complete their PhD (for some), and a deliberate decision by a few to balance their personal and professional lives so that they maintain a healthy lifestyle. It is hard not to acknowledge all of these motivations.

Compulsion and rewards: Inevitably the question arises as to whether, or for whom, a qualification in university teaching should become mandatory. The arguments typically made for compulsion include comparisons with other sectors of education (primary, secondary and early childhood), all of which require lengthy periods of professional training for their teachers. A second argument focuses on accountability and quality – the need to ensure that the public purse is being spent wisely and to guarantee that tertiary students receive a quality education (ie. value for money).

There are, however, some very obvious problems with compulsion: not all staff would benefit equally from a teaching qualification; availability of resources would be limited; compulsion is not always an effective motivator for bringing about change; and the existing employment contracts of academic staff would require renegotiation for participation to be required.

If, instead, targeting is considered to be an appropriate strategy, new (probationary) staff are an obvious group. They are the university teachers with the most to gain from a teaching qualification both in terms of meeting their performance review requirements and in looking forward to a long term future in university teaching. However, even within this group, staff arrive with a varied background. While many new staff have little or no exposure to university teaching, except through their own experiences as students or as part-time tutors in first-year programmes, others already possess a teaching qualification (eg. ex-school teachers) or may be appointed to senior positions having previously established a distinguished record of university teaching at another institution. Blanket targeting of new staff is therefore not itself an appropriate strategy.

The introduction of a financial incentive, such as an increment in pay, may prove to be a more effective basis for encouraging participation. An automatic increment would send a clear message to staff and students that senior management values teaching. The benefits of such a move in terms of public relations with the wider community should also be considered. However, the obvious drawback to this strategy is that it would make demands on valuable university resources at a time when austerity in funding is the norm. If this approach is adopted, targeting of financial rewards might need to be considered; again

certain categories of probationary staff seem the most obvious teachers to receive such targeting.

References

Chickering, A. & Gamson, Z. (1987), Seven principles of good practice in undergraduate education, *AAHE Bulletin,* 39, pp3-7.

Hall, C. and Kidman, J. (1996), *The Development of a Certificate in University Teaching at Victoria University of Wellington,* Victoria University of Wellington, UTDC Academic Development Series.

University Teaching Development Centre (1993), *Strategic Plan*, VUW/UTDC.

Chapter 5: University Teacher Accreditation in New Zealand and the Association of University Staff: A Policy of Watchful Waiting

Neville M Blampied
National President, Association of University Staff, New Zealand
Senior Lecturer, Department of Psychology, University of Canterbury.[1]

Introduction

The Association of University Staff (AUS) came to its current composition and organisation by a somewhat uncertain path. Its predecessor, the University Teachers' Association of New Zealand (UTA), was founded in 1923 under the leadership of Professor (later Sir Thomas) Hunter, who was then at Victoria University College, and who later became the first (part-time) Vice-Chancellor of the federal University of New Zealand. Its objects included both "advancing university education and research" in New Zealand and "safeguarding the interests of its members" (Tarling, 2000, p 12.). By 1936, however, the UTA had ceased to operate, and it was not until October 1947 that a revived national organisation, called the Association of University Teachers (AUT) was formed (Tarling, 2000).

The AUT survived and grew, and in time both absorbed the organisation representing university library staff, and became involved more comprehensively with industrial and bargaining matters within universities. The most fundamental change occurred, however, when the AUT merged in 1991 with the University Technicians Union (Franks, 1993) to form the present AUS. At that time the merged entity altered its membership rules to permit any university employee to join. The AUS now has somewhat in excess of 6000 members, most of them employees of the seven, pre-1999 universities, and grouped broadly into academic (including tutors, lecturers and professors) and general staff (all other university employees). Staff at the Auckland University of Technology are represented by other unions, and have not participated in any of the developments reported below, nor are their views on accreditation and related issues known to the author.

Although it has had other legal forms, the AUS is currently a union, registered under the Employment Relations Act (2000). This status indicates that it has a substantial and continuous responsibility to promote, protect and defend its members' interests as employees, through activities such as the negotiation of employment agreements and the prosecution of personal grievances. In addition, it inherited from the UTA and the AUT an additional, major responsibility, which is to concern itself with professional and policy issues affecting university staff, students, the tertiary education system generally, and national and even global issues. University teacher accreditation has been seen primarily as a professional issue, but it is recognised as having potentially serious impacts on employment, and so there have been compelling reasons for the Association to keep the issue under review.

It may help readers understand some of the discussion below to explain briefly the organisational structure of the AUS. In addition to being an amalgam of different occupational sectors, the AUS has a quasi-federal structure. There is a Branch at each university, and each Branch has a President, various officers and a committee, all elected annually by Branch members. In proportion to their size, Branches elect delegates to the Association's Annual Conference (held in December each year), which is the supreme policy-making body of the Association. Implementation of policy and general management of the business of the AUS throughout the year is in the hands of a Council, on which each Branch has one delegate. Day-to-day activities are the responsibility of the National President and the staff of the AUS led by the Executive Director, and including a Policy Analyst. The National President and the National Vice-Presidents (representing Academic, General, Women, and Maori staff respectively) each chair a standing committee of Council.

Because it has been seen as predominantly a professional issue affecting mostly academic staff, debate and policy development concerning teacher accreditation has largely been assigned to the Education Policy Committee, chaired by the Academic Vice-President. It would be fair to say that accreditation has not, to date, been of active concern at Branch level, although at each Branch there are members with active personal and professional interests in this and the related issue of professional development. AUS includes in its membership considerable numbers of those employed in professional development and training units in universities, and has drawn to some degree (but perhaps insufficiently) on their expertise.

A Brief History of AUS's Engagement with University Teacher Accreditation Issues

Early initiatives

During the 1970's the then AUT, sometimes in association with the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutes (Technical Institutes were the precursors of Polytechnics), made representations in various contexts advocating the introduction and extension of in-service training for members. This was done "out of concern for teaching quality" and was seen "as the most practical means of raising teaching standards in the institutions" (AUT, 1977, #27). Representations to this effect were made in submissions to the Educational Development Conference, 1972, to the University Grants Committee concerning the 1975 – 1979 Quinquennium, and to the Committee on the Registration of Teachers in 1977. In its later submission, the AUT noted that the first tangible action expressing its concern for teaching quality took the form of one-day courses offered to teaching staff by the Canterbury Branch of AUT. These were offered from 1967, and continued to be offered annually by the Branch until responsibility was assumed by the University's staff development unit, which was established in 1969.

Contemporary action: Phase 1, 1997 – 1998

The first engagement by the AUS with the issue of the accreditation of university teachers occurred in February, 1997 when the Education Committee (precursor to what is now the Education Policy Committee) resolved to give high priority in its work that year to forming a policy on "staff development and the acquisition by university teachers of a recognised

tertiary teaching qualification" (Ledgerton, 2000, S1.2). The Education Committee asked the AUS Policy Analyst, Margaret Ledgerton, to prepare a discussion paper, and this was circulated to the Committee and to Branches in May, 1997 (Ledgerton, 1997).

This paper summarised a number of reasons why accreditation should be a priority concern for AUS and identified some issues of potential concern to members in doing so. It is clear that international developments, such as those occurring through the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia (HERDSA) and the United Kingdom's Staff Educational Development Association (SEDA) (see Chapters 1 & 2) were exerting local influence. The possibility that the international mobility of New Zealand academic staff might be restricted if they did not have access to staff development and accreditation qualifications similar to those being developed elsewhere was noted. Reference was also made to the development of quality assurance mechanisms, although the Academic Audit Unit was not specifically identified. While the possible benefits of teacher accreditation were noted, it is also clear that anxiety about the Tertiary Education Review which had been initiated by the government in 1996 (which led ultimately to the infamous Green and White Papers of 1997 and 1998 respectively) was also part of the motivation for taking up the discussion of accreditation – "if AUS does not … provide energetic and principled input into its debate, events will overtake us and the impetus for its development and implementation will be political – with potentially negative results" (Ledgerton, 1997, #5.1).

Ledgerton reported (some time in 1998) that "comment on the AUS discussion paper had been generally positive", and that the Association's 1997 Annual Conference had resolved to continue with detailed policy-making on accreditation, and that as part of the policy-formation process, a special conference would be held which would gauge support not just among AUS members but more widely in the university sector for some sort of accreditation scheme. It seems that at this stage, the initial discussion paper had been circulated to other groups, including the New Zealand University Students' Association (NZUSA).

A Conference on the Accreditation of University Teaching was duly held in Wellington on 25 June 1998. Delegates from all the AUS Branches were joined by invited representatives of university students and other relevant agencies, including David Woodhouse, representing the AAU, and Ted Murphy, Assistant General Secretary of the National Tertiary Education Union of Australia (NTEU), the AUS's trans-Tasman counterpart. A number of Directors and other personnel from university staff development units also attended.

The Conference was opened by Graham Webb, as the first Keynote speaker, who spoke on *The Accreditation of University Teaching – The Major Arguments.* Although different in detail, the arguments presented were similar to those presented in Webb's Chapter 1 (above). As background reading, delegates were also given a copy of the Discussion Document produced by HERDSA (HERDSA, 1997). This was followed by the second

keynote address, in which Cedric Hall discussed *Programme Models – Certificate in University Teaching*, which canvassed some of the same material as his contribution in Chapter 4 (above).   The rest of the day was spent in Panel Discussions and group workshops, and ended with a plenary session reporting back and summarising the discussions. In addition to the HERDSA paper already mentioned, delegates also had copies of the AUS Discussion paper (Ledgerton, 1997) and a second paper on accreditation and industrial issues (Street & Brettkelly, 1998). This paper concluded that "Standardising teaching qualifications in the tertiary area is essential if teaching competence is not going to be used as an industrial weapon against staff" (Street & Brettkelly, 1998, p 5). Material to prompt and guide the group discussion was also provided. The Conference clearly gave the AUS the opportunity for informed and comprehensive discussion of the issue.

It was the intention that this Conference should produce first a comprehensive report of the proceedings, possibly as a book, as happened with other like Conferences (eg Crozier, 2000). Second, it had been the intention to produce a policy statement for submission to the 1998 Annual Conference for debate and possible adoption. Neither of these things happened. The reasons for this are various, and have to do with the volunteer nature of the Education Policy Committee's membership, the absence of Margaret Ledgerton (AUS Policy Analyst) on a staff exchange with NTEU in Melbourne, and the many other priority commitments which engaged the energies of the organisation during the balance of 1998, especially the release of the Government's White Paper (Ministry of Education, 1998). During 1999 there were further distractions from pursuing a policy on accreditation, including the release of the "Bright Futures" policy by the then Government in the lead-up to the election, and the election itself. In addition, the AUS undertook a considerable examination of its own structures and governance procedures that year, under the dynamic leadership of Professor Jane Kelsey as National President. The nett effect of this was that there was a hiatus in the AUS's consideration of tertiary teacher accreditation for more than a year.

Contemporary developments: New initiatives in 2000-2001
From the perspective of those enthusiastic about university teacher accreditation, the loss of momentum which followed the 1998 Conference has had a substantial negative effect. I will attempt to give my views of why this happened below, but note that the 1999 Annual Conference made a further request that during 2000, the Education Policy Committee should "advise AUS Council on whether the Association should develop new policy on the accreditation of university teaching." (Minutes, AUS Annual Conference, 1999). To assist the Committee, Margaret Ledgerton prepared an updated version of the original policy paper produced in 1997.

As was the case with the first initiative in 1997, external developments played a considerable role in the re-initiation of AUS interest in the matter. This time it was the election of a new Labour government, whose new Associate Minister of Education (Tertiary), the Hon Steve Maharey, had expressed an active interest in enhancing the quality of teaching in universities by an accreditation mechanism. The Minister was thought to be especially interested in the UK's Institute of Teaching & Learning model. This political

interest in teaching quality remains on the government's agenda, and this will serve to maintain AUS interest in the issue, independent of any other considerations.

In contrast to the "generally positive" reception accorded the idea of accreditation in 1997-90, the vigorous debate which ensued within the Education Policy Committee (mostly by email) tended to be more reserved and even negative about the idea. After continuing debate, some of it quite robust, the Committee prepared the following Draft Policy Statement on "Professional Development & the Accreditation of University Teaching which was referred to Annual Conference 2000 for ratification.

> *Professional development and the accreditation of university teaching*
> *[see also AUS policy on professional development, Annual Conference 1999]*
>
> 1. *AUS reaffirms its support for the active development of a culture of in-service, ongoing professional development for university staff.*
> 2. *The Association supports fully-resourced, high-quality staff development units at all universities and the provision of appropriate, high-quality professional development programmes that are accessible to all staff. Emphasis is placed on the need for the provision of adequate time and resources for staff to engage in professional development programmes.*
> 3. *In particular, professional development programmes related to university teaching should emphasise the distinctiveness of university teaching and its interdependence with research. Such programmes should be discipline-appropriate and based on the premise that high-quality university teaching is integral to in-depth knowledge of a subject gained through the completion of original research and scholarship. They should also include specifically university-related teaching issues such as: ethical issues related to university work; academic freedom issues; and the legislative rights and responsibilities of university staff*
> 4. *AUS will continue to monitor both national and international developments in the professional development and accreditation of university teaching and will actively seek to influence national developments.*
> 5. *AUS notes its opposition to any mandatory accreditation scheme and would regard with extreme caution any non-mandatory formal accreditation scheme. Reasons for this view include:*
>   * *New Zealand recruits many academic staff from overseas and any regulations imposed on us here could harm that recruitment;*
>   * *the possibility that accreditation might become an instrument of managerial control;*
>   * *the possibility that accreditation could further segregate academic staff into teachers and researchers*
>   * *the possibility that non-mandatory schemes could lead to mandatory accreditation.*

This policy, while endorsing the provision of in-service professional development for staff opposed accreditation schemes if they were other than voluntary, and listed a number of reasons for this opposition. It was adopted by Annual Conference, 2000, and is now the official policy position of the AUS.

Conclusion

Point 5 of the AUS policy (see Table 1) commits the Association to "monitor ... national and international developments ...". It is this core aspect of the policy that leads me to characterise AUS policy as "watchful waiting". In contrast to the trajectory of policy development in 1997-1998, which seemed to be heading in the direction of a positive endorsement of university teacher accreditation, with the AUS leading the debate, the present position is both tentative and conservative. Why the change?

As an attender at the 1998 Conference and an active participant in the debate since, I believe that the Conference had an unintended effect. In general, and in the abstract, I believe that most AUS members find positive arguments for (voluntary) teacher accreditation, such as those advanced by Webb at the Conference and in Chapter 1 above, quite persuasive. I have heard and read very little in the way of systematic rebuttal of these arguments. Despite this, the arguments have not carried the debate. How so?

I believe (and I came to this conclusion independently) that Hall is right in his argument in Chapter 4 above, that contextual factors are critical. I have no disagreement with the contextual factors (financial pressures, workloads, and compulsion and rewards)
he identifies as problematic to the implementation of accreditation programmes. It was clear in the second phase of the Conference – the workshops and discussions – that people were thinking in concrete and personal ways about how accreditation would affect them, rather than considering it in the abstract and ideal. When individuals considered in a quite specific and personal way the meaning of accreditation for them, in the concrete reality of the lives they lived as academic staff in New Zealand universities, their enthusiasm for accreditation cooled rapidly. This, however, is not because they are not concerned for the quality of the education their students receive, nor, necessarily, a rejection of the need for accountability for teaching performance.

Recognising the contextual realities which have engendered the relatively cautious and watchful response of AUS members to the organisation's attempt to develop a policy on university teacher accreditation has some important implications for future strategies for those who advocate the benefits, and for the adoption, of accreditation policies. I think that it is clear that the strategy of attempting to persuade by appeal to the "ideal" of accreditation will continue to fail. Those who believe that "accreditation and the professionalisation of university teaching should be developed because it is the right thing to do from a values perspective" (Webb, Chapter 1, above) need to focus much more on the contextual variables which structure the lived experience of academic work and the barriers therein contained.

I would argue that the contextual problems in the path of the adoption of accreditation policies and practices are even wider than those identified by Hall in Chapter 4. His focus was essentially on a "within-institution" perspective, but there are broader aspects to consider. The contacts AUS has with sister academic labour organisations throughout the English-speaking developed world indicate that university staff in New Zealand have endured an experience common to most if not all academic workers, which is a loss of social status and relative economic standing in their communities. At the same time, in many places, government expectations of the role of universities has become more commercial and contractual, public investment has declined, and acceptance of collegiality as the founding principle of university governance has been replaced by managerial approaches. Evidence from comparisons of remuneration levels for academic staff such as those reported by Provan (2001) suggest that these negative experiences may have been felt more sharply in New Zealand than in many other places. It is not surprising then, that the ideal of accreditation has fallen on stony ground. Equally, it is clear that before our policy of watchful waiting is abandoned for something more positive, substantial and extensive changes will need to be made in the relationship of university staff to government, the community and to their institutions.

References

Association of University Teachers of NZ (Inc.) (1997), *Submission to the Committee on Registration of Teachers,* Unpublished paper, AUS archives, AUS National Office, Wellington.

Crozier, R. (ed.) (2000), *Troubled Times: Academic Freedom in New Zealand,* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Franks, P. (1993), *Reluctant Unionists: From Ivory Tower to the Real World,* Wellington: Association of University Staff.

Higher Education Research & Development Society of Australia (1997), *The Accreditation of University Teachers: A Discussion Document,* ACT: HERDSA.

Ledgerton, M. (1997), *AUS and the Accreditation of University Teaching: Branch Discussion Paper*, Unpublished paper, 20 May, 1997, Wellington: Association of University Staff.

Provan, D. (2001), *Academic Staff Salaries & Benefits in Six Commonwealth Countries 2000-01,* London: Association of Commonwealth Universities.

Street, M. & Brettkelly, G. (1998), *Accreditation of University Teaching: The Industrial Issues,* Unpublished paper, Wellington: Association of University Staff.

Tarling, N. (2000), *Professionals & Unionists: A History of the Association of University Staff 1923-98,* Wellington: Association of University Staff.

Footnotes

1. I particularly wish to thank Margaret Ledgerton and Rob Crozier, AUS National Office, for assistance with the preparation of this paper. The views expressed are personal, and should not be taken as endorsed by the AUS.

2. Author's address for correspondence: Department of Psychology, University of Canterbury, PB 4800, Christchurch, NZ. Email: n.blampied@psyc.canterbury.ac.nz

Appendix A

New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit

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

Definition

Preamble

1. In order to maintain and enhance the quality of their academic activities, the eight universities of New Zealand have established the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit (AAU) and fund and sustain its operation.

2. In its activities, the AAU takes account of the special features of the New Zealand universities including

    i.   the characteristics of a university, as generally accepted, and as set out in the Education Amendment Act 1990;
    ii.   the obligation that each university has under that Act to establish a charter;
    iii. the obligation under such a charter to take account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi;
    iv.   the obligation to develop and state aims and objectives in accordance with the goals and principles stated in the charter;
    v.   the relatively small scale of the university system;
    vi.   the provisions the universities have made for interinstitutional cooperation and peer review;
    vii. their long-standing relationships with university systems in other parts of the world; and
    viii. the existence of other agencies monitoring the performance of the universities.

Terms of Reference

3. The AAU's terms of reference are:

    i.   to consider and review the universities' mechanisms for monitoring and enhancing the academic quality and standards which are necessary for achieving their stated aims and objectives;
    ii.   to comment on the extent to which procedures in place in individual universities are applied effectively;
    iii. to comment on the extent to which procedures in place in individual universities reflect good practice in maintaining quality;
    iv.   to identify and commend to universities good practice in regard to the maintenance and enhancement of academic standards at national level;

     v.   to assist the university sector to improve its educational quality;

    vi.   to advise the NZVCC on quality assurance matters;

   vii.   to interact with other national and international agencies and organisations in relation to matters of quality assurance in education;

  viii.   to carry out such contract work as is compatible with its audit role.

4.   In fulfilling these terms of reference, the AAU focuses its attention on areas of particular importance to universities, including mechanisms for

     i.   quality assurance in the design, monitoring and evaluation of courses and programmes of study for degrees and other qualifications;

    ii.   quality assurance in teaching, learning and assessment;

   iii.   quality assurance in relation to the appointment and performance of academic and other staff who contribute directly to the teaching and research functions;

   iv.   quality assurance in research, more especially, but not exclusively, in the context of its relationship with university teaching; and

    v.   taking account of the views of students, of external examiners, of professional bodies, and of employers in respect of academic matters.

5.   One quality assurance mechanism which is used by all of the universities is the Committee on University Academic Programmes of the NZVCC. On behalf of the NZVCC, that body exercises a number of functions of course approval and monitoring as a result of the 1990 Act and by agreement among the eight universities. The AAU audits and comments on the adequacy and effectiveness of CUAP's execution of these functions.

Structure

6.   The AAU comprises:

     i.   a Board;

    ii.   a Register of auditors; and

   iii.   a secretariat, headed by a Director.

7.   The Board comprises eleven or twelve members, appointed by the NZVCC. They include

     i.   one student member representative nominated by the NZUSA;

    ii.   one member nominated by the national employers body;

   iii.   one member nominated by the national trade union body;

   iv.   two members drawn from those professions for which the universities provide a specific educational preparation, in respect of which nominations will be sought from the various relevant professional bodies;

    v.   two members drawn from the community, as a result of public notice;

   vi.   two senior academics, one nominated by the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, preferably being a member of the Australian Quality Committee or its equivalent, and one nominated by AUSNZ;

   vii.   one member of the NZVCC;

  viii.   the Director of the AAU; and

    ix.   a chairperson appointed by the NZVCC either in addition to or from within the above members.

In making its appointments the NZVCC takes account of the need to include at least one Maori member. No member shall represent the Ministry of Education or other agencies. The term of office of appointed Board members is three years, with the exception of that of the nominee of the NZUSA, which, at the request of that Association, is one year. Appointed Board members shall not serve continuously for more than two terms of office.

8.   The functions of the Board are to

    i.   advise the NZVCC on the terms of reference of the AAU and on its operation;
    ii.   determine the policy of the AAU, within the parameters set by this document, and monitor its implementation;
    iii.   appoint the Director of the AAU;
    iv.   approve the operating procedures of the AAU, and confirm that they are carried out;
    v.   approve the budget of the AAU for recommendation to the NZVCC; and
    vi.   approve and submit an annual report of the AAU to the NZVCC.

It does not have the power to offer or make recommendations to or in respect of individual universities. It has no power to amend the audit reports, but ensures that the process of audit is such as to produce reliable reports that reflect an independent judgement.

9.   Auditors are appointed to the Register by the Board on the advice of the Director and given an appropriate training. They include both currently employed academics and other persons of appropriate experience. From the Register, small panels are drawn in order to audit the individual universities, and such panels normally include at least two persons in the former category and one in the second.

10. The Director's role is to

    i.   ensure that the terms of reference of the AAU are fulfilled;
    ii.   advise the Board on matters relating to the review, maintenance and enhancement of quality in universities;
    iii.   make recommendations to the Board on the appointment of auditors to the Register, and provide for their training;
    iv.   assist in and ensure the smooth running of the audits and the preparation of the audit reports;
    v.   employ the other staff of the AAU;
    vi.   report to the Board on the operation of the AAU;
    vii.   prepare the annual report of the AAU; and

viii.   fulfil such other duties as are appropriate to the purpose and functioning of the AAU.

Other Aspects

11. In its procedures, the AAU bases its operations on the concept of quality audit as defined by the ISO, paying attention to both process and outcomes.

12. The AAU is an independent body.

13. The AAU is funded by the universities by such levies or contributions as the NZVCC sees fit, but is expected additionally to draw on the staffing and secretarial resources of the universities which it audits.

14. The eight universities have undertaken to participate in this scheme. The scope of its operation shall not be extended, nor the number or nature of institutions participating be varied or increased, without their unanimous consent (although the AAU may undertake work on contract for any institution or organisation at the discretion of the Board of the AAU).

January 2001

Contact:
   Academic Audit Unit,
   Box 9747, Wellington, New Zealand
   tel: +64-4-801-7924
   fax: +64-4-801-7926
   email: admin@aau.ac.nz