

**REPORT OF A REVIEW OF**

**NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITIES ACADEMIC AUDIT UNIT**

**TE WAHANGA TATARI KAUTE TOHUNGATANGA O NGA WHARE WANANGA O AOTEAROA**

---

**OCTOBER 1997**

---

---

**REPORT OF A REVIEW OF  
NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITIES ACADEMIC AUDIT UNIT**

---

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>Page No</b>
<b>0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
0.1 The External Review Process	2
0.2 Summary of Key Findings	2
0.3 List of Recommendations	3
<b>1 THE ACADEMIC AUDIT UNIT (AAU BOARD)</b>	
1.1 Composition	9
1.2 Functions	9
1.3 Relationship with the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (NZVCC)	10
1.4 Relationship with the Director of the AAU	10
<b>2 THE ACADEMIC AUDIT UNIT (AAU)</b>	
2.1 Terms of Reference	10
2.2 Critical Success Factors	11
2.3 Staffing Matters	12
2.4 Publications	13
2.5 International and National Profile	13
2.6 Relationship with the Universities	13
2.7 Relationship with CUAP	14
2.8 Relationship with the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)	14
2.9 Relationship with Professional Associations	14
<b>3 THE AUDIT PROCESS</b>	
3.1 Impact of the Audit Process	15
3.2 Audit Panels	16
3.3 Audit Manual	16
3.4 Quality Portfolios	17
3.5 Audit Visits	17
3.6 Audit Reports	18
3.7 Audit Follow-Up	19
<b>4 FUTURE DIRECTIONS</b>	
4.1 Next Cycle of Audits	20
4.2 Theme and Comprehensive Audits	23
4.3 Future Activities of the AAU	23
4.4 Funding Matters	23

**APPENDICES**

---

---

<b>Appendix A</b>	Terms of Reference of the External AAU Review	25
<b>Appendix B</b>	Written Submissions received by the External AAU Review Panel	26
<b>Appendix C</b>	External AAU Review Panel Interview Programme	28

## REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AAU REVIEW PANEL TO THE AAU BOARD

### 0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 0.1 The External Review Process

The New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit (AAU) was established in 1993 by the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC) as an independent body with a governing Board, the AAU Board. The purpose of the AAU is to assist New Zealand universities to achieve an organisational culture that values quality and is committed to the continuous enhancement of quality. The AAU also is expected to provide an independent public affirmation of the universities' quality culture through a rolling cycle of audits.

In April 1997, the AAU Board initiated an external review of the AAU's operations to date. The External AAU Review Panel consisting of four members is listed at the end of this report, together with the Terms of Reference of the Review (Appendix A).

A portfolio of documents was provided to the review panel by Dr David Woodhouse, Director of the AAU in May 1997, and the first meeting of the panel took place on 26 June. On 17 July, two members of the panel met with members of the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) to discuss the AAU and the audit process. Before the meeting, written submissions were requested from the CUAP members. Further submissions were invited from the university sector, government agencies and professional associations in mid-July with a closing date of 18 August. In total, 23 written submissions were received by the panel (Appendix B).

A series of interviews was conducted by the panel on 4-5 September. Approximately 35 people were interviewed including members of the AAU Board, university staff, representatives of staff associations, auditors, students and student representatives, members of the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, and the Director of the AAU (Appendix C). Members of the panel also made a point of participating in gatherings where academic audit issues were discussed such as the Quality Enhancement Meeting attended by the Convener in August 1997.

The Terms of Reference provided a basis for the style of presentation which has been adopted for this report. The report consists of an Executive Summary and four sections with subheadings. Each subheading contains comments and, where appropriate, recommendations. A separate list of the recommendations can be found in 0.3.

The following abbreviations have been used.

AAU	Academic Audit Unit
AUSNZ	Association of University Staff New Zealand
CUAP	Committee on University Academic Programmes
NZQA	New Zealand Qualifications Authority
NZUSA	New Zealand University Students' Association
NZVCC	New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee

## **0.2 Summary of Key Findings**

The process of academic audit and quality improvement in New Zealand universities is at the crossroads. The initial audit cycle is near completion and the future direction of the AAU and the audit process requires resolution. The Review Panel is convinced of the continuing value of the AAU and the audit process to the university sector both in terms of public accountability and the impetus it gives the universities to examine, measure and improve their performance.

The audit process has been effective in bringing about a culture shift in the universities with respect to quality matters. Though penetration has been uneven across the university sector, there is a broad acknowledgement that positive benefits have resulted and that the outcomes have been worth the costs. The AAU has shown itself to be responsive to feedback from the universities and to have produced audit reports that are generally considered to be authoritative, rigorous, fair and perceptive. Consequently, trust has been developed between the universities and the AAU.

The procedures developed by the AAU which encourage the universities to engage in self review, with the AAU validating the process through the publication of the audit reports, has been a stimulus for reform in the universities. The challenge is to maintain the momentum of quality improvement in the universities after audit and it is vitally important there be an effective follow-up process and a clearly articulated direction for the next audit cycle.

During its first years of operation the AAU has been managed in a cost-effective and efficient manner. The Review Panel is impressed with the scope and nature of the AAU's activities and the success and high standing it has achieved given the small number of staff employed by the AAU. The current Director is highly regarded by people both within the higher education sector, amongst professional associations and internationally.

Many of the recommendations contained in this Report are underpinned by the need for increased resourcing of the AAU. Currently, the AAU is under-resourced with respect to such matters as: the performance of the AAU's educative role in relation to quality enhancement, good practice and benchmarking; funds available to pay audit panel members; technological support; and progression opportunities for staff.

In the present political environment, with its increasing focus on accountability and value for money, it is essential that the university sector not only perform to a high standard but be able to demonstrate that it is doing so. Having taken the initiative in setting up the AAU, the universities must continue to show they can manage the audit process without intervention. External pressures aside, it behoves the universities to move in this direction of their own accord and the AAU in its first years of operation has established a sound basis from which to progress.

The Review Panel strongly recommends that immediate steps be taken by the AAU Board in combination with the NZVCC to secure on-going, long-term and adequate funding for the AAU. This is necessary to ensure the stability and independence of the AAU, to reinforce the credibility of the AAU and the audit process and to maintain the momentum of quality improvement within the universities.

## **0.3 LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

## **1 THE ACADEMIC AUDIT UNIT (AAU) BOARD**

### **1.1 Composition**

- 1 That the composition of the AAU Board be amended to read:
- vi two senior academics, one nominated by the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, being a member of the Australian Quality Committee or its equivalent, and one nominated by the AUSNZ;
  - vii one member of the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee.

### **1.2 Functions**

- 2 That the AAU Board develop strategies to promote confidence in the independence of the AAU, as an essential element in maintaining the standing and integrity of both the AAU and the NZVCC.

## **2 THE ACADEMIC AUDIT UNIT (AAU)**

### **2.1 Terms of Reference**

- 3 That the NZVCC take a leading role in the development of goals, objectives, standards and performance indicators which relate to quality assurance for the New Zealand university sector, doing so in consultation with the Ministry of Education and NZQA.
- 4 That the AAU's term of reference (i), be amended to include not only the stated aims and objectives of the universities but those goals, objectives, standards and performance indicators established by the NZVCC which relate to quality assurance and quality standards in higher education.
- 5 That the terms of reference (ii) and (iii) be amended to take account of outcomes.

### **2.3 Staffing Matters**

- 6 That an annual performance contract be arranged for all staff of the AAU, having as a baseline their current salary arrangements and conditions.
- 7 That the AAU Board in combination with the NZVCC review staffing levels to enable the AAU to meet fully its current and any increased commitments as determined by its amended terms of reference.

### **2.4 Publications**

- 8 That the AAU review its current list of publications with a view to rationalising the production of its printed publications.
- 9 That the AAU develop its publications electronically via the AAU Web Site, incorporating an indexed electronic database with the capacity for users to interrogate it on the basis of subject.

## **2.7 Relationship with CUAP**

- 10 That any revision of the AAU's terms of reference take account of the role of CUAP, and ensure that the complementary activities of the AAU and CUAP are managed in an efficient and effective way.
- 11 That the AAU audit CUAP annually in relation to the certification of programmes that have been approved and accredited by CUAP.

## **2.8 Relationship with the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)**

- 12 That the AAU's relationship with NZQA be strengthened through regular meetings.

## **3 THE AUDIT PROCESS**

### **3.1 Impact of the Audit Process**

- 13 That in view of the success of the AAU in its first years of operation the Review Panel strongly recommends to the NZVCC through the AAU Board that it confirm the AAU as an integral part of the New Zealand university system.

### **3.2 Audit Panels**

- 14 That the AAU continue, and where possible extend, its practice of having auditors serve on more than one audit panel in each cycle to ensure consistency across audit panels.
- 15 That the remuneration paid to audit panel members be increased in accordance with government approved rates for this kind of activity.
- 16 That before the next audit cycle commences there be a further training programme for auditors which builds on and incorporates feedback from the first audit cycle.

### **3.3 Audit Manual**

- 17 That the Audit Manual be reviewed in light of experience and any approved changes to the audit scope and audit process, and be made more 'user-friendly'.

### **3.4 Quality Portfolios**

- 18 That if a university's Quality Portfolio is deemed not to have met a minimum standard by the panel auditing the institution, it be referred back to the university for resubmission with appropriate feedback and an extended submission date.

19 That members of other audit panels be invited to scrutinise the Quality Portfolio of the university about to be audited as a cross validation.

20 That a copy of each university's Quality Portfolio be forwarded to the members of the AAU Board along with the Audit Report for information.

### **3.5 Audit Visits**

21 That the AAU prepare a brochure for staff and students setting out the audit rationale and role and responsibilities of the interviewees, and including advice about the opportunities for making submissions to the audit panel before visits and for requesting interviews during the visit.

22 That the length of audit visits be no more than three days.

23 That sufficient periods for members of the audit panels to reflect, rest and discuss be set aside in the visit programmes.

24 That the following procedural changes be made to arrangements for the visits and to the visit programmes:

- visit programmes to include some interviews with students and staff in their own environment
- use of split panels to be strictly limited and preferably not used at all
- no group to have only a lunch session
- care to be taken to ensure there is sufficient opportunity for general staff to contribute to the audit process
- care be taken to ensure that the audit panels take into account all delivery modes for teaching and learning during their deliberations.

25 That more careful attention be given to the selection of interviewees with the end result being that no more than 150 people be interviewed. This will enable a more in depth interaction to occur between those being interviewed and the audit panel.

### **3.6 Audit Reports**

26 That the audit reports become more robust in argumentation and explicit in style and recommendations.

### **3.7 Audit Follow-Up**

27 That the AAU fully inform universities of follow-up plans when the audit report is released.

28 That the primary responsibility for responding to audit continue to lie with the individual universities but that the AAU Board ask the NZVCC to act in a supportive role by reviewing progress towards implementation of the audit recommendations of its member institutions on an annual basis.

29 That the AAU Board give consideration to the suggestion that all or some of the audit panel return to an institution approximately three months after the publication of the audit report to discuss matters surrounding the recommendations and to offer advice and provide insight.

---

## **4 FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

### **4.1 Next Cycle of Audits**

- 30 That the next cycle of audits comprise three theme audits followed by a comprehensive 'whole institution' audit, a six-year cycle with each audit taking 18 months to complete. This cycle to commence in 1999, with 1998 being used to complete the initial cycle and to plan for the next cycle.
- 31 That the AAU Board seek an extension of funding for the current audit cycle to the end of 1998, to ensure completion of the initial cycle including 'follow-up', and to allow sufficient time for planning of the next cycle.
- 32 That in the interests of sound management, fairness and equity, and given an ever- changing political, financial and economic environment, every effort be made to ensure that each theme audit round be concluded within a 12 month period. This will ensure that matters of national concern are effectively highlighted and sector-wide improvement strategies put in place as soon as possible.

## AAU - CYCLE OF AUDITS

33 That the theme audits be nationwide, with each university being audited in turn on that theme, and with the comprehensive ‘whole institution’ audit following a similar pattern to the current audits but with a concentration on outcomes as well as processes across the range of university activities.

34 That in addition to the nationwide theme, each institution be invited to nominate an university-specific theme for the audit panel to review alongside the nationwide theme. For example:

	<b>Nationwide theme</b>	<b>University-specific theme</b>
University 1	Postgraduate Supervision & Support	Treaty of Waitangi
University 2	Postgraduate Supervision & Support	Community Service
University 3	Postgraduate Supervision & Support	Student Services

35 That the AAU Board take responsibility for determining the nationwide themes and the programme for each audit cycle, taking into account any emergent themes from the initial cycle of audits, and after consultation with the NZVCC and other interested parties.

36 That the theme audit panels be smaller in size than those used in the initial audit cycle, but in order to spread the auditing load and ensure the integrity and standing of the audit reports, they consist of not fewer than four members including at least one member from outside the university sector, with the

comprehensive 'whole institution' audit panel retaining the size and composition of the typical audit panel as set out in the Audit Manual (Section 8.1).

37 That the themes and the audit programme be widely publicised before the cycle commences as a signal both to the universities and the wider community of the audit cycle's scope and intent.

**4.3 Future activities of the AAU**

38 That the AAU extend its educative role including engaging in full cost recovery activities such as workshops and commissioned audit undertakings.

**4.4 Funding Matters**

39 That strategies for securing ongoing and adequate funding of the AAU be explored by the AAU Board in combination with the NZVCC.

40 That consideration be given to moving towards charging each university the full costs of audit.

41 That the resources of the AAU be expanded to enable it to respond to its terms of reference more fully in relation to quality enhancement, good practice and benchmarking.

## **1 THE ACADEMIC AUDIT UNIT (AAU) BOARD**

### **1.1 Composition**

#### **AAU Board**

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 and one nominated by the AUSNZ;
- vii the chairperson of the Committee on University Academic Programme or nominee;
- viii the Director of the Unit; and
- ix a chairperson appointed by the NZVCC either in addition to or from within the above members.

In making its appointments the NZVCC will take account of the need to include at least one Maori member. No member shall represent the Ministry of Education or other agencies. The terms of office of appointed Board members is four years with the exception of that of the nominee of the NZUSA, which, at the request of the Association, is one year.

#### ***Comments***

- The composition and size of the AAU Board and the balance achieved between academic and external representation is appropriate, with the weighting of membership in favour of external representation being a positive feature.
- There is continuing value in having an Australian representative on the AAU Board for international referencing purposes. A member of the Australian Quality Committee would have the range of skills and experience most relevant to the Board.
- It is important the AAU Board continues to maintain strong links with the NZVCC.

#### ***Recommendations***

***1 That the composition of the AAU Board be amended to read:***

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

### **1.2 Functions**

The functions of the Board are to

- i advise the NZVCC on the terms of reference of the Unit and on its operation;
- ii determine the policy of the Unit, within the parameters set by this document, and monitor its implementation;
- iii appoint the Director of the Unit;
- iv approve the operation procedures of the Unit, and confirm that they are carried out;
- v approve the budget of the Unit for recommendation to the NZVCC; and
- vi approve and submit an annual report of the Unit 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 panel reports (Section 11 ii), but ensures that the process of audit is such as to produce reliable reports that reflect an independent judgement.

### **Comments**

- The functions of the AAU Board as specified are appropriate with no change required. The Board seems to be carrying out its functions both successfully and effectively.
- Many university staff and members of the wider community are either unaware or not convinced of the ‘independence’ of the AAU Board and the AAU on the one hand, from the NZVCC on the other.
- The Review Panel commends the decision to incorporate both educative and audit functions in the New Zealand quality system (in contrast to the quality systems adopted in many other countries, notably the United Kingdom, where the two roles are quite separate) and considers that with adequate resourcing it has the potential to work very well.

### **Recommendations**

- 2 *That the AAU Board develop strategies to promote confidence in the independence of the AAU, as an essential element in maintaining the standing and integrity of both the AAU and the NZVCC.*

## **1.3 Relationship with the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors’ Committee**

### **Comments**

- The current nominee of CUAP on the AAU Board is also a member of the NZVCC and consequently has provided a useful liaison/mediation role between the AAU Board and the NZVCC.
- The relationship between the AAU Board and the NZVCC appears to be strong and effective.

## **1.4 Relationship with the Director of the AAU**

### **Comments**

- An excellent relationship is apparent between the AAU Board and AAU Director. Members of the AAU Board spoke highly of the Director of the AAU and his abilities, “*I believe quite a lot of the success of the Unit is due to the quality of David Woodhouse’s work*”; in turn the Director of the AAU spoke highly of the calibre of the Board members and the quality of their contributions.

## **2 THE ACADEMIC AUDIT UNIT (AAU)**

### **2.1 Terms of Reference**

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; and                                                      |
| iv  | to identify and commend to universities good practice in regard to the maintenance and enhancement of academic standards at national level.                                             |

In fulfilling these terms of reference, the Unit is expected to focus its attention on a number of areas of particular importance, namely 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 relations 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.                     |

### **Comments**

- In the main, the terms of reference of the AAU are adequate but there is scope for refinements to reflect the current environment.
- Any widening of the future role of the AAU will require additional or modified terms of reference.
- With regard to term of reference (i), it would be timely to give consideration to a suggestion from NZQA that there is a need to develop goals, objectives, standards and performance indicators for the New Zealand university sector.
- It is not sufficient to evaluate the effectiveness only of processes in universities. Reference should also be made to outcomes, and terms of reference (ii) and (iii) would be enhanced by the inclusion of this feature.
- The AAU has not yet given priority to term of reference (iii) and the Review Panel supports addressing it more fully after the first cycle of university audits is completed.
- In the absence of agreement about academic standards and performance indicators at the national level, it is difficult to carry out term of reference (iv). To carry it out, strong liaison and co-operation must be developed between the universities and the AAU with respect to the collection of the data necessary to address it.

### **Recommendations**

- 3** *That the NZVCC take a leading role in the development of goals, objectives, standards and performance indicators which relate to quality assurance for the New Zealand university sector, doing so in consultation with the Ministry of Education and NZQA.*
- 4** *That the AAU's term of reference (i), be amended to include not only the stated aims and objectives of the universities but those goals, objectives, standards and performance indicators established by the NZVCC which relate to quality assurance and quality standards in higher education.*
- 5** *That the terms of reference (ii) and (iii) be amended to take account of outcomes.*

## 2.2 Critical Success Factors

The following factors are deemed critical to the success of the Academic Audit Unit, namely that the Unit should

- i produce audit reports that are acknowledged, both within and without the universities, to be authoritative, rigorous, fair and perceptive;
- ii through these reports, and otherwise, contribute to the improvement of quality in New Zealand universities;
- iii maintain sufficient international contact to give international credibility to its reports; and
- iv liaise appropriately with relevant New Zealand organisations in relation to ensuring and demonstrating the academic quality of universities.

### *Comments*

- The Review Panel commends the AAU Board for establishing the Critical Success Factors.
- In relation to Critical Success Factor (i), the audit reports so far produced are acknowledged to be authoritative, rigorous, fair and perceptive.

*“The operation of quality audits within the university sector by the NZAAU is a positive activity and NZQA supports that initiative.”*

(Extract from the NZQA submission to the External Review Panel).

- In relation to Critical Success Factor (ii), the AAU’s contribution to the improvement of quality in New Zealand universities has, for the most part, occurred as a by-product of the audit process. This is hardly surprising given that the AAU is not sufficiently resourced to undertake other improvement activities.
- In relation to Critical Success Factor (iii), this has been achieved mainly through Australian representation on the AAU Board and the audit panels, and through the international activities of the AAU Director.
- The AAU’s present relationship with relevant New Zealand organisations (Critical Success Factor iv) appears to be largely informal and ad hoc. Given the current state of maturity of the AAU it is timely to put these relationships on a more stable and formal footing, particularly with regard to NZQA and the Ministry of Education.

## 2.3 Staffing Matters

### *Comments*

- The Review Panel is impressed with the scope and nature of the AAU’s activities and the success and high standing it has achieved given the small number of staff employed by the Unit.
- The current Director is highly regarded by people both within the higher education sector, amongst professional associations and internationally. He is noted for his professionalism, knowledge of his field, extensive network of contacts and meticulous approach to his work.
- Current staffing levels within the AAU are likely to be inadequate if greater emphasis is placed on the quality improvement aspect of the AAU’s terms of reference, or if any extension to the scope of activities of the AAU is planned.
- The AAU would benefit from an increased critical mass, such as the appointment of a Deputy Director or similar post.

- The Chair of the AAU Board stated that he and an NZVCC representative conduct an annual performance review with the AAU Director, and the Review Panel commends this process.

### ***Recommendations***

- 6 *That an annual performance contract be arranged for all staff of the AAU, having as a baseline their current salary arrangements and conditions.*
- 7 *That the AAU Board in combination with the NZVCC review staffing levels to enable the AAU to meet fully its current and any increased commitments as determined by its amended terms of reference.*

## **2.4. Publications**

### ***Comments***

- The AAU currently publishes four newsletters/information packets to meet the needs of different audiences. The Director of the AAU gave this as a reason for the overlap in content between the various publications and, given limited resources, he sees the publications as an efficient way for the AAU to fulfil its educative role.
- However, there is a low level of penetration and knowledge of the publications in the university sector and wider community.
- The development of a Web Site by the AAU is a noteworthy initiative, which has the potential to communicate information about the AAU and the audit process and disseminate information about good practice and quality assurance in general.

### ***Recommendations***

- 8 *That the AAU review its current list of publications with a view to rationalising the production of its printed publications.*
- 9 *That the AAU develop its publications electronically via the AAU Web Site incorporating an indexed electronic database with the capacity for users to interrogate it on the basis of subject.*

## **2.5 International and National Profile**

### ***Comments***

- The AAU has a high profile nationally amongst senior university staff but awareness of the AAU and its activities is less well known within the wider university community.
  - The sending of photographs and auditors' curriculum vitae in advance of the audit visit assists the universities in publicising the audit, and the profile of the AAU within the universities increases considerably at the time of the audit visits and when the audit reports are released.
  - Knowledge of the AAU amongst the wider community is limited, though some professional associations are aware of the AAU's role and activities through meetings and workshops the AAU has organised, and through membership on the AAU Board and audit panels.
-

- The international profile of the AAU is currently assured by the impressive international networks and contacts of the current AAU Director. The cultivation of an extensive international network is desirable whoever the Director may be.

## **2.6 Relationship with the Universities**

### *Comments*

- The AAU's relationship with the universities has been enhanced by the audit process and the nature of the audit reports.
- All university representatives expressed a high regard for the quality of the audit panels.

## **2.7 Relationship with CUAP**

### *Comments*

- The relationship with CUAP is positive and mutually beneficial and it is important the complementary roles of the AAU and CUAP be managed in an efficient and effective way.
- Auditing CUAP is an appropriate role for the AAU, but responsibility for implementing and monitoring the implementation of the AAU Report on CUAP lies with the NZVCC not the AAU.
- NZQA has suggested that an appropriate role for the AAU would be to audit CUAP annually in relation to the certification of programmes that have been approved and accredited by CUAP.

### *Recommendations*

- 10 That any revision of the AAU's terms of reference take account of the role of CUAP, and ensure that the complementary activities of the AAU and CUAP are managed in an efficient and effective way.*
- 11 That the AAU audit CUAP annually in relation to the certification of programmes that have been approved and accredited by CUAP.*

## **2.8 Relationship with the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)**

### *Comments*

- NZQA has expressed a desire for its relationship with the AAU to be formalised and strengthened.

### *Recommendation*

- 12 That the AAU's relationship with NZQA be strengthened through regular meetings.*

## **2.9 Relationship with Professional Associations**

### *Comments*

---

- An important role is played by professional associations through membership of the AAU Board and the audit panels.
- The reports of externally-initiated reviews, such as professional body accreditation, have the potential to be of considerable value to audit panels. The Review Panel is aware that the AAU currently makes efforts to take account of the views of professional bodies by asking that the Quality Portfolios include information about externally-initiated reviews (Audit Manual Section 5.3.iv).
- The efforts of the Director of the AAU to develop relationships with professional bodies through meetings, workshops and seminars is commended.

### 3 THE AUDIT PROCESS

#### 3.1. Impact of the Audit Process

##### *Comments*

- The audit process has been effective in encouraging a culture shift in the universities with respect to quality matters, though penetration has been uneven across the sector. However, there is a broad acknowledgement within the universities that positive benefits have resulted and the outcomes have been worth the costs.

*“The prospect of a quality review has caused the universities to examine and monitor processes in ways which they had not done hitherto. Under such examination, defects have been identified and addressed rather than lingering to face public exposure. The presence of the AAU, coupled with new awareness in social and legal contexts of the rights of consumers, has encouraged universities to make more effort to deliver services of quality.”*

(Extract from a submission to the External Review Panel)

- The procedures developed by the AAU which encourage the universities to undertake self review, with the AAU validating the process, have been a stimulus for reform resulting in initiatives such as:
  - improvements in strategic planning;
  - increased emphasis on the codification of processes and practices;
  - strengthened internal review mechanisms;
  - specific staff appointments such as Quality Managers;
  - an increased recognition for staff development;
  - improved promotion policies and procedures including increased recognition for excellence in teaching;
  - streamlined and strengthened programme design processes;
  - an increased willingness to seek feedback from students, graduates and employers and to incorporate their views in programme development and monitoring;
  - a raised profile for Treaty of Waitangi and social conscience issues.
- The audit process has enabled student groups on campus to highlight areas of particular concern to students.

*“The [AAU’s] philosophy of encouraging self-audit and international best-practice while avoiding the pitfalls of a mechanistic and bureaucratic model [meets] many of the concerns within students’ associations.”*

(Extract from a submission to the External Review Panel).

- The audit process has increased the credibility of the New Zealand university sector both nationally and internationally.

##### *Recommendation*

- 13** *That in view of the success of the AAU in its first years of operation the Review Panel strongly recommends to the NZVCC through the AAU Board that it confirm the AAU as an integral part of the New Zealand university system.*

### 3.2 Audit Panels

#### *Comments*

- There is a valuable mix of academic, external/community and overseas members on the audit panels and it is important this balance in the panel selection be maintained.
- The Review Panel supports the practice of having auditors serve on more than one audit panel in each cycle to improve consistency across audit panels.
- At present the participation of external representatives on audit panels relies on the financial goodwill of their sponsoring organisations. Continued reliance on goodwill contributions may eventually result in a decline in performance or an inability to participate.
- The opportunity for the universities to comment on the composition and balance of their audit panels is a commendable practice which has been well-received and has fostered trust in the AAU and the audit process.
- Participating in the audit process has had a significant impact on audit panel members both internal and external to the universities by increasing their knowledge and understanding of the university system.
- The auditor training programme for the first cycle of audits appears to have been appropriate and adequate.

#### *Recommendations*

- 14 *That the AAU continue, and where possible extend, its practice of having auditors serve on more than one audit panel in each cycle to ensure consistency across audit panels.*
- 15 *That the remuneration paid to audit panel members be increased in accordance with government approved rates for this kind of activity.*
- 16 *That before the next audit cycle commences there be a further training programme for auditors which builds on and incorporates feedback from the first audit cycle.*

### 3.3 Audit Manual

#### *Comments*

- The overall content of the Audit Manual is both useful and necessary. However, a number of criticisms relating to the style of the Audit Manual were made, including the following:
  - an overuse of technical language;
  - minor lack of internal coherence;
  - some unnecessary repetition;
  - too long;
  - need for an executive summary.

*“While helpful, the manual was not “user friendly”. It contained a lot of jargon and concepts that some staff could not relate to and the sheer volume was overwhelming. The format and function of the manual needs to be evaluated before any further audits are undertaken.”*

(Extract from a submission to the External Review Panel).

#### *Recommendations*

---

- 17 *That the Audit Manual be reviewed in light of experience and any approved changes to the audit scope and audit process, and be made more 'user-friendly'.*

### 3.4 Quality Portfolios

#### *Comments*

- The Review Panel endorses the guidelines for the preparation of the Quality Portfolio as set out in the Audit Manual.
- The Quality Portfolio is an important resource for audit panels and plays a key role in setting the agenda for the audit visit and ultimately the tone of the audit report.
- If the standard of a university's Quality Portfolio is deemed unsatisfactory, or poorly prepared, there should be a mechanism in place whereby an audit panel can refer it back to the university for improvement and resubmission.
- There would be benefit in having members of other audit panels scrutinise the Quality Portfolio of the university about to be audited as cross validation and to ensure all major issues of potential concern are addressed.
- Members of the AAU Board should receive a copy of each university's Quality Portfolio, along with its Audit Report, for their information.
- The fact that audit panels will receive written submissions other than the portfolio in the course of auditing a university (Audit Manual Section 5.6.3) is not widely known amongst student and staff groups.

#### *Recommendations*

- 18 *That if a university's Quality Portfolio is deemed not to have met a minimum standard by the panel auditing the institution, it be referred back to the university for resubmission with appropriate feedback and an extended submission date.*
- 19 *That members of other audit panels be invited to scrutinise the Quality Portfolio of the university about to be audited as a cross validation.*
- 20 *That a copy of each university's Quality Portfolio be forwarded to the members of the AAU Board along with the Audit Report for information.*

### 3.5 Audit Visits

#### *Comments*

- The Review Panel received extremely favourable feedback about the value of the planning visit made by chairs of audit panels and the Director of the AAU before audit visits, and this process is commended.
  - There is considerable diversity of opinion as to the appropriate length of audit visits. Concern was expressed to the Review Panel about whether it was possible to have a quality interaction with the university and its staff and students in three days, given the broad scope of the initial audit cycle. On the other hand, comments were also made about the stresses a longer audit visit would place on both the institutions and the audit panel members.
  - Opinion was also divided amongst those interviewed on the value of split panels. Some suggested that the increased use of split panels would provide a means of improving the quality of interaction with an institution and its staff. However
-

others, who had been members of the split panel lunch time sessions, expressed the view that they had been disadvantaged by the lack of opportunity to interact with the audit panel as a whole.

- General concerns raised about audit visits and visit programmes included:
  - the selection process;
  - the mix of people at some of the sessions and how they had come about;
  - the confidentiality of information imparted to the audit panels;
  - the extent to which people are free to comment on their own institutions.
- There was a perception amongst general staff that their perspective and insights were not seen as a valuable part of the consultation process.
- In the main, students were unaware they could request an interview with the audit panel towards the end of an audit visit.
- The Review Panel believes many of the criticisms raised about the audit visits and visit programmes could be addressed by:
  - extending the scope of the planning visit;
  - improving the quality of the information supplied to institutions before audit visits;
  - cutting back on the number of people interviewed during each session;
  - ensuring those who take part in split panel lunch time sessions have another opportunity to meet with the audit panel as a whole;
  - the introduction of theme audits (see Sections 4.1 & 4.2 of this report)
- It is important that audit panels take into account all delivery modes in the context of teaching and learning during their deliberations.
- Audit panels require sufficient time for rest, reflection and discussion, and the 'review' periods on the visit programme are a commendable and necessary feature.

### ***Recommendations***

- 21 *That the AAU prepare a brochure for staff and students setting out the audit rationale and role and responsibilities of the interviewees, and including advice about the opportunities for making submissions to the audit panel before visits and for requesting interviews during the visit.*
- 22 *That the length of audit visits be no more than three days.*
- 23 *That sufficient periods for members of the audit panels to reflect, rest and discuss be set aside in the visit programmes.*
- 24 *That the following procedural changes be made to arrangements for the audit visit and to the visit programmes:*
- *visit programmes to include some interviews with students and staff in their own environment*
  - *use of split panels to be strictly limited and preferably not used at all*
  - *no group to have only a lunch session*
  - *care to be taken to ensure there is sufficient opportunity for general staff to contribute to the audit process*
  - *care be taken to ensure that the audit panels take into account all delivery modes for teaching and learning during their deliberations.*
- 25 *That more careful attention be given to the selection of interviewees with the end result being that no more than 150 people be interviewed. This will enable a more in depth interaction to occur between those being interviewed and the audit panel.*

### **3.6 Audit Reports**

---

### **Comments**

- The obscure style of the audit reports which embeds the commendations, criticisms, suggestions and recommendations in the body of the text makes extraction of the key points a challenging task.

*“...key statements were either not present or buried in detailed comments. We had to extract these statements and interpret as best we could to provide it to staff, students and stakeholders.”*

*“There was inconsistency in the use of highlighting of recommendations and the underlining of comments. The pattern of use was confusing. For example, some of the underlined statements were not comments at all and in other cases the underlining skewed the emphasis of the sentence or paragraph.”*

(Extracts from a submission to the External Review Panel).
- Some criticism was levelled at the bland and ‘sanitised’ tone of the reports.

*“The suppressed tone of the report was a disappointment as we were prepared for more explicit criticism of our deficiencies and commendation of our successes.”*

(Extract from a submission to the Review Panel).
- The style of report writing used for the audit reports was adopted following the pilot audits. However, the university environment has changed substantially since then, and there is now an acceptance of, and even requests for, more explicit recommendations, an overall concluding statement, and a more robust style of argumentation.
- This acceptance has arisen because trust has been developed between the institutions and the AAU which is seen as being very responsive to feedback from the universities, and to have produced reports that are authoritative, credible, accurate and fair.
- The opportunity given to the universities to comment on points of factual error before public release of the reports has been much appreciated, and has helped foster this trust in the AAU.
- The Review Panel supports the inclusion in each audit report of a context statement addressing such issues as the environment in which the institution operates, its resource base, staff and student profile, and any distinctive features or characteristics.
- Care should be taken to ensure the reports are institution-specific, and avoid comparison and generalised comment on the university sector as a whole.
- As noted previously in Section 3.4 of this report, the quality of the reports is to some extent dependent on the quality of the portfolios. Improving the quality of the portfolios would have a flow-on effect in enabling the reports to reflect more fairly the performance of the institutions.
- Audit Reports should be available on the AAU Web Site.

### **Recommendation**

- 26** *That the audit reports become more robust in argumentation and explicit in style and recommendations.*

## **3.7 Audit Follow-Up**

### **Comments**

---

- The Review Panel notes that it is too early to evaluate the extent to which New Zealand universities have responded to audit reports. At the time of writing, the University of Auckland has yet to be audited, and only one university, Victoria, has been invited to respond to a ‘follow-up’ request from the AAU.
- The Audit Manual (Section 3.8) refers to an invitation being extended to each institution to provide a short ‘progress report’ 12-24 months after the audit report is published. However, many university representatives are uncertain about what this follow-up process involves or requires of their institution.
- It is vital there be a well-publicised and clearly understood follow-up process both to maintain the momentum of quality improvement within the universities and to maintain the credibility of the audit process within the universities and the wider community.
- Several staff pointed out that the real value of the audit process will only be measured in the way in which the universities address the audit report recommendations and associated issues.

*“The recommendations that are made as a result of the audit are neither binding nor have any timelines for putting them into effect. In addition, the fact that it will be four years before the university will be audited again sets the AAU up to be potentially a “paper tiger”. Interest groups and critics could thus claim that the universities have developed a process that in the final analysis “lacks teeth”.*

(Extract from a submission to the External Review Panel).

- While advocating the existence of a clearly understood follow-up process, the Review Panel does not consider that the AAU should take on a policing and compliance role with regard to implementation of the audit reports; the primary responsibility for responding to audit lies with the individual universities. However, given that the reputation and quality of the university sector depends on the quality of its member institutions, it would be helpful if the NZVCC were to take a supportive role by reviewing progress toward implementation of the audit recommendations on an annual basis.
- Some audit panel members suggested that it may be useful for all or some of the audit panel, to return to the University approximately three months after the publication of the audit report to discuss matters surrounding the recommendations and to offer advice and insight.

### ***Recommendations***

- 27 *That the AAU fully inform universities of follow-up plans when the audit report is released.*
- 28 *That the primary responsibility for responding to audit continue to lie with the individual universities but that the AAU Board ask the NZVCC to act in a supportive role by reviewing progress towards implementation of the audit recommendations of its member institutions on an annual basis.*
- 29 *That the AAU Board give consideration to the suggestion that all or some of the audit panel return to an institution approximately three months after the publication of the audit report to discuss matters surrounding the recommendations and to offer advice and provide insight.*

## **4 FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

---

---

## 4.1 Next Cycle of Audits

### Comments

- As previously stated, the scope of the next audits should encompass both processes and outcomes.
- During its investigations, the Review Panel found that opinion was divided as to the form the next audit cycle should take. There was support for both the comprehensive ‘whole institution’ audits of the initial cycle and for more focused or theme audits.

*“It might be feasible in the next round of audits for the AAU to focus on particular aspects - for example there might be an audit based solely on research and its relations to teaching. This more limited focus would help to overcome some of the criticisms we have made about the shortness of time allowed to the auditors.”*

(Extract from a submission to the External Review Panel)

- However, the Review Panel considers that in the next audit cycle there is a place for both theme and comprehensive ‘whole institution’ audits because of the different emphases and benefits of each.
- The comprehensive ‘whole institution’ audit would follow a similar pattern to the current audit cycle, whereas the theme audits would focus on a particular topic or area of interest across the university sector, with each university being audited in turn on the same theme.
- The Review Panel noted that funding for the current audit cycle ceases on 30 June 1998 and is of the view that an extension of funding is required until the end of 1998, to ensure completion, including ‘follow-up’ of the initial audit cycle, and to allow sufficient time to plan for the next audit cycle.
- The AAU Board, in consultation with the NZVCC and other interested parties, should determine the audit themes and set the audit programme.

*“...any aspect chosen...should be fundamental to the distinctive nature of a University...The public, and others, needs to see that we are performing our distinctive role.”*

(Extract from a submission to the External Review Panel).

- Audit themes suggested include:
  - research
  - teaching and learning
  - the research/teaching nexus
  - strategic planning
  - resource allocation
  - EEO
  - community service
  - postgraduate supervision and support
  - the Treaty of Waitangi
  - staff and employment matters
  - student services
  - the external examiner system
  - the university’s role as critic and conscience of society.
- In addition to the nationwide theme audit, each university could be invited to nominate a University-specific theme which the audit panel would investigate alongside the main nationwide theme. The University-specific theme would be an area of especial interest or currency within an individual university, whereas the nationwide theme would focus on areas of interest across the sector.

- Because of the more focused nature of the theme audits, smaller audit panels would be used during the theme rounds. It would be appropriate for the audit panel conducting the comprehensive ‘whole institution’ audit to be of the same size as the current audit panels.
- It is important the audit programme and nation-wide themes be known well in advance of the commencement of the first audit in the next cycle, both to assist the universities’ planning and preparation, and to instil public confidence in the audit process.

### ***Recommendations***

- 30 *That the next cycle of audits comprise three theme audits followed by a comprehensive ‘whole institution’ audit, a six-year cycle with each audit taking 18 months to complete. This cycle to commence in 1999, with 1998 being used to complete the initial cycle and to plan for the next cycle.*
- 31 *That the AAU Board seek an extension of funding for the current audit cycle to the end of 1998, to ensure completion of the initial cycle, including ‘follow-up’, and to allow sufficient time for planning of the next cycle.*
- 32 *That in the interests of sound management, fairness and equity, and given an ever-changing political, financial and economic environment, every effort be made to ensure that each theme audit round be concluded within a 12 month period. This will ensure that matters of national concern are effectively highlighted and sector-wide improvement strategies put in place as soon as possible.*

### **AAU - CYCLE OF AUDITS**

33 *That the theme audits be nationwide, with each university being audited in turn on that theme, and with the comprehensive ‘whole institution’ audit following a similar pattern to the current audits but with a concentration on outcomes as well as processes across the range of university activities.*

34 *That in addition to the nationwide theme, each institution be invited to nominate an university-specific theme for the audit panel to review alongside the nationwide theme. For example:*

	Nationwide theme	University-specific theme
University 1	Postgraduate Supervision & Support	Treaty of Waitangi
University 2	Postgraduate Supervision & Support	Community Service
University 3	Postgraduate Supervision & Support	Student Services

35 *That the AAU Board take responsibility for determining the nationwide themes and the programme for each audit cycle, taking into account any emergent themes from the initial cycle of audits, and after consultation with the NZVCC and other interested parties.*

36 *That the theme audit panels be smaller in size than those used in the initial audit cycle, but in order to spread the auditing load and ensure the integrity and standing of the audit reports, they consist of not fewer than four members including at least one member from outside the university sector, with the comprehensive ‘whole institution’ audit panel retaining the size and composition of the typical audit panel as set out in the Audit Manual (Section 8.1).*

37 *That the themes and the audit programme be widely publicised before the cycle commences as a signal both to the universities and the wider community of the audit cycle’s scope and intent.*

#### 4.2 Theme and Comprehensive Audits

##### Comments:

- In relation to outcomes the future audit scope should embody overall institutional performance as measured by performance indicators.
- It is timely for the university sector as a whole to develop further the use of performance indicators and international benchmarking
- With respect to theme audits both process and outcomes should be taken into account.
- It would be appropriate to review the Audit Manual, auditor training programme, and information disseminated via the Web Site to incorporate these changes to the audit scope.

#### 4.3 Future activities of the AAU

##### Comments

- Notwithstanding earlier comments about the limited staff resources of the AAU, an expansion of its educative role is timely.

*“The Academic Audit Unit could...play a much more pro-active role in promulgating international best practices with regard to quality assurance.”*

(Extract from a submission to the External Review Panel).

*“...consideration [could] be given to strengthening the AAU’s role in advocating best practice, including reference to external models as appropriate.”*

(Extract from a submission to the External Review Panel)

- There is scope for the AAU to organise workshops and undertake commissioned audits on a full cost recovery basis.

### ***Recommendations***

- 38 *That the AAU extend its educative role including engaging in full cost recovery activities such as workshops and commissioned audit undertakings.*

## **4.4 Funding Matters**

### *Comments*

- The AAU has been managed in a cost-effective and efficient manner during its first years of operation.
- The AAU is under-resourced with respect to such matters as: performance of the AAU's educative role, funds available to pay audit panel members, technological support, and progression opportunities for staff.
- An increase in funding of the AAU is required to consolidate the stability and independence of the AAU and the audit process.
- It is time the AAU moved from marginal funding and a reliance on goodwill (for example the financial support of the sponsoring organisations of external representatives on audit panels), to a funding situation that reflects real costs.
- One means of improving the AAU’s financial position would be to charge each university the real costs of audit. Other means which warrant exploration include:
  - commercialisation opportunities;
  - obtaining an increase in the operating grant;
  - a mix of the above.

### ***Recommendations***

- 39 *That strategies for securing ongoing and adequate funding of the AAU be explored by the AAU Board in combination with the NZVCC.*
- 40 *That consideration be given to moving towards charging each university the full costs of audit.*
- 41 *That the resources of the AAU be expanded to enable it to respond to its terms of reference more fully in relation to quality enhancement, good practice and benchmarking.*

## APPENDIX A

### External AAU Review Panel

Dr Phil Meade, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), University of Otago,  
(Convener)

Professor Timoti Karetu, Maori Language Commissioner

Professor Jane Morrison, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Development), University of New  
South Wales

Mr Colin O’Loughlin, Consultant in Forestry and Science

#### *Administrative Support*

Ms Margaret Morgan, Quality Advancement Manager, University of Otago.

### Terms of Reference of the Review

- 1 Investigate and report on whether the AAU has successfully met the Terms of Reference set by the NZVCC, and the Critical Success Factors identified by the Board.
- 2 Investigate and report on the AAU’s effect on the universities.
- 3 Investigate and report on the AAU’s effects more generally.
- 4 Recommend any changes or improvements in the audit process.
- 5 Provide comment on the Terms of Reference of the AAU and the composition of the Board of the AAU, including comment on possible future activities, structures or goals for the AAU.

## APPENDIX B

### SUBMISSIONS

#### CUAP Responses

- 1 University of Auckland
- 2 University of Canterbury
- 3 University of Otago
- 4 Massey University
- 5 Lincoln University
- 6 Victoria University of Wellington
- 7 UNITEC

#### University Responses

- 8 Professor W.G Carson  
Vice-Chancellor  
University of Auckland
- 9 Professor Warren J Parker  
Head of Department (Agribusiness & Resource Management)  
Massey University
- 10 Helen Renwick  
University Librarian  
Massey University
- 11 Dr Keith Sullivan  
Director of Postgraduate Studies  
Victoria University of Wellington
- 12 Penny Fenwick  
Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic)  
Victoria University of Wellington
- 13 Dr Neville Withers  
Quality Assurance Manager  
Waikato University

#### Student Association Responses

- 14 Rick Marshall  
WSU President  
Waikato Students Union  
University of Waikato
- 15 Dean Carroll  
Education Co-ordinator  
VUWSA  
Victoria University of Wellington

### **Professional Societies Responses**

- 16 Dr KJ Thomson  
President  
The Medical Council of New Zealand
- 17 Catherine Smith  
NZVA Board  
New Zealand Veterinary Association Inc.
- 18 Graeme Law  
Secretary of the Council  
New Zealand Council of Legal Education
- 19 Katherine Fraser  
Education Development Manager  
New Zealand Institute of Valuers

### **Staff Association Responses**

- 20 Ijan Beveridge  
President  
Association of University Staff
- 21 Mr Tim Bravenboer  
Organiser  
PSA

### **Other Responses**

- 22 Dr Douglas Blackmur  
Chief Executive  
New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)
- 23 Elizabeth Eppel  
Group Manager  
PCET Policy  
Ministry of Education

**APPENDIX C**

**AAU REVIEW PANEL INTERVIEW PROGRAMME  
4 - 5 September 1997**

**DAY 1 Thursday 4 September**

- 9.00 am Panel assembles (15 mins)
- 1.1** 9.15 am Some members of AAU Board (60 mins)
- Mr Gill Cox (nominated by ICANZ)  
Mr Peter Harris (nominated by the national trade union body)
- Dr Norman Kingsbury (Chair)  
Ms Robyn Leeming (nominated by NZ Employers' Federation)  
Mr Buddy Mikaere (representative of the community)  
Mr Basil Wakelin (nominated by IPENZ)
- 10.15 am Review (15 mins)
- 1.2** 10.30 am Staff Associations (60 mins)
- Mr Rob Crozier Executive Director, AUS  
Ms Margaret Ledgerton, Research Officer, AUS  
Mr Neville Blampied, AUS Member (University of Canterbury & AUS nominee on AAU Board)  
Mr Michael Walker, Academic Vice-President, AUS (The University of Auckland)  
Mr Tim Bravenboer, PSA  
Ms Barb Harold, University of Waikato, ASTE  
Ms Kathleen Vossler, Massey University, ASTE
- 11.30 am Review (15 mins)
- 1.3** 11.45 am Vice-Chancellors' Committee (75 mins)
- 11.45-12.10 Chair, NZVCC (by telephone)  
Professor Bryan Gould, Waikato
- 12.10-12.40 NZVCC nominee on AAU Board  
Professor Les Holborow, VUW
- 12.40-1.00 Executive Director, NZVCC  
Mr Lindsay Tairaro
- 1.4** 1.00 pm Students and student representatives (includes lunch; 60 mins)
- Mr Dean Carroll (Education Officer, VUW)  
Mr Michael Gibbs (President, NZUSA, formerly VUW)
-

---

		Mr Patrick Rooney (President, Massey USA) Ms La Ropiha (Te Mana Akonga, Ngai Taurira, VUW) Mr Paul Williams (former NZUSA nominee on AAU Board) Mr Hayden Wilson (Vice-President, NZUSA, formerly OU; also current NZUSA nominee on AAU Board)
	2.00 pm	Review (30 mins)
<b>1.6</b>	2.30 pm	Auditors (60 mins)
		Assoc Prof Tony Charleston      Massey University (Otago Audit) Professor Gareth Jones      University of Otago (Canterbury Audit) Mr Rau Kirikiri      Lincoln (Massey Audit) Mr Graeme McNally      Christchurch (Auckland Pilot Audit, CUAP Audit) Dr Margaret Mutu      The University of Auckland (VUW, Waikato Audits)
<b>1.7</b>	3.30 pm	Staff heavily involved with audit preparations (45 - 60 mins)
		Mr Martin Carroll      Massey University (Projects Manager, Vice-Chancellor's Office) Professor Cedric Hall      Victoria University of Wellington (Dean, Education) Dr Neville Withers      University of Waikato (Quality Manager) Assoc Prof Chris Heath      University of Otago (Quality Advancement Committee member)
	4.15 pm	Review (15 mins)
	4.30 pm	Director, AAU (60 mins) Dr David Woodhouse
	5.30 pm	CLOSE
<b>DAY 2 Friday 5 September</b>		
	9.00 am	Panel assembles (30 mins)
<b>2.1</b>	9.30 am	Chair, AAU Board (15 mins) Dr Norman Kingsbury
	9.45 am	CLOSE OF INTERVIEWS
	10.45 am	Review and begin drafting report (Director, AAU to be on standby to assist with questions that might arise)

---

12.00 Noon Lunch (Panel and Director, AAU)

1.15 pm Drafting report

5.00 pm CLOSE

(Note: Other private meetings of panel are not shown)