A meeting of the Academic Board will be held on Tuesday, 24 September 2019 at 1:00pm in the Hunter Council Chamber.

AGENDA

PART A

1. APOLOGIES AND WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS

2. PART B OF THE AGENDA
   
   To consider: requests from members to transfer items from Part B to Part A of the agenda.

   *Items for approval that are not transferred to Part A will be considered approved.*

3. ORAL REPORTS
   
   To receive: oral reports from:
   
   - Vice-Chancellor
   - Provost
   - Tumu Ahurei (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Māori)
   - Vice-Provost (Academic)
   - Vice-Provost (Research).

4. PROVOST’S FORUM
   
   To discuss: Advance HE Accreditation

5. ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEWS
   
   To receive: the report and implementation plan for the Music academic programme review;

   To receive: the report and implementation plan for the Landscape Architecture academic programme review;

   To advise: the Pro-Vice Chancellors and Deans on any matters arising from the reviews.
To approve: for forwarding to the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP), the following Graduating Year Reviews:

- **Commerce**
  - i. Master of e-Government

- **Education**
  - ii. Bachelor of Education (Honours)
  - iii. Master of Teaching and Learning

- **Humanities and Social Sciences**
  - iv. Master of Political Science

- **Science**

The next meeting will be held at 1:00pm on Tuesday, 12 November 2019 in the Hunter Council Chamber.

### PART B

**MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

To confirm: the minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 20 August 2019 (Nos. 52.19–62.19). Note: The Minute related to 63.19 is excluded at this time due to confidentiality.

**REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC COMMITTEE**

To approve: the 16 non-CUAP proposals summarised in the report;

To note: the other matters discussed and/or approved by the Committee at its 3 September meeting.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW UPDATES**

To receive: the implementation update reports from the following academic programme reviews:

- i. Initial Teacher Education;
- ii. Science in Society;
- iii. Interior Architecture and Architecture History & Theory.

**MEETING DATES 2020**

To note: the 2020 Academic Board meeting dates:

- Tuesday 17 March
- Tuesday 21 April
- Tuesday 23 June
- Tuesday 21 July
- Tuesday 25 August
- Tuesday 22 September
- Tuesday 10 November.

*All meetings are scheduled for 1pm in the Hunter Council Chamber.*
Executive Summary
This paper outlines a proposal for a staff development approach using an accreditation partnership with Advance HE (formerly HEA). This will provide the opportunity for all VUW academic staff members to obtain an internationally recognised higher education accreditation for learning and teaching.

We are proposing that the University:

1. Obtain a strategic membership of the Advance HE and accredit a programme of staff development courses.

2. That CAD restructure the existing HELT programme courses into a combination of taught and online micro-credentials sufficient to meet the needs of Advance HE accreditors according to the timetable provided below.

3. That the University formally recognise the value of accreditation and other teaching qualifications in the criteria for promotion for academics and other teaching staff.

Recommendation
That Academic Board discuss these proposals and provide feedback.
Current Context
The Centre for Academic Development (CAD) has offered the Postgraduate Certificate and Diploma in higher education learning and teaching (PHELT) programme since 2007. PHELT comprises two high quality CUAP-approved postgraduate qualifications, with pathways into Masters and Doctoral study in the School of Education. These are offered to VUW academic and professional staff.

Participant-students have unequivocally commended the teaching approach adopted in PHELT and claimed that they feel that what they have learned is valuable in their feedback and through formal focus groups (e.g. in the 2015 external moderation review and the 2016 GYR report). PHELT graduates in the past five years have been awarded with two Victoria Early Career Teaching Awards, six Victoria Teaching Excellence Awards and a national Ako Aotearoa teaching award, based on the portfolios they developed in the PHELT.

Despite this positive experience, the PHELT programme has struggled to attract significant numbers of enrolments with EFTS remaining low. This low impact is not inconsistent with that reported for similar programmes in other New Zealand institutions and appears to reflect a combination of factors including high workload pressures and the less than optional positioning of the programme by the university in formal recognition and promotion processes.

PHELT Programme Completions 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Completed EFTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internationally, accreditation is gaining in popularity as an alternative to formal teaching qualifications for academics. Accreditation is a process of structured reflection aligned to formal standards and supported by peer review that is informed by evidence generated in normal work practice. Unlike a qualification, attendance in formal classes and assessed work is not required, although a formal professional development programme can be used to facilitate gaining accreditation.

The United Kingdom professional accreditation scheme operated by the Advance HE organisation\(^1\), introduced to address concerns regarding professional teaching standards in UK higher education, is now widely recognised and offers a range of fellowship levels: Associate Fellow, Fellow, Senior Fellow, and Principal Fellow. These allow for recognition of teaching work by staff working as tutors, through to staff working at various levels of academic responsibility, including strategic leadership of educational change and improvement.

Two other universities in New Zealand – Auckland University of Technology and Massey University – are HEA subscribers and are already offering HEA Accredited programmes with AUT having contextualised the UK standards to reflect a New Zealand/Aotearoa perspective\(^2\). In late 2018, Ako Aotearoa executed a Memorandum of Understanding with Advance HE to collaborate on the

\(^1\) [https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/individuals/fellowship](https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/individuals/fellowship)

\(^2\) [https://cflat.aut.ac.nz/ako-aronui/](https://cflat.aut.ac.nz/ako-aronui/)
development of accreditation processes, building on the experience of AUT and Massey\(^3\). They are now working to explore potential developments for New Zealand tertiary education\(^4\).

Advance HE accreditation is similarly gaining in acceptance in Australia and the Australian Tertiary Education and Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA) entered into an MoU with Advance HE in 2018 recognising the significant presence the fellowships have there\(^5\). Australian universities accredited through Advance HE include the Australian National University, Murdoch University, QUT and the University of Tasmania.

In 2018, 15 VUW staff obtained accreditation as Senior or Principal Fellows in the HEA in a pilot project led by CAD and involving staff from across the University\(^6\). This project helped CAD understand the practical issues involved in obtaining recognition for staff teaching in New Zealand using the UK professional standards, and with reviews undertaken by predominantly UK-based reviewers.

**Proposed Changes**

This paper proposes that VUW obtain a strategic membership of the Advance HE and accredit a programme of academic staff development courses. This would see us adopting a strategy for supporting continuous academic professional development that would be enacted through a combination of existing courses (necessary for recognition and accreditation by Advance HE), and recognition of other learning and teaching work undertaken by staff, with portfolios reviewed by VUW peers.

As part of this change, CAD would restructure the existing HELT programme courses into a combination of taught and online micro-credentials (expected to be 5 points/50 hours in size) sufficient to meet the needs of Advance HE accreditors according to the timetable provided below. PHELT courses are currently delivered via weekly workshops as the most time efficient way of ensuring sufficient face-to-face contact and student collaborative time. However, recently a number of courses have moved to block mode (e.g. HELT 501, HELT 502) in order to create a more flexible approach for its cohort. HELT 507, with its focus on digital technologies and approaches, uses a number of delivery techniques, in part as a tool for flexibility, but also to model approaches that we want participant students to consider applying in their own teaching contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2019 – December 2019</td>
<td>Up to 5 courses updated for accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>Membership commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimester 1 2020</td>
<td>Submit courses for accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimester 2 2020</td>
<td>New Accredited Programme Commences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) [https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/ako-aotearoa-MoU](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/ako-aotearoa-MoU)

\(^4\) [https://ako.ac.nz/assets/reports/Synthesis-reports/64b76bfc74/SYNTHESIS-REPORT-Professional-standards-for-Tertiary-Teachers.pdf](https://ako.ac.nz/assets/reports/Synthesis-reports/64b76bfc74/SYNTHESIS-REPORT-Professional-standards-for-Tertiary-Teachers.pdf)


\(^6\) 2018 Pilot Outcome: Principal Fellows: A Prof Meegan Hall, Prof Rawinia Higgins, Prof Wendy Larner, A Prof Stephen Marshall, A Prof Kathryn Sutherland, Prof Steven Warburton, Prof Marc Wilson. Senior Fellows: Tash Buist, Dr Sue Cherrington, Dr Irina Elgort, Jonathan Flutey, Dr Xiaodan Gao, Dr Amanda Gilbert, Dr Bernadette Knewstub, Dr James McKinnon
This programme would be designed to normally require a maximum of 150 hours of additional work by staff seeking accreditation as Fellows or Senior Fellows over a two-year period, with parts of the programme designed to support reflection of work being undertaken as part of normal learning and teaching duties.

In order to communicate the importance of ongoing professional development and improvement in learning and teaching, success in obtaining recognition through fellowships will need to be incorporated into the University’s formal recognition and promotion systems. Following the example of universities elsewhere, this could be done in a variety of ways such as including requirement for a Fellowship or equivalent for promotion over the L5 bar or to Senior Lecturer, and a recognition of a Senior or Principal Fellowship as part of the criterion for promotion to Associate Professor. Progress towards levels of fellowship could also be incorporated into the Victoria Academic Career Framework\(^7\) and PDCP process.

There are other accreditation schemes being operated which have relevance to University learning and teaching, including the Association for Learning Technologies (CMALT) for learning technology\(^8\) and professional bodies such as the New Zealand Nursing Council (NZNC), the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC), and the Institute of Professional Engineers of New Zealand (IPENZ). The HEA Fellowship process could accommodate evidence used for these other accreditations allowing staff to obtain recognition in multiple schemes without significant duplicated work.

**Benefits of Shift to Advance HE Accreditation**

The main benefit of the proposed change would be to create a substantive and meaningful academic professional development scheme able to operate at scale. As well, this approach could offer the ongoing professional development needed to engage with the full range of staff in teaching roles at VUW including tutors, teaching fellows and academics at different points in their careers.

Other benefits to the University include:

- Recognition for staff through a fellowship that has a well-established international recognition and reputation and is thus portable.
- Reputation benefits for the University by promoting its qualifications and programmes internationally through showing the capability of the teaching staff and how its quality is benchmarked against international standards.
- Responsiveness to the evolving needs of the University for capability in changing and improving learning and teaching enacted in a way that also demonstrates the University’s commitment to its staff and their ongoing career development.
- Reduction in workload for staff gaining formal recognition by providing a mechanism that incorporates recognition for work undertaken as part of normal learning and teaching activities and associated change and improvement initiatives.

---

\(^7\) [https://intranet.victoria.ac.nz/staff/human-resources/academic-promotion/documents/victoria-academic-career-framework.pdf](https://intranet.victoria.ac.nz/staff/human-resources/academic-promotion/documents/victoria-academic-career-framework.pdf)

\(^8\) [https://www.alt.ac.uk/certified-membership](https://www.alt.ac.uk/certified-membership)
MEMORANDUM

To Academic Board
From Professor Stuart Brock, Vice-Provost (Academic)
Date 16 September 2019
Subject Academic programme review – NZ School of Music and Landscape Architecture programmes

Executive Summary
The reports and subsequent implementation plans resulting from the following academic programme reviews are attached for the consideration of the Academic Board:

1. New Zealand School of Music (reviewed in July 2018)
2. Landscape Architecture (reviewed in October 2018)

Each implementation plan has been approved by the Dean and Faculty Board for the relevant Faculty (Humanities and Social Sciences, and Architecture and Design, respectively).

The New Zealand School of Music – Te Kōkī (NZSM) review made 8 commendations of good practice in the School’s programmes, including the breadth of offerings, the high achievement of graduating students, and strong outreach activity across external partners and organisations.

The review also made 15 recommendations, which were all accepted and are now being actioned. This includes beginning a curriculum development process and collaboration with Faculty and University marketing activity.

The Landscape Review made 6 commendations, including the strong sense of community and collaborative atmosphere amongst staff and students in the programme. This review also made 10 recommendations, and a number of suggestions for ways the Landscape Programme would be able to act on those recommendations. The Programme accepted all the recommendations and actions taken in response include a CAD-supported review of curriculum, and identification of core landscape material in shared courses and possible electives outside the Faculty.

Recommendation
That the Academic Board:

1. Receive the report and implementation plan for the academic programme review of the New Zealand School of Music
2. Receive the report and implementation plan for the academic programme review of the Landscape Architecture programme
3. Advise the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellors & Deans on any matters arising from the reviews.

Enclosed

I. Report from the academic programme review of NZSM
II. Implementation plan from the academic programme review of NZSM
III. Report from the academic programme review of Landscape Architecture
IV. Implementation plan from the academic programme review of Landscape Architecture
ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Review of New Zealand School of Music – Te Kōkī

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Plan Development &amp; Approval</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td>04 July 2019</td>
<td>Christina Hyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>04 July 2019</td>
<td>Christina Hyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Board (or equivalent)</td>
<td>13 June 2019</td>
<td>Christina Hyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>10 July 2019</td>
<td>Edward Schofield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | Ensure that the organisation of the School has clarity on the person(s) or committee(s) responsible for the following areas:  
  - Teaching and Learning/Curriculum  
  - Postgraduate Coordinator  
  - Health and safety  
  - Equity and Diversity  
  - Engagement                                                                                                                                  | (Accepted / Not Accepted, with comment.)
  Accepted, and completed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
<p>| 2.  | Ensure there is a strong leadership team supporting the Director in NZSM, which can facilitate developments across and outside the School. This may require a consideration of the appointment of one or two senior staff as part of new hires in the future.                                                                 | Accepted: work to develop confidence and skills in NZSM staff is ongoing; further hires are resource dependent and a function of academic priorities.                                                                                       |
| 3.  | Review the undergraduate offerings comprehensively, including each major, with a goal of allowing students more flexibility in course choices across programmes and creating pathways for study in multiple disciplines.                                                                                                                                             | Accepted: work by NZSM Curriculum Review Development Group (established Nov 2018), with Programme Directors and Associated staff, and FHSS Associate Deans                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 3a. | As part of the curriculum review, ensure performance students are maximising the ‘transferable skills’ required for being a professional musician.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Accepted                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 3b. | As part of the curriculum review, consider how to introduce musical pedagogy/teaching skills that will facilitate graduates being able to teach effectively in a studio setting.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Accepted. Budget constraints ruled out recruitment of a pedagogy specialist after a 2017 departure; current collaboration with School of Education requires an NZSM relay (competitors are reinforcing this EFTS-rich area).                                                                 |
| 4.  | Provide clarity to students and staff on the roles and responsibilities of artist teachers, and how they differ from                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Accepted. Demand on Artist Teachers to assume coordinator roles previously ensured by (departed)                                                                                                                                                                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic staff.</td>
<td>Academies poses problems: ATs depend for administrative tasks on School Office, overloaded since 2018 restructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ensure that assessment practices in all parts of the School (in all subjects, at all levels) are both suitable for music students and in line with the University’s Assessment Handbook.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.</td>
<td>Consider means to provide students with course credit or recognition of creative and performance work undertaken outside formal course work (e.g. for contribution towards public performances). This would require close consultation with faculty staff in FHSS and the Academic Office as to the best means to achieve such recognition.</td>
<td>Accepted. Microcredentials could contribute to such means, appealing to non-NZSM and NZSM students (e.g. for cultural management, recording tech skills).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Work with the relevant Faculty and central university communications group(s) to promote their Postgraduate options and qualifications, emphasising the strengths of taking postgraduate study at NZSM and the high quality research and distinctive offerings available.</td>
<td>Accepted. Improved visibility of PG offerings – Mmus, MMA, Honours – is needed. Music PG qualifications fall outside current FHSS promotion campaign for taught MA offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Clarify the roles and responsibilities for supervision of thesis students, and ensure that wherever possible students are assigned supervisors who will not be on leave for the majority of the year.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Utilise the faculty expertise in tracking Māori and Pasifika students to identify and react to areas of the programmes that may allow greater retention, and improve the cultural competence of all staff in the School. Consider whether the responsibility for tracking Māori and Pasifika student success and staff cultural competence lies with the equity and diversity person/group established in Recommendation 1.</td>
<td>Accepted. NZSM staff cohort took Te Hāpai programme in 2018; 2019 follow-up in planning. The absence of Māori or Pasifika staff is a shortcoming, as regards student success and staff cultural competence. Discussion to identify a possible cross-school strategic hire is underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The School, Faculty and University should work to develop a model for codifying the engagement outputs of the School into the financial model, and identify the strategic, cultural and public good provided by a successful NZSM in annual management and engagement planning processes.</td>
<td>Accepted. Discussion will be sought with VUW Engagement and Finance leaders to see how philanthropic revenue arising from resource-intensive NZSM activities can feature in business plans. 'Creativity' CoRE exchanges with cultural policy and arts academics are informing “public good” discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ensure the current facilities are consistent with the health and safety needs of all students and staff. To achieve this requires that both the physical environment as well as organizational and reporting structures facilitate communication and awareness.</td>
<td>Accepted. - Efforts to clarify organisational and reporting structures are underway. - Physical facilities issues lie beyond control of the School: - VUWSA reported issues to VUW’s Director of Safety, Risk &amp; Assurance, and NZSM’s Director, in June 2018. - Issues were regularly noted at FMT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Continue to analyse the work and needs of the administrative office in the School, in order to identify and clarify to all staff and students where and with whom the responsibility for each activity lies.</td>
<td>Accepted NZSM administrative restructure launched in 2017 shortly after arrival of the current Director has raised staffing issues still outstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Promote the School’s distinctive offerings and strengths, at the levels of School staff, faculty staff and university marketing.</td>
<td>Accepted Specific advertising for NZSM 2020 recruitment is underway, managed by the FHSS Communications and Marketing Manager. The University’s undergraduate recruitment campaign, Know Your Mind, features an NZSM student, speaking to the excellent teaching received at the University/NZSM. Communication messaging for the planned national music centre includes strong messages around the excellence of NZSM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>That an archive of NZSM events be kept on the NZSM website.</td>
<td>Accepted but cannot be advanced without central support. Unresolved requests since 2017 to web services, communications, marketing, to ensure archiving of promotional materials that disappear once events have taken place, are frustrating for donors and potential recruits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Introduce a pan-NZSM postgraduate seminar series, in collaboration with students and staff, to facilitate students sharing of work and research and also provide career development skills.</td>
<td>Accepted Some PG presentations are hosted by Music Forum seminars; means to run a complementary, specific PG research platform are under discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Utilise the links of the AVC-Pasifika office by working with them to investigate opportunities for university-level music study for Tongan students specifically, and other Pacific nations more broadly.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation details

Recommendation 1 (Clarity on the person(s)/committee(s) responsible for areas)
Responsibility: Director, NZSM Leadership Strategy Group, School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All key roles/ assigned persons have been clarified.</td>
<td>Mid 2019</td>
<td>Mid 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 2 (Strong leadership team supporting the Director)
Responsibility: Director, Dean FHSS, HR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New staff appointments to be considered as opportunities arise and resources permit. Professional development opportunities to explore and encourage to provide leadership around the Director, together with promotion and succession planning.</td>
<td>End of 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 3, 3a, 3b (Review the undergraduate offerings)
Responsibility: Curriculum Development Working Group convened by Deputy Director/ Composition Programme Director, working with Associate Deans in FHSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum review led by Deputy Director (replaced during Tri2-Tri3 2019 RSL by Composition Programme Director) is working with NZSM staff to implement changes to the four UG majors. Review of PERF majors is extensive and requires CUAP approval (Round 1, 2020). Changes to CMPO and MUSC are smaller in scope and will be implemented via FHSS processes. Associate Dean Academic will assist with these processes. 3a. Addressed via the curriculum review process outlined above 3b. Changes to existing courses in music pedagogy will address this recommendation, making the study of music pedagogy accessible to advanced UG students, and allowing for focused study of music performance pedagogy at Hons level.</td>
<td>Mid 2020</td>
<td>Mid 2020 End 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 4 (Clarity on the roles and responsibilities of artist teachers)
Responsibility: Classical and Jazz Programme Directors, School Manager, FHSS Associate Dean for Teaching and Equity, FHSS Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision of Artist Teacher Handbook Review of HR-related aspects of role, including exploration of resourcing of fractional permanent coordinator appointments</td>
<td>Jan 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 5, 5a (Assessment practices suitable for music students)
Responsibility: Learning and Teaching Committee representative with Faculty Associate Dean for Teaching and Equity, NZSM Curriculum Development Working Group and Leadership Strategy Group, NZSM Department Heads/ Academic Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing and integral to Curriculum Development Working Group considerations</td>
<td>Mid 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 6 (Promote postgraduate options and qualifications)
Responsibility: Faculty Communications Manager with NZSM Post-Graduate Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss marketing options with FHSS Communications Manager, to include NZSM qualifications within future FHSS marketing priorities.</td>
<td>End of 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 7 (Clarify roles and responsibilities for supervision)
Responsibility: Post-Graduate Coordinator, Leadership Strategy Group, Director, FHSS Associate Dean - Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify NZSM supervisory practices school-wide to ensure alignment with VUW guidelines and requirements</td>
<td>Jan 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 8 (Track Māori and Pasifika students to identify and react)
Responsibility: NZSM representative on Te Maruaka Aronui; Associate Dean (Teaching and Equity) FHSS / Awhina and Pasifika Student Support representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore options for NZSM cohort to undertake the extension Te Hāpai professional development courses. Use data provided by the Faculty office to analyse enrolment and completion rates for Māori and Pasifika students, and work with the Associate Dean to identify areas and initiatives to improve retention.</td>
<td>Mid 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 9 (Model for codifying engagement outputs)
Responsibility: Director/ Faculty Finance/ DVC Engagement/ Development Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore ways school business model can feature philanthropic funds generated to VUW Foundation through direct NZSM efforts, as part of revenue to offset contribution margins. Pursue “creativity” CoRE bid (intangible cultural values focus) and relevant policy discussions.</td>
<td>TBC – VUW Engage and FHSS/VUW Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 10 (Facilities consistent with health and safety needs)
Responsibility: Property Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University is committed to new facilities though these will not be available until 2025. This issue is outside the control of the school. Immediate problems have been identified and escalated, and property services short-term remedial work is scheduled.</td>
<td>TBC – Property Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 11 (Continue to analyse the administrative office)
Responsibility: School Manager, FHSS Finance and HR Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZSM Office Staff review submitted Feb 2019. Work distribution in the administrative team is continuously evaluated and output adjusted, pending necessary resource that will allow identification and clarification of responsibilities. Work with Faculty Finance and HR on ensuring Young Musicians’ Programme is self-supporting, thereby freeing up school office staff.</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 12 (Promote distinctive offerings and strengths)
Responsibility: FHSS Communications and Marketing Manager in liaison with NZSM Engagement Manager, Leadership Strategy Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop/ disseminate marketing and communications materials</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 13 (Archive of events on the website)
Responsibility: **FHSS Dean, Faculty and Central Communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue for FHSS Dean to escalate after a prolonged period without a resolution to an issue beyond NZSM control.</td>
<td>TBC – Central Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 14 (Pan-NZSM postgraduate seminar series)
Responsibility: **PG Coordinator, Research Director, Research Forum Convenor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore possibilities for the regular Research Forum, which showcases some PG work alongside that of NZSM and visiting academics, to be optimally linked to a student-led seminar.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 15 (Utilise links of the AVC-Pasifika office)
Responsibility: School Equity and Diversity representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet with AVC Pasifika and Associate Dean Teaching and Learning/ Equity and Diversity, to identify opportunities.</td>
<td>End of 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Commendations

The Panel would like to commend the New Zealand School of Music for:

**Commendation 1**
Maintaining a goodwill and positive attitude towards cooperation and understanding amongst the School's staff and students

**Commendation 2**
The intra-supportive nature of the Staff and the Director of the School, which will enable the programme to make changes necessary to increase the strengths of the School.

**Commendation 3**
The breadth of offerings in the New Zealand School of Music are a distinctive element and strength of the School

**Commendation 4**
Providing teaching experiences that enable students to achieve at an internationally acceptable standard upon graduation.

**Commendation 5**
Their dissemination of high quality research outputs and performance outputs in all areas (Classical, Jazz, Music Therapy, Composition, Sonic Arts, Musicology).

**Commendation 6**
Ensuring that Māori students are appropriately represented in the School’s structure at both the undergraduate and postgraduate level.

**Commendation 7**
Having a strong outreach and engagement programme across external partners and organisations, in all programmes within the School.

**Commendation 8**
A strong basis exists for the programme to evolve/grow in future, in both practically-focused and academically-focused areas.
Summary of Recommendations

The Panel has identified several areas of improvement for the School. These areas for improvement have been identified by the Panel as recommendations. Some of them also include suggestions in the body of the report which the Panel thinks will be helpful to the School in addressing the recommendation.

The Panel recommends that the New Zealand School of Music:

Recommendation 1
Ensure that the organisation of the School has clarity on the person(s) or committee(s) responsible for the following areas:

- Teaching and Learning/Curriculum
- Postgraduate Coordinator
- Health and safety
- Equity and Diversity
- Engagement

Recommendation 2
Ensure there is a strong leadership team supporting the Director in NZSM, which can facilitate developments across and outside the School. This may require a consideration of the appointment of one or two senior staff as part of new hires in the future.

Recommendation 3
Review the undergraduate offerings comprehensively, including each major, with a goal of allowing students more flexibility in course choices across programmes and creating pathways for study in multiple disciplines.

Recommendation 3a
As part of the curriculum review, ensure performance students are maximising the ‘transferable skills’ required for being a professional musician.

Recommendation 3b
As part of the curriculum review, consider how to introduce musical pedagogy/teaching skills that will facilitate graduates being able to teach effectively in a studio setting.

Recommendation 4
Provide clarity to students and staff on the roles and responsibilities of artist teachers, and how they differ from academic staff.

The Panel has made suggestions for possible actions to address this recommendation in the body of the report.

Recommendation 5
Ensure that assessment practices in all parts of the School (in all subjects, at all levels) are both suitable for music students and in line with the University’s Assessment Handbook.

Recommendation 5a
Consider means to provide students with course credit or recognition of creative and performance work undertaken outside formal course work (e.g. for contribution towards public performances). This would require close consultation with faculty staff in FHSS and the Academic Office as to the best means to achieve such recognition.
Recommendation 6
Work with the relevant Faculty and central university communications group(s) to promote their Postgraduate options and qualifications, emphasising the strengths of taking postgraduate study at NZSM and the high quality research and distinctive offerings available.

Recommendation 7
Clarify the roles and responsibilities for supervision of thesis students, and ensure that wherever possible students are assigned supervisors who will not be on leave for the majority of the year.

Recommendation 8
Utilise the faculty expertise in tracking Māori and Pasifika students to identify and react to areas of the programmes that may allow greater retention, and improve the cultural competence of all staff in the School.

Consider whether the responsibility for tracking Māori and Pasifika student success and staff cultural competence lies with the equity and diversity person/group established in Recommendation 1.

Recommendation 9
The School, Faculty and University should work to develop a model for codifying the engagement outputs of the School into the financial model, and identify the strategic, cultural and public good provided by a successful NZSM in annual management and engagement planning processes.

Recommendation 10
Ensure the current facilities are consistent with the health and safety needs of all students and staff. To achieve this requires that both the physical environment as well as organizational and reporting structures facilitate communication and awareness.

Recommendation 11
Continue to analyse the work and needs of the administrative office in the School, in order to identify and clarify to all staff and students where and with whom the responsibility for each activity lies.

Recommendation 12
Promote the School’s distinctive offerings and strengths, at the levels of School staff, faculty staff and university marketing.

Recommendation 13
That an archive of NZSM events be kept on the NZSM website.

Recommendation 14
Introduce a pan-NZSM postgraduate seminar series, in collaboration with students and staff, to facilitate students sharing of work and research and also provide career development skills.

Recommendation 15
Utilise the links of the AVC-Pasifika office by working with them to investigate opportunities for university-level music study for Tongan students specifically, and other Pacific nations more broadly.
Process of Review

This review of the New Zealand School of Music (NZSM) was done as part of the regular cycle of quality assurance reviews at Victoria University. The PVC/Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and Vice-Provost (Academic) agreed to use a more comprehensive Terms of Reference for this review, given it encompassed an entire school and advice was sought on a wider range of issues.

The ten terms of reference for the review covered:
1. Governance and Vision
2. Teaching and Learning
3. Research and Research Training
4. Equity and Diversity
5. Community, Alumni and Donor Engagement
6. Organisation, Administration and Resources
7. Directions of Growth
8. Promotion of the School
9. Synergies between Programmes
10. International Connections

The Review was supported by Edward Schofield, Reviews Advisor, in the Academic Office.

Self-review

The Director of NZSM led the development of a self-review document that summarised the key challenges and opportunities for the School and responded to each of the Terms of Reference. This self-review document had input from several staff in the School and was available to all staff prior to their meetings with the Panel.

Written Submissions

The Panel received 23 written submissions from students, graduates, teaching and professional staff relating to the School. Written submissions were provided to the Panel as they were received in the weeks before the Panel visit and throughout the days of the Panel visit. This included a written submission from the Victoria University of Wellington Students Association, who surveyed 166 students to inform their submission.

Oral Submissions

The Panel visited Victoria University for just over three days, and during that time met with a number of University staff and students from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, the New Zealand School of Music, and the central university. Meetings with the Panel were sometimes as individuals and sometimes as groups. Those who met the Panel included:
- The Pro Vice-Chancellor and Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
- The Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
- The Associate Dean (Students) of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
- The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Māori
- The Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Mātauranga Māori)
- The Executive Officer to the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Pasifika)
- The Director of the Academic Office
• The Director of the New Zealand School of Music
• The Programme Directors of the Programmes in the School (Classical performance, Jazz performance, Music Therapy, Music Studies (incl. musicology, ethnomusicology etc.), Composition)
• Academic Staff of the New Zealand School of Music
• Artist Teachers who teach in the New Zealand School of Music
• The Professional Staff of the New Zealand School of Music
• Seventeen undergraduate students from across the programmes in the New Zealand School of Music
• Seventeen postgraduate students from across the programmes in the New Zealand School of Music, in a range of qualifications at Honours, Masters and Doctoral levels
The Panel’s Findings

Preamble

As the Panel has noted in its acknowledgements, it was very impressed by the openness and goodwill of staff and students in the School. Submissions to the Panel provided a range of ideas on the future, so in most areas of this report the Panel will be reflecting back to the New Zealand School of Music (NZSM) its own thoughts and desires (and not solely the ideas of the Panel).

The Panel also recognises at the outset of the review that NZSM is currently facing serious pressures on resourcing and facilities, and that the School is nearly at (or at) capacity for what financial and staffing resources it can assign. The Panel wishes to make clear at the outset that it is aware of this, and that its suggestions and recommendations are going to require some additional resourcing in order to achieve the intended results, and that these cannot be merely added to the existing business as usual of the School.

The Panel would also like to commend the staff and students of NZSM for their goodwill and positive attitudes. Despite the resource pressures noted above, submissions to the Panel were mainly positive and with constructive thoughts about how to realise future benefits/goals. Students were also appreciative of the efforts of their teachers, and understood the constraints and pressures on staff. This is particularly notable as this goodwill is overcoming barriers, including the resource constraints and the geographical spread of the School across several buildings and floors on Fairlie Terrace/Kelburn Parade.

Commendation 1

Maintaining a goodwill and positive attitude towards cooperation and understanding amongst the School’s staff and students

Before commenting on the terms of reference, and discussing the commendations, suggestions and recommendations, the Panel wish to outline that a recurring theme of this report will be on providing clarity. After reading the material provided and meeting with staff and students, the Panel believes that clarity is needed in many areas – including staff roles, organisational practices, and the structure of the degrees. In some cases, providing this clarity may simply involve raising the awareness of existing structures/systems. In other cases, it may involve the creating of new practice/structures/roles aligned with broader Faculty and University functions.

Further, most of the areas for improvement (suggestions and recommendations) that the Panel have identified are interconnected and linked together. The Panel has tried to note these connections where they are most apparent, but also recognised that other connections between recommendations may exist. The School should work to respond to any of the areas raised in this report in whatever interconnected fashion is most effective.
Term of Reference 1: Governance and Vision

to review the governance, leadership, organisation and inclusive decision-making structures in relation to promoting a clear and distinctive vision for the future development of the School as a whole and to the individual Programmes in the School.

The Panel believes that the organisational structure of the School is in need of improvement. All of the staff groups that made submissions to the Panel expressed an interest in collaborating within the School to effect change, yet were generally unaware that other staff groups were also interested in change, and unaware of the person, group or method for voicing their ideas and developing them into actual changes.

The lack of platform(s) for driving change underpins a lack of flexibility in the programmes as a whole and is causing aspects to stagnate. The Panel notes that this stagnation has also been significantly affected by several historical factors, including the turnover of leadership in the School, and the remnants of when the School was connected to both Massey University as well as Victoria. At a broad level the School should review its governance structures across a range of operational areas to facilitate communication and enhance development across disciplines.

A critical area for focus is with regards to the overall governance of teaching and learning programmes and practices across the School. A number of staff identified a desire to improve school connectedness via a governance structure that supported communication between areas. Such a structure can be modelled on numerous existing ones in the University and should ensure a strong representation or connectedness with Faculty-level expertise.

The Panel believes that there is also a need to provide more structure in a range of specific areas of School function, especially in situations where a single staff member has sole responsibility. As one example, the programme directors for each of the majors could receive additional support to manage the programmes. As another example, the School’s engagement manager could receive additional academic support for planning the events in the School. Establishing committees or groups to provide this kind of support could help provide more effective organisation of the relevant area of the school. The Panel notes that the existing academic leadership works to broadly align School activity to the goals and Strategic Plan of NZSM, but gained the impression that more ‘on the ground’ support was needed.

Similarly, equity and diversity issues, including professional development for staff in cultural confidence/competence, should be led by a suitable person (supported by others). Clear communication lines for health and safety issues are also needed, as the Panel will comment later in this report about such issues affecting some students, which ideally could be addressed in a business-as-usual fashion by an appropriate organisational structure.

As such, the Panel makes the following recommendation, noting that for some of these areas, its statement in the preamble regarding clarity may be relevant – such roles may already exist in the School (e.g. Programme directors might be the persons in charge of Teaching and Learning) or they may need to be created. Clarity is needed in all of these organisational areas in order for staff (and students) in the School to be able to contribute and develop their ideas.
Recommendation 1

Ensure that the organisation of the School has clarity on the person(s) or committee(s) responsible for the following areas:

- Teaching and Learning/Curriculum
- Postgraduate Coordinator
- Health and safety
- Equity and Diversity
- Engagement

The Panel wants to make it clear that it is not necessarily recommending an overhaul of the organisation of the School to create this – rather it is recommending that the School has these positions/committees and that there is clarity in what those people/groups do. In doing so the school will need to look at other school structures within Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (FHSS) as well as consider how to align internal structures with Faculty roles and committees.

Providing clarity on these roles (which may include establishment of the person/group, or clarity in the purposes of the role) are also linked to a recommendation the Panel will make in the section on Learning and Teaching below. Many staff who made submissions to the Panel shared desires for changes to the BMus curriculum, but told the Panel they were unaware of the right platform to do so. The Panel themselves were unclear on whether such a platform for teaching and learning even exists, and so have made the recommendation about clarity of these roles to highlight that these positions are both needed and need to have clear responsibilities.

Whatever way NZSM decides to provide this clarity, the Panel’s advice is that student involvement should be considered in all of the areas. Students are the ones with first-hand experience of the teaching and learning, and have an important voice in ensuring health and safety, equity and diversity and external performances within the School. However, the current student representation model in the School provides only one avenue. Therefore, in the future it is important to ensure that students have alternative ways to engage with the person responsible or be represented on relevant committee(s).

Having clear responsibilities and greater involvement of a range of staff and students will also make the implementation of later recommendations in this report more achievable. The Panel wishes to note in particular that some of the later recommendations have a staff professional development component. Having a person or committee in charge of leading that development (whether that be cultural confidence, health and safety, assessment practices or other areas) gives clarity to the School as a whole about what is expected of staff, and allow ongoing development to take place.

The Panel notes that the several years before the review have been, organisationally, a challenging time for the School. Prior to the appointment of the current Director, there was some prolonged instability in the leadership of the School. This has combined with issues from the recent un-merging from Massey University to create a period of (understandable) uneasiness for the future.

Based on the written and verbal submissions from staff to the Panel, the current Director of NZSM has the backing of the teaching and the professional staff. The Panel would like to commend the Director, for gathering the support of all staff in the programme. The Panel would also like to commend the staff, for giving their support to the Director and their desire to work together to effect change.
Commendation 2
The intra-supportive nature of the Staff and the Director of the School, which will enable the programme to make changes necessary to increase the strengths of the School.

However, despite the current Director’s strengths, the Panel feels that she needs additional support and collaboration at a senior level to help in the management/organisation of the School and implementation of her vision. Currently, the Director has a school leadership team, which works but is limited in time and capability to address all the aspects of the School. These limitations mean the team does not provide the platforms for change that the Panel has discussed concerning Recommendation 1. Having stronger leadership to support the Director will allow for more time for that leadership to address matters internal to NZSM, with other schools/faculties and externally to the university.

The Panel suggests that one way the School and FHSS could achieve some leadership support is by emphasising ‘leadership’ and ability to drive and support change into search criteria when recruiting for new positions. In addition to whatever other academic needs are identified, having someone come in at the professor or associate professor level with a mandate to support the leadership of the School would be a method for realising the intent of this recommendation.

Recommendation 2
Ensure there is a strong leadership team supporting the Director in NZSM, which can facilitate developments across and outside the School. This may require a consideration of the appointment of one or two senior staff as part of new hires in the future.

This recommendation is tied into the earlier recommendation above regarding people/committee responsibilities, as the leaders of the areas or committees should be the kind of senior staff who can be part of the leadership team. However, artist teachers form a significant component of the teaching staff. These roles are typically fractional and the individuals carry a range of responsibilities outside the University. However, their voice in decision making and planning is also critical. Recommendation 4 (below) also goes some way to indicating how their input could be included.

Term of Reference 2: Teaching and Learning

to review the quality and coherency of the School’s curriculum and teaching in light of domestic and international enrolment trends, student success, retention and completion, perception of key external stakeholders, Programme accreditation (where relevant), availability of alternative Programmes in Australasia, with a particular focus on benchmarking how the school is performing in comparison to international institutions, and future developments in the discipline(s)

As all members of the School are aware they currently offer a strong breadth of offerings for a contemporary Music School. Expertise is available that spans the performative areas in classical and jazz, into knowledge of sonic arts and composition, as well as the more theory-based music studies, music therapy & musicology/ethnomusicology. This breadth is a distinctive area of the School, and the Panel commends this strength of the School.

Commendation 3
The breadth of offerings in the New Zealand School of Music are a distinctive element and strength of the School
The Panel also encourages the School to leverage this strength, and utilise the co-location of its programmes to become a distinctive part of the Music offering at Victoria.

All of the programme directors in the School expressed interest in changes, as mentioned in the section above (Governance and Vision). The suggested changes discussed with the Panel shared a common theme about opening up some flexibility in the Bachelor of Music (BMus) majors to allow students a greater degree of course options outside the major, a desire that was reiterated by the students themselves. Enabling such flexibility would enable the students to follow their wider reaching interests (and also the demands for flexibility in their future job market). Creating this flexibility would, in the Panel’s view, be of benefit to the students and also allow the School to capitalise on its distinctive breadth of offerings.

To effect this, the Panel advises that a comprehensive review of the undergraduate programmes is needed, covering all of the majors at the same time. The goals of this review should be to incorporate flexibility in each major, to allow for an appropriate level of cross-fertilisation across the other programmes in the School. Such flexibility could be achieved via a number of mechanisms. For example:

- All the majors should enable and encourage students to include courses outside their major. In deciding how many courses would be appropriate for the degree it is worth examining other degrees in the University and striving towards having a commonality of approach irrespective of major (e.g. irrespective of whether a student is majoring in classical, sonic arts, jazz etc., their programme of study enables them to gain credit for ‘X’ points outside the courses listed for their major).
- The school consider whether there is a possibility of a core 100-level curriculum for all majors, or at least a broadening of the core papers across 100 and advanced levels.
- Review points values and timing of courses, as well as regularly survey assessment scheduling, in order to minimise any structural hindrances to programme flexibility.

The Panel also suggests (but does not recommend) that this review should also consider if there are offerings in other faculties/schools (e.g. Film, Engineering, Design) that it would be appropriate to allow students some flexibility to take as part of a BMus, in order to leverage and grow some interdisciplinary opportunities that NZSM has already begun forming.

The Panel has taken the submissions from the academic staff it received to be a sign that there is strong willingness to collaborate in such a review to create the best pathways for students, which places the School in a positive starting position for looking at the BMus/BA curriculum as a whole. Recommendation 3 also recognises, and builds upon, the willingness of many staff and students in the NZSM to provide opportunities for students from different areas to interact outside of the formal curriculum.

**Recommendation 3**

Review the undergraduate offerings comprehensively, including each major, with a goal of allowing students more flexibility in course choices across programmes and creating pathways for study in multiple disciplines.

As part of the review of curriculum, the Panel has other suggestions that the School should incorporate into such a review:

- Firstly, the school should consider how best to represent the various strands of further study in music, especially with a view to post graduate opportunities and the benefits of further study as a means to retain students. Such an overview of
opportunities should be balanced against the need to provide a coherent and integrated package of material to students at the 100-level in order to avoid the perception of siloed areas of knowledge and skill.

- Further, the Panel feels that the performance programmes in the BMus should provide increased opportunity to gain ‘transferable skills’ and clarity about the value of these skills to students. The current curriculum is largely focused on developing musical skills to a high level, and while this is good preparation for the top percentile of students who will go on to prestigious performance groups, the remainder of students would benefit from greater exposure to the other skills they will apply in their musical career. This includes things such as writing grant applications for cultural events, self-promotion to find gigs/performances and developing audition skills.

- In addition, staff were strongly in support of an idea which was also discussed favourably by a handful of the student submissions – to include a pedagogy/teaching component in the undergraduate programmes. The reasoning for this offered by submissions, and which the Panel believes is accurate, is that performance graduates of the BMus would be very likely to need to teach as part of their professional musical careers, alongside the skills mentioned in the paragraph above.

The Panel’s understanding is that there are two ‘versions’ of music teaching/pedagogy that the School can consider. One version is to prepare graduates to be able to teach in a studio setting, typically in one-on-one sessions to people learning a single instrument. The second version is preparing graduates to go into teaching positions in primary and secondary schools in New Zealand. The Panel advises the School that the second version will require a significant investment of resources (time, staffing and finances) and close collaboration with the Faculty of Education at Victoria.

Because of the higher investment required for the second version of introducing pedagogy (primary/secondary teaching), the Panel suggests that in the shorter term, the School focuses on the first version – providing students with knowledge of teaching/pedagogy for studio based teaching. This would be easier to achieve and tie in well with the development of other transferable skills (grants, self-promotion) discussed above.

The Panel was advised by the leadership of the School and Faculty that the Panel’s advice would be welcomed on what areas/disciplines of knowledge future appointments to the School should have. The Panel suggests that recruiting someone with strong music pedagogy knowledge would be of great value to helping the School introduce this pedagogy element.

**Recommendation 3a**
As part of the curriculum review, ensure performance students are maximising the ‘transferable skills’ required for being a professional musician.

**Recommendation 3b**
As part of the curriculum review, consider how to introduce musical pedagogy/teaching skills that will facilitate graduates being able to teach effectively in a studio setting.

To achieve these recommendations may require the prioritisation of musical pedagogy as a core component of the skills being sought in a future appointment or appointments in the School.
After the School has developed a music pedagogy strand in this vein, it will be in a good position to further consult with the Faculty of Education to consider the viability of a pathway to registered music teaching. The Panel agrees with the views of many submissions – that the quality of music training in secondary/primary schools is declining, and providing a dedicated pathway for students to receive high quality training in music teaching is an excellent longer-term goal for the School. The Panel also notes that this could potentially create a new recruitment pathway, with graduates who go into teaching (hopefully) encouraging their pupils to study music at NZSM when they go to university.

The Panel was impressed at the involvement of staff in skill development in their first year students. Like many countries in the world, the experiences of students at the pre-university level in New Zealand may not adequately prepare them for the expectations at the tertiary level. Despite such contextual challenges, staff in NZSM have succeeded in bringing these students up to the appropriate standard by the end of their qualification, whether that be in performative skills or in their literacy and writing skills.

**Commendation 4**

Providing teaching experiences that enable students to achieve at an internationally acceptable standard upon graduation.

A separate area that NZSM should consider is in clarity of the roles of artist teachers. The use of artist teachers – typically professional musicians who provide 1-on-1 training with specific instruments – is essential at any music school. Although such a resource-intensive approach is not common at the undergraduate level elsewhere in the university, the panel wishes to emphasise that the practice is common internationally. The practice is viewed as an effective and essential way of providing instrumental teaching for variable numbers of students each year and for instruments not covered by the academic staff.

However, there are some challenges faced by the current system for how NZSM uses artist teachers. These challenges include:

1. Artist teachers commonly have roles outside their teaching, such as roles in the New Zealand Symphony Orchestra (NZSO) or other performing groups, which can limit their availability to engage with students.
2. Artist teachers are hired through contracts, based on student numbers that in many instruments are hard to predict year-to-year, meaning that students who come to NZSM in order to learn from an individual performer do not have certainty that they will be able to continue being taught by them.
3. In most cases, artist teacher contracts cover the essential duties related to teaching but with few possibilities for wider involvement in the life of the school (such as attendance at performances, group performances, etc.).
4. As artist teachers are not part of the permanent School staff, they are often (involuntarily) disengaged from the progress of their students and the culture of the School.
5. Students and some staff appeared to the Panel to have difficulty in clearly distinguishing the differences in roles/responsibilities between academic staff and artist teachers. A clarification would help especially students to identify the appropriate person to address issues with.

**Recommendation 4**

Provide clarity to students and staff on the roles and responsibilities of artist teachers, and how they differ from academic staff.
The Panel suggests that the following be considered as possible actions to address the recommendation.

**Suggestions for recommendation 4**

4A: Establish permanent artist teacher positions (i.e. same part-time hours but non-contract), which may also help attract postgraduate students who wish to undertake intense study with a particular person.

4B: Expanding the hours artist teachers are expected to work to include several hours (or whatever is appropriate) to attend their students performances/assessments beyond the 1-to-1 teaching.

4C: Providing clarity to students (and staff) on the roles and responsibilities of artist teachers.

4D: Artist teachers could receive professional development offered by the School or University and/or mentoring from academic staff in teaching and pedagogy.

4E: Consider the establishment of ‘Senior Tutor / Senior Artist Teacher’ roles to provide coordination of fractional teaching appointments with a view to providing coherence, guidance and oversight of factional teaching-only staff.

No matter the method(s) that NZSM decides to address Recommendation 4 with, the Panel notes that the provision of 1-to-1 musical training is a very valued, essential and effective part of the teaching in the School, that it is standard for music schools, and its benefits are evident in the quality and future job perspectives of its graduate students.

The next paragraphs still relate to **Term of Reference 2: Teaching and Learning**, but are concerned with assessment in the School across all programmes and staff.

The Panel received several submissions from students regarding poor assessment practice. Several different students raised these concerns, across the undergraduate and postgraduate levels, and from a wide enough number of students that the Panel felt it had to make a recommendation in this area. Most of the practice discussed with the Panel fell well out of the University guidelines in the Assessment Handbook.

The first area reported to the Panel was in the area of feedback on assessments. The Panel received multiple reports of feedback from lecturers being provided extremely late after the assessment task, if at all. This goes against the intention of in-term formative assessment, which should aim to provide students with some idea of how well they are developing and indicate areas they need to improve on. Some student comments included:

“I didn’t get my grades back until the end of the year”
“I still haven’t had feedback on assessments from last trimester”
“I only got feedback on my first assessment on the night before I had to complete my last assignment”
“In my programme, we were told at the start that we’d get feedback throughout the course, but received nothing”
A second area reported to the Panel was that students are not clear about the assessment criteria and organisation of assessment tasks. Students reported that many staff seemed to not use or struggle to use the University’s Blackboard online system, and that several courses had no course outlines where they could get the information on what assessments the course contained. This has led to students being unaware of assessment tasks, and unsure of how/why their grades are awarded. Some student comments included:

“When I asked for a course outline, the staff member told me I should contact a fellow student to get a copy of theirs”
“It seems like your course mark is just the mark for the final assessment”
“I only got a grade for one piece of assessment, and my next grade was for the overall course”
“I turned up for my ensemble, and after it was finished my teacher told me I had done well in this assessment. I didn’t even know I was being assessed!”
“There is little if not any communication from teachers as to what the assessments actually are. Students find themselves finding out most information from other senior students”
“I am still waiting on a course syllabus for some of my papers. I don’t know what the assessment criteria are”

The Panel notes that these comments are only from students who made submissions during the review, and that these might be the ‘exceptions’ rather than the ‘rule’. Nonetheless, the Panel would urge the School, and particularly the Director, to investigate the assessment practices in the School and ensure they are both appropriate to the discipline and in line with the University’s regulations in the Assessment Handbook. Even if these are only exceptional occurrences, they should not be happening at all and such issues should be resolved.

**Recommendation 5**
Ensure that assessment practices in all parts of the School (in all subjects, at all levels) are both suitable for music students and in line with the University’s Assessment Handbook.

**Recommendation 5a**
Consider means to provide students with course credit or recognition of creative and performance work undertaken outside formal course work (e.g. for contribution towards public performances). This would require close consultation with faculty staff in FHSS and the Academic Office as to the best means to achieve such recognition.

**Term of Reference 3: Research and Research Training**

_to review the research performance of the School including its disciplinary and interdisciplinary research activity, including creative practice and scholarship (where relevant), research outcomes, including quality and impact, scope and quality of research training, in light of future developments in the discipline(s)._  

The Panel was impressed by the research outputs of all parts of the School. The staff are active researchers with strong outputs – as recognised by their current number one ranking in the national Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF). The School should be commended for this.

**Commendation 5**
Their dissemination of high quality research outputs and performance outputs in all areas (Classical, Jazz, Music Therapy, Composition, Sonic Arts, Musicology).
Another area for improved clarity in the School is the difference between performance for research and performance for engagement. The Panel was unclear how many of the performances of staff in the School were for research purposes, and how much were for engaging with people/groups in Wellington. Whilst it is not impossible for performances to be both, the Panel believes that providing additional clarity on this would be a valuable step, since many performances will only be for one purpose. This can also feed into the development of the postgraduate programme, in helping students articulate the performative aspects of events as research.

The Panel was informed early in the process that the School was interested in advice for growing its student numbers. The Panel believes that, based on its observations and conversations with the staff and students of the University, that increasing postgraduate numbers (and retention in general) is the best way to achieve this.

The Panel received the impression that there was not a consistency in views within the School around the best pathways for students wanting to go into postgraduate study. Some people who made submission to the Panel, including from the student groups, was that there are greater opportunities for postgraduate study overseas. Whilst the focus is clearly on good outcomes for students, the Panel advises that it is only the top students who will make their way to the top conservatoriums and music schools around the world. The majority of students would still be well served by a postgraduate degree from NZSM. Staff should recall their research success (as the Panel has commended above) and not undersell their own abilities, in order to develop a larger postgraduate cohort.

The Panel therefore recommends that the School increase its focus on retaining undergraduate students to postgraduate study. NZSM can and does offer a range of expertise and valuable qualifications. This emphasis on postgraduate should also include increasing the awareness of the Music Therapy programme. Music Therapy was not mentioned in staff submissions to the Panel outside its meeting with that programme’s staff, despite being a nationally distinctive area.

**Recommendation 6**
Work with the relevant Faculty and central university communications group(s) to promote their Postgraduate options and qualifications, emphasising the strengths of taking postgraduate study at NZSM and the high quality research and distinctive offerings available.

The Panel noted that there is a need to improve clarity with regards to the roles of supervisors and postgraduate students. Some student submissions indicated that their supervision meetings were irregular and often cancelled, or that their supervisor was unavailable due to overseas travel for long periods. The Panel suggests that the postgraduate coordinator or a research committee needs to be the clear ‘source of truth’ on acceptable supervision practice, in order to avoid such situations as these in future.

**Recommendation 7**
Clarify the roles and responsibilities for supervision of thesis students, and ensure that wherever possible students are assigned supervisors who will not be on leave for the majority of the year.
Term of Reference 4: Equity and Diversity

to review the performance of the School in meeting its commitments to te Tiriti o Waitangi and to providing equity and diversity in access, employment and learning for both academic and professional staff and both domestic and international students, including the recruitment of students and staff from under-represented groups

Māori students appeared to be well represented in the School organisational structure, based on the self-review and submissions that the Panel received. The number of Māori students in courses offered by the School are generally in line with the average across the university, so having this representation is of value to the School. The Panel commends this representation, and suggests that both the School and FHSS should make this system more widely known, given its relevance to the strategic goals of the University.

Commendation 6

Ensuring that Māori students are appropriately represented in the School’s structure at both the undergraduate and postgraduate level.

The Panel encourages the School to consider the same for Pasifika students (although recognises that there are fewer Pasifika students currently enrolled), but most importantly that this representation is preserved through any other changes to organisation discussed in the section on Governance and Vision above.

The Panel has identified some areas of improvement for the School that should help improve its numbers and retention of Māori and Pasifika students. One area is the tracking of Māori and Pasifika students. Currently, the Panel understands based on submissions from the Faculty and the central university that FHSS is already tracking these student numbers. The School should utilise this information, which could include identifying courses that are more/less popular among these students, and allow the School to take steps to retain these students into further study.

Another area for improvement is in the cultural confidence of its staff. Information provided to the Panel noted that some students reported a lack of understanding from staff for family events – such as a Tangihanga (Māori funeral) requiring more than just one day off from study. The Panel was informed that the University has professional development opportunities in this area that could assist, and so the Panel recommends that all staff, including professional, academic and artist teachers, take the Te Hapai course. (For professional development of hourly-paid artist teachers, hours for professional development would need to be accommodated. Such seemingly small gestures will contribute greatly to the overall integration of the School.)

The Panel notes that the above areas would naturally fall into an equity committee/coordinator role – measuring, reporting and improving Māori and Pasifika student success and staff cultural confidence. The Panel has already discussed this in relation to Recommendation 1 earlier in the report, and recommends that this person/group monitors student numbers for equity groups and leads the coordination of ongoing professional development.
Recommendation 8

Utilise the faculty expertise in tracking Māori and Pasifika students to identify and react to areas of the programmes that may allow greater retention, and improve the cultural competence of all staff in the School.

Consider whether the responsibility for tracking Māori and Pasifika student success and staff cultural competence lies with the equity and diversity person/group established in Recommendation 1.

Finally, the School noted in its self-review and the Panel received some submissions noting the lack of Māori or Pasifika staff members. The Panel understands that there is notable difficulty in attracting Māori and Pasifika staff to any School, and so suggests that NZSM consider targeting as a strategic priority a ‘home-grown’ approach. This would involve identifying students at undergraduate who could be targeted for support to study throughout postgrad and continue into PhD programme, with a goal of employing the student after they graduate. This approach would need a long-term commitment to see the student through to completion and joining the staff of the programme. The Panel notes that even if full employment fails, they could potentially be retained as an artist teacher (as a plan b). This initiative could serve as a basis for a ‘grow your own’ approach that could be used to gain Māori or Pasifika staff on the programme.

As a final note on equity, the Panel noted during its time at Victoria that the gender balance of the overall School is weighted towards male academics. Whilst it is encouraging that this is not a critical issue for staff or students (as it was not raised at all in submissions), the Panel suggests that this be considered alongside Recommendations 2 and 3b when establishing new appointments.

Term of Reference 5: Community, Alumni and Donor Engagement

to review the role played by the School with its relevant stakeholder communities and the School’s relationship with its alumni and the broader community in the context of the University commitment to civic engagement and its philanthropy goals

NZSM has a strong outreach and engagement programme, which the Panel would like to commend. Based on the evidence provided, all of the programmes in the School have strong overall connections to the relevant professional individuals and professional organisations relevant to their programme. This indicates to the Panel a strength of the School and something that stands them in good stead to be seen as movers on the University’s Primary Strategy 5 – Deepen engagement with alumni, benefactors and communities.

The Panel would also like to note the effective young musicians programme (YMP) run by the School. The Panel’s understanding of this programme is that it brings primary and secondary school children into the NZSM in order to receive extra-curricular training in musical performance and composition. This provides a pipeline for future students, and also helps to upskill students so that they enter university study at a proficient level (unlike many entering students, see the Panel’s comments under recommendation 3b).

NZSM is also doing excellent work in many collaborations outside the ‘standard’ music professions. The Panel notes that the Schools work with the film sector in Miramar is another distinctive music area at the university, which could be leveraged in future.
Commendation 7
Having a strong outreach and engagement programme across external partners and organisations, in all programmes within the School.

Given that the School is achieving this strategic priority for the university so well, the Panel very strongly feels that NZSM needs recognition from the University for its significant engagement activity built into its financial model. In a traditional school budget model, revenue is generated largely via student numbers and external research funding. Whilst NZSM does this, it also has a significant, and expected, dimension of engagement, the value of which is not fully recognised by the University in terms of value outside of student- and research-based sources of revenue.

The Director of NZSM indicated to the Panel that interdisciplinary reflection had been started on developing some method of transmissibly assessing the benefits of the School’s engagement. The Panel strongly recommends that this work be continued and utilised for NZSM. The Panel envisions an end point where the School is recognised in 2019 to have produced $X worth of engagement activity, and so its revenue can be adjusted as such.

The Panel also received a clear message in submissions that there is an expectation for the School to conform to the standard financial contribution models of the University. The TEC funding category for music does not necessarily recognise the intensive (often one-one-one) and high cost nature of providing high quality music-based education. Such models also do not necessarily encompass the non-financial good and value that the School provides to the University, especially in the broader areas of engagement, public profile, and distinctiveness in terms of creative arts.

Recommendation 9
The School, Faculty and University should work to develop a model for codifying the engagement outputs of the School into the financial model, and identify the strategic, cultural and public good provided by a successful NZSM in annual management and engagement planning processes.

Term of Reference 6: Organisation, Administration and Resources

to review the effectiveness of the School’s organisational and administrative/professional support structures in relation to its current functions and anticipated developments, and to review the School’s use of resources.

A number of the recommendations above speak to organisation, administration and resources. In addition, the Panel wishes to make it clear to the School, the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the University at large, that they have health and safety concerns that need to be addressed. To preface this, the Panel was made aware at the outset of the review that the current facilities used by NZSM are, in the campus master plan, marked as no longer suitable and the School is planned to move to a new music hub in the central city.

However, the health and safety of students in the current facilities cannot be neglected until this move happens. There was a concern raised that the current hard surfaces in most of the practice rooms do not attenuate the sound pressure level generated by instruments - especially brass and percussion instruments - sufficiently to meet hearing protection standards, and they reflect those higher frequencies to which the human ear is most vulnerable to damage. The Panel strongly recommends that the rooms be brought up to
acceptable health and safety standards, as soon as possible, particularly given that a number of complaints about the facilities were raised by both students and staff during the review. The Panel further has some suggestions of possible, relatively cost-effective ways to improve the acoustical safety of the current practice rooms, and the efficacy of these will vary depending on the instrument being taught. These include: installation of heavy, acoustically effective curtains in practice rooms or fabric-wrapped fiber panels in practice rooms.

The Panel also wants to express its concerns about the risks of 1-to-1 teaching, including by artist teachers, in isolated environments. The Panel did not receive any reports of inappropriate behaviour, but noted that the current facilities often lack doors with windows or visibility into the room, and the Panel believe it is important for the health and safety of all students and staff that the School has clear procedures and guidelines in place for appropriate conduct between students and teachers. The appropriate people (as part of Recommendation 1) need to be clearly identifiable to students and seen as approachable and unbiased. Teachers involved in 1-to-1 teaching should be explicitly reminded in appropriate cycles of the procedures and guidelines, and students should be informed at the beginning of their studies about the procedures and guidelines.

Additional concerns were raised by students regarding the power-imbalance of the student-teacher relationship, which was noticed at all levels but more so at the postgraduate level. Student submissions to the Panel stated that they felt unable or unwilling to voice any concerns about teaching practice, as their learning of the instrument is so closely tied to that individual. This became more pressing in postgraduate study, where supervisors reportedly included some artist teachers who were unable to supervise effectively when travelling overseas for performances. As part of health and safety and their duty of care to students, the School needs to provide clarity to students on safe mechanisms for complaint or questions they would prefer not to ask their supervisor or teacher.

Finally, and tying back to Recommendation 1, a health and safety person/group in the School’s administrative structure should be the point at which students and staff can raise concerns about such issues, and the facilities currently in use until the Music Hub project is completed highlight the importance of such a role. One approach would be to install heavy, acoustically effective curtains along the walls, which can be adjusted based on the specific use of the space at a given time. Another approach would be to create areas on walls and possibly ceilings with fabric-wrapped fiber panels. By applying such approaches in collaboration with the expertise of staff, the spaces could be easily adapted to specific requirements (for example the different requirements of percussion and voice).

**Recommendation 10**
Ensure the current facilities are consistent with the health and safety needs of all students and staff. To achieve this requires that both the physical environment as well as organizational and reporting structures facilitate communication and awareness.

The administrative support for NZSM was restructured in response to a Faculty change proposal in the twelve months preceding this review, and the Panel was informed that the Faculty and School are aware that additional changes may yet be needed. As such, the Panel would like to comment on the changes made so far and make some suggestions that it hopes will lead to an improvement.

The Panel understands that the overall intent of the administrative review was to consolidate the administration team – removing the dedicated programme roles (such as
‘jazz admin’) and having responsibility for all programmes be shared across the School administrative team.

The Panel does not object to this goal, but advises the Faculty and School that the administration structure is in need of further refinement. The most urgent problem, and one that is affecting students, is tied back to the lack of clarity noted in the preamble to this report – it is not clear what the role of the respective staff members is. This manifested in submissions to the Panel from students, who are not clear about what support they can/should receive from the admin office (and perceive the professional staff as not knowing this either), and from academic staff are also unsure on the exact boundaries between what is academic workload and what is professional staff workload.

Professional staff themselves were aware of this lack of clarity, and also seemed to the Panel to be unsure of exactly what their roles now are. There was understanding that the change would lead to academic staff taking on course coordination roles with greater clarity, more in line with common practice in the rest of the Faculty, but the exact extent of this did not seem clear to the professional staff who made submissions to the Panel.

All parties, including students, academics and professional staff, who spoke to the Panel about the admin change were accepting of the change in workload, which the Panel notes and compliments the School for.

The Panel notes that the restructure of the administrative support for the school is receiving ongoing attention and that the School is aiming for equitable roles and responsibilities across the professional (including admin and technical) and academic staff, as well as to having a cohesive working environment. The Panel encourages a continued analysis of needs, with a goal of identifying and clarifying exactly what roles each member of staff should do (clarifying the different admin roles, what academics should do, and what services are critical for students). Providing this needs analysis and creating clarity in the roles is vital, as the student experience is currently being affected negatively, through students reportedly being unable to receive assistance when needed, and lacking confidence that any issues they face can be solved.

**Recommendation 11**
Continue to analyse the work and needs of the administrative office in the School, in order to identify and clarify to all staff and students where and with whom the responsibility for each activity lies.

---

**Terms of Reference 7 and 8: Directions of Growth and Promotion of the School**

*ToR7:* to review the current discipline coverage of the school and current student interest in order to identify areas of growth, which will likely include trend areas of growing student
interest, non-traditional groups/methods of teaching, and options for working across faculties.

ToR8: to review the ways, both existing and potential, that the School can better promote its contribution to the university and demonstrate its ability to provide benefits in the reputation and the civic and community engagement space.

The Panel believes that its response to both these terms of reference are intrinsically tied together, and that the promotion of the School will be a necessary precursor to its future growth, in addition to other potential growth areas such as the music pedagogy strand discussed in relation to Recommendations 3a and 3b earlier.

Growth in the New Zealand School of Music will be difficult to realise in the current environment. The slowly declining school-leaver base coupled with the general pressure on the humanities and arts across the world mean the programme will have to look for non-traditional areas to grow (as they acknowledged in their self-review).

The ability of the School to grow is also constrained by the expectations around conforming to the university’s financial models. The Panel has already discussed this in relation to recommendation 9 under Term of Reference 5 above.

The Panel would like to commend the NZSM for being well placed both musically and intellectually for the programme to evolve and grow. In the experiences of the Panel, it can often be the case that a music school is lacking in either the practical area – being unable to teach instrumental/performative skills to a high enough standard, or the academic area – being unable to create research outputs and musicology knowledge from their content. NZSM has capacity in both of these areas, giving it the required foundation for future success.

Commendation 8
A strong basis exists for the School to evolve/grow in future, in both practically-focused and academically-focused areas.

As discussed earlier in this report in relation to Recommendation 6, the School should be aiming to promote its own postgraduate offerings, and retain students into postgraduate study. This focus on retention also extends to retaining more students throughout their undergraduate study as well. The Panel believes this retention strategy should be the focus because there are static and/or falling numbers of school leavers from New Zealand secondary schools, making growth via new students a more challenging prospect than retaining the existing numbers through to further study.

Likewise, the Panel’s discussion of developing/increasing focus on a music pedagogy strand for the BMus, discussed in relation to Recommendation 3b, can potentially grow in the short and long term. In the short term, a studio pedagogy strand, or increased pedagogy components in the existing majors, could potentially attract community members and teachers to enrol in a few courses for professional development. In the long term, collaboration with the Faculty of Education to facilitate the training of registered music teachers will be another pathway for growth. Developing the NZSM’s research into musical pedagogy will enable staff in the School to expand their research into another field of international research as well.

The Panel was informed that Massey University is redeveloping a music offering (after having departed from its involvement in NZSM some years ago), with a focus on popular
music and very contemporary offerings. In this context, the Panel suggests that Victoria and the NZSM should remain committed to their current offerings of a wide breadth of disciplines, and avoid directly competing with Massey.

The overall impression of the Panel was that NZSM is very active in events and engagement, but the School itself needs to be promoted more by all involved – from the central university down to the staff. The School has a range of distinctive aspects, as noted already in this report:

- Wide breadth of music offerings
- Music Therapy
- Ties to the film industry in Miramar

NZSM can also tie into the ‘creative capital’ of the city that houses the university, as the Panel’s understanding is that Wellington has a strong creative/artistic culture, and promoting this aspect of the School would also tie in to the Strategic Plan of the University. As such the Panel believes that staff in the School, and the Faculty, and the University should promote these distinctive areas and recognise that they are strengths of the School. This includes capitalizing on the public musical concerts and events presented at the School through a combination of University and School communications channels, including the University website.

**Recommendation 12**

Promote the School’s distinctive offerings and strengths, at the levels of School staff, faculty staff and university marketing.

The Music Therapy programme needs more support and promotion from both the university and the School staff. As noted in the Panel’s comments relating to Recommendation 6, the programme was not mentioned in staff submissions, and only a few students who made submissions to the Panel were aware of it. This is in spite of it being a nationally unique programme. The Panel also notes that Music Therapy could reasonably grow through being promoted outside the School, as the University has undergraduate offerings in psychology and health that could naturally feed into the postgraduate music therapy offerings. The Panel also notes that any significant increase to the number of students in the programme will require some additional staffing support.

The Panel received very clear submissions from many people that the current university website is not effective in promoting the School to international students. The primary reason for this was cited as being a lack of archiving events/performances that the School has run. The Panel notes that having such an archive would be common practice internationally, as a record of the performances and music taught in the School clearly demonstrates to potential students the speciality of the individuals involved in that event. The Panel suggests that the School has this information available on the website, in line with international best practice.

**Recommendation 13**

That an archive of NZSM events be kept on the NZSM website.

Furthermore, the current facilities that house the NZSM are an obstacle to the university’s intended growth in student numbers. The facilities - which as noted in the preamble to Recommendation 10 are not at an appropriate standard expected by students, whether domestic or international. New students who arrive here, experience high quality teaching in below quality premises, and use that experience as the basis of their ‘word of mouth’ discussions about the NZSM, at national levels and overseas. The Panel’s advice is that until
the move to the Music hub is complete, the current facilities will have an impact on the school’s international attractiveness, and university expectations should recognise this.

**Term of Reference 9: Synergies between programmes**

To review the current connections between programmes in the School and identify areas where the breadth of expertise can lead to more synergy that realises benefits in the areas of enrolments, interdisciplinary offerings, and social & reputational standing.

The Panel has already noted in this report the strength of NZSM having a breadth of offerings, and the need for clarity on organisational roles so that the BMus can be adjusted to better allow students flexibility in their offerings.

Another area of growing strength in NZSM is its existing connections to non-music disciplines. The information provided to the Panel described some successful co-supervisions with the Faculty of Engineering, and as the Panel has already noted NZSM has begun a distinctive offering tied to the film industry and film programme here at Victoria. This also extends to the codification of ‘engagement good’ being added to the School’s budget, as this already has interest from staff in the Victoria Business School. The Panel believes that these interdisciplinary connections are beneficial for the students and the schools involved, and should continue. Once NZSM is confident in the strength of these connections (which may already be the case), it should include these as part of its distinctive strengths in external promotion.

The postgraduate students who made submissions to the Panel were eager for additional interaction within their own cohorts, but notably with the students in other programmes in NZSM as well. In the experience of the Panel, having a sense of cohort with fellow students, especially spreading across disciplines, is beneficial for those students’ individual studies. The Panel understands that there is some moderate student-led activity in this (a music students group) and a weekly research forum, but advises the School that increased staff facilitation of cohort activities would be appreciated and valuable to the student experience.

The Panel envisions a postgraduate seminar series, with highly encouraged attendance, organised in collaboration between a postgraduate coordinator and students (possibly the more experienced PhD students). These seminars would give an opportunity for students from all the disciplines to share their work & research, and could have feature weeks interspersed to provide academic and career development skills (such as grant application writing, research methodologies, etc.). This seminar would need to be timetabled at a time when all students can attend.

**Recommendation 14**

Introduce a pan-NZSM postgraduate seminar series, in collaboration with students and staff, to facilitate students sharing of work and research and also provide career development skills.

**Term of Reference 10: International connections**

To review the programmes international connectivity, reflecting on the school’s ability to grow interest in the programme overseas in terms of both our student profile and research profile, and to determine where NZSM expertise might serve international audiences (consultancy, programme developments and their validation, etc).
The Panel has already detailed areas of improvement that can help attract international students, including the website archive of events at NZSM, and permanent part-time artist teachers (that students come specifically to learn from).

The Panel was also impressed at the international connections the School already has, as were described in the self-review (including international exchanges, research collaborations, links to embassies in NZ). The Panel advises NZSM to maintain the connections and continue to leverage them to attract international students.

The Panel was also advised by the office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor Pasifika that there are opportunities in the pacific region for the discipline of music. The Tongan government has placed some priority on musical study. Currently, the country is facilitating this through the Tupou Tertiary Institute, but there is a market developing there for full tertiary study. The NZSM should consider becoming involved there, which could be through staff visits or student travel to NZSM.

**Recommendation 15**

Utilise the links of the AVC-Pasifika office by working with them to investigate opportunities for university-level music study for Tongan students specifically, and other Pacific nations more broadly.
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Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conduct a stock take of relevant electives within and outside the faculty. This would strongly benefit from the knowledge of current students who have taken outside electives and of staff in other programmes.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Review the skills development in the undergraduate curriculum with a view to ensuring there is appropriate skills development.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Identify the critical pieces of knowledge to Landscape Architecture that students must gain through any shared course(s) throughout their study in the undergraduate and postgraduate offerings.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>That SARC 491 Research Methodologies receive a School-wide review to ensure it meets the needs of all students in the School</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Urgent consultation be undertaken to understand and mitigate the challenges to embedding meaningful field trips in the Landscape Architecture curriculum.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Actively and explicitly celebrate the uniqueness of Landscape Architecture and how landscape architecture knowledge contributes to designing for changing environments. This should aim to raise its profile as more than a subset of another programme.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Develop a workforce strategy for future recruitment into the Landscape Architecture Programme, informed by national and international benchmarks for Landscape Architecture Programme staffing levels.</td>
<td>Accepted in principle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Improve the quality of staff research outputs in proportion to the expected increase of staff in the Programme.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Replicate the successes of Māori content and student success for Pasifika content and students.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Continue with plans to create a professional advisory group for the Landscape Architecture Programme.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation details**

**Recommendation 1**

**Responsibility:** Landscape Programme Director & Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a stock take of relevant electives within and outside the faculty. This would strongly benefit from the knowledge of current students who have taken outside electives and of staff in other programmes.</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An initial survey of potential electives from outside the School and Faculty has been undertaken. Courses of relevance to Landscape Architecture, such as ecology, geology and biodiversity are on offer in both the Schools of Biological Sciences and Geography Environment and Earth Sciences Geography in an undergraduate capacity; however their accessibility to the Landscape Programme is restricted by:

1. Courses are 20pts rather than the 15pt used in the Faculty of Architecture and Design.
2. Significant timetabling issues compounded by travel distance from the School of Architecture

Phase Two of this survey is to consider:

1. If ecology, geology, biodiversity courses in the Schools of Biological Sciences and Geography Environment and Earth Sciences Geography could be offered in modular format for Landscape students.
2. Potential electives for Landscape Architecture in the School of Design is being considered. With a programme amendment (due for approval September 2019) the School of Design’s courses shift to the 15pt unit. This makes many potential electives in digital and drawing media accessible to the Landscape Programme. A process for narrowing down the most relevant electives for Landscape is underway.
3. The viability of having dedicated elective courses within the undergraduate Landscape Programme is being reviewed.
**Recommendation 2**  
**Responsibility:** Landscape Programme Director & Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the skills development in the undergraduate curriculum with a view to ensuring there is appropriate skills development.</td>
<td>29 September 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A VUW Centre for Academic Development supported curriculum review of the Landscape Programme was undertaken between February – June 2019. This process closely identified skill-based content within the existing curriculum requiring more focussed teaching. The process mapped development of these skills course by course. As a result of this extensive process the course prescriptions, assessments and learning objectives have been refined to place more emphasis on construction, planting and ecology, and expand content in areas such as landscape planning. This skill development focus is augmented by increased teaching capacity given the recent appointment of a SL.

A programme amendment detailing these changes has been proposed and is through stage one of approval. This process will see completion 29 September with the intention to initiate the new curriculum in Trimester 1 2020.

**Recommendation 3**  
**Responsibility:** Landscape Programme Director & Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify the critical pieces of knowledge to Landscape Architecture that students must gain through any shared course(s) throughout their study in the undergraduate and postgraduate offerings.</td>
<td>By the start of Academic Year 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the curriculum review process and resulting programme amendment proposal outlined above, critical knowledges that characterise and constitute Landscape Architecture were identified. Moreover these pieces of critical knowledge were situated within the matrix of concerns and particularities of the Landscape Programme. The detailed and thorough work undertaken in the programme review process has prompted the Landscape Programme to develop improved coherence of its aspirations, unique qualities and most importantly the knowledge development needs of the students. Improved coherence in this context is leveraging the first phase a strategy that will see Landscape communicate its content and interface with other knowledges in a more effective manner across shared courses.
Recommendation 4
Responsibility: Landscape Programme Director & Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That SARC 491 Research Methodologies receive a School-wide review to ensure it meets the needs of all students in the School</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An initial review has been undertaken resulting in pragmatic action for Trimester Two of the 2019 academic year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the year of the program review there was one course coordinator for Research Methodologies, which has now been changed to three co-coordinators, one from each of: Building Science, Architecture and Interior Design area, and importantly Landscape Architecture. This should ensure a balance of coverage and the needs of Landscape Architecture students are met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The associated review is still in progress with completion anticipated September 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 5
Responsibility: Landscape Programme Director & Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urgent consultation be undertaken to understand and mitigate the challenges to embedding meaningful field trips in the Landscape Architecture curriculum.</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>June/July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions have taken place between Head of School, relevant Associate Dean and Program Directors to ensure that appropriate field trips can take place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A particular feature and strength of the degrees and Architecture is that there are shared courses (the SARC courses) across the five disciplines, so much of the problem comes down to ensuring that Landscape Students are not removed, to their detriment, from SARC courses or electives in order to take part in field trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms for advance planning have been agreed so that meaningful field trips will be part of the curriculum in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 6
Responsibility: Landscape Programme, Director, Head of School, University-wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively and explicitly celebrate the uniqueness of Landscape Architecture and how landscape architecture knowledge contributes to designing for changing environments. This should aim to raise its profile as more than a subset of another programme.</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We see raising the profile of Landscape Architecture as an ongoing concern. We should note that:

1. We have received (June 2019) a very positive visit from the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA) and a five-year accreditation. This has cemented out high-level profile with the NZILA.
2. The website for VUW is out-of-date and does not serve the Landscape Architecture profile well. Substantial efforts are being made to address this. We have an ongoing process of engagement with the University to implement our desired changes that would improve both access and content. Our aim is to celebrate Landscape Architecture, its place in the School and the built environment professions with this website.
3. We have been active initiators and participants in new projects such as the ‘Thinkers and Doers’: a national talk series in the discipline of Landscape Architecture.
4. We have begun to develop a more comprehensive system for collecting industry and related contacts. It is the intention to create an Advisory Board in Landscape Architecture.

Recommendation 7
Responsibility: Landscape Programme, Director, Head of School, University-wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a workforce strategy for future recruitment into the Landscape Architecture Programme, informed by national and international benchmarks for Landscape Architecture Programme staffing levels.</td>
<td>All action points: Within 2 years</td>
<td>Action point 1: 2019 Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action point 2: July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action point 3: 2019 Academic Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are constraints to implementation of this recommendation that are beyond the control of the School.

Actions:

1. We ran, for over two years, an unsuccessful recruitment campaign to recruit both a Professorial and an AP position in Landscape Architecture, and an unsuccessful campaign at L/SL level for two years prior to that. We have changed strategy to still give us Research leadership (such as PhD supervision) plus the ability to address key issues and filling of skills gaps, such as resilience and post-colonial landscapes (see point 2, and point a below)
2. Since the Academic Review we have (July 2019) appointed two new full-time staff members at SL level. One is 100% in Landscape and brings international (USA) experience in areas such as resilience, plus leadership qualities; one has some commitment to Landscape and also very strong in Maori issues engagement and post-colonial landscapes.
3. From 2019 Landscape staff contribute more substantially in year 1 courses. Additionally a Landscape staff member has become co-coordinator of SARC491, Research Methods. The new staff appointments allows the potential for further contribution to SARC Courses; but this has to be balanced with the need to cover core courses for Landscape.
Further actions being pursued:

a. A strategic investment bid is being prepared that would allow us to appoint a high-profile fractional Professor of Practice in 2 or 3 areas. One of these would be in Landscape Architecture. We have no Landscape Professors and only one AP in this discipline area. But this would give us leadership and impact without investing in a full Professor. We have an ideal candidate in mind; she would be very interested in the post.

b. We will seek to do all we can to support the early career professionals across the school and this will take in the Landscape appointments that we can make.

Recommendation 8

Responsibility: Landscape Programme, Director, Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of staff research outputs in proportion to the expected increase of staff in the Programme.</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appointments mentioned in recommendation 7 help substantially in contributing to a strategy for supporting increased quality and number of outputs in the Landscape area.

Because of staff in Landscape having been stretched in terms of teaching and management/leadership, along with the vacant posts mentioned above not being filled, maintaining research outputs has been a challenge. However, factors mentioned in relation to the other recommendations are expected to contribute to increased number and quality of research outputs.

Recommendation 9

Responsibility: Landscape Programme, Director, Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replicate the successes of Māori content and student success for Pasifika content and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In relation to student support we have appointed a Pasifika Engagement Adviser in the Faculty of Architecture and Design from July 2019. This is someone who has a Design degree and is aware of the particular issues that are faced by students in our faculty.</td>
<td>1.July 2019</td>
<td>Point 1: July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Further, it is planned that the Landscape Programme will increase its connections and exposure to design projects that take in Pasifika content.</td>
<td>2.By start of Academic Year 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 10
Responsibility: Landscape Programme, Director, Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue with plans to create a professional advisory group for the Landscape Architecture Programme.</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Landscape Programme team have initiated the drafting of terms and references for a Professional Advisory Group. An Industrial advisory Group in one of the other discipline areas is currently being established and we are using this work as a template. As a first step a professional contacts group list has been compiled and will be regularly updated. If we are successful in the appointment of a fractional Professor of Practice mentioned recommendation 7 this would be an important contributor to the success of this advisory group.

Completion of the Implementation Plan

(Normally within 2-3 years of the initial plan being presented to the Academic Board)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Recorded by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVC/Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Leadership Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Board (notification)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of Commendations

The Panel would like to commend the Landscape Architecture Programme for:

**Commendation 1:**
Commitment to and following through the development of strong and effective communication skills in students.

**Commendation 2:**
Providing effective workshop facilities for students with training on the safe and effective use of a wide range of tools and equipment.

**Commendation 3:**
For the popular, immersive and effective learning environment provided by the field trip to a Marae in the Wairarapa

**Commendation 4:**
A strong sense of community between all Landscape Architecture students and staff

**Commendation 5:**
For a collaborative research culture which effectively utilises the School’s research clusters and encourages co-publication with students.

**Commendation 6:**
The staff are engaged in Mātauranga Māori and have committed time and effort to upskilling in this area.
Summary of Areas for Improvement

The Panel has several observations that it believes will be useful for the Landscape Architecture Programme. These take the form of: Recommendations, which the Panel thinks must be acted upon, and Suggestions, which are ideas the Panel has for implementing the recommendations or other practices the Programme may decide it could benefit from.

The Panel has identified the following areas of improvement in the Landscape Programme:

Recommendation 1:
Conduct a stock take of relevant electives within and outside the faculty. This would strongly benefit from the knowledge of current students who have taken outside electives and of staff in other programmes.

Recommendation 2:
Review the skills development in the undergraduate curriculum with a view to ensuring there is appropriate skills development.

Recommendation 3:
Identify the critical pieces of knowledge to Landscape Architecture that students must gain through any shared course(s) throughout their study in the undergraduate and postgraduate offerings.

Recommendation 4:
That SARC 491 Research Methodologies receive a School-wide review to ensure it meets the needs of all students in the School

Recommendation 5:
Urgent consultation be undertaken to understand and mitigate the challenges to embedding meaningful field trips in the Landscape Architecture curriculum.

Recommendation 6:
Actively and explicitly celebrate the uniqueness of Landscape Architecture and how landscape architecture knowledge contributes to designing for changing environments. This should aim to raise its profile as more than a subset of another programme.

Recommendation 7:
Develop a workforce strategy for future recruitment into the Landscape Architecture Programme, informed by national and international benchmarks for Landscape Architecture Programme staffing levels.

Recommendation 8:
Improve the quality of staff research outputs in proportion to the expected increase of staff in the Programme.

Recommendation 9:
Replicate the successes of Māori content and student success for Pasifika content and students.
Recommendation 10:
Continue with plans to create a professional advisory group for the Landscape Architecture Programme.

*For the suggestions below, please see the body of the report for context and the relationship that some have with specific recommendations above.*

**Suggestion 1:**
Consider development of modular courses that draw from a range of expertise across a range of disciplines

**Suggestion 2:**
Consider undergraduate special topic courses for the Landscape Architecture Programme that can be offered as electives and modified to fit the needs of students or visiting expertise.

**Suggestion 3:**
Build more opportunities for students to explore and experiment with the use of those facilities in applications of landscape architecture.

**Suggestion 4:**
Consider whether planting and/or ecological content would better serve landscape architecture students at 100-level than structural focused topics such as applied physics

**Suggestion 5:**
Review the assessment in the 300-level SARC courses with a goal of minimising overlap in assessment due dates with landscape (and other programme-specific) courses.

**Suggestion 6:**
Review assessment throughout the Landscape Programme to ensure that all assessments are contributing to the development of the students

**Suggestion 7:**
A practitioner in Landscape Architecture should be involved in the appointment process for new members of staff.

**Suggestion 8:**
Consider if alternative positions may be suitable for having practitioners appointed as academic staff. These might include:
- an ‘Adjunct professor/Professor of Practice’ for a practitioner.
- an ‘Assistant Lecturer’ role, where the person has 50% of their time dedicated to PhD study, and 50% of their time to teaching and Programme support.
- Early identification of, and support for, promising Māori and Pasifika students to whom the options for academic roles might be highlighted (“growing your own”).
- support for academic staff to continue professional practice in some capacity alongside their academic role.

**Suggestion 9:**
Improve the experience of the PhD cohort, through better integration with the Masters students and research clusters of the School, as well as encouraging upgrades to PhD from suitable masters students.

**Review Procedure**

**Self-Review**

In accordance with the University’s Academic Programme Review Handbook, the staff from the Landscape Architecture Programme and School of Architecture prepared a self-review document. The self-review exercise is designed to involve qualitative reflection by those responsible for an academic programme on issues such as how well the Programme is achieving its aims, the future development of the Programme and the integration of teaching and research, in the context of the strategic directions of the University and of international disciplinary trends.

The information gathered as part of the self-review process was presented to the Panel in advance of their visit. Details were provided in response to the questions posed by the academic programme review terms of reference. These cover: programme design, integration of research into teaching and learning activities, quality of the learning opportunities, assessment, academic community, exploration of and reflection on learning and teaching, and links to community. A student profile and staff profile were included, as were the current challenges and future directions of the Programme.

**Student Input into the Review**

**VUWSA Submission**

The Victoria University of Wellington Students Association (VUWSA) provided the Panel with a report containing the results of their survey of students in the Landscape Architecture Programme. A total of 22 students participated in the survey which covered the undergraduate and postgraduate offerings in the Programme.

**Students meeting with the Panel**

In accordance with the Programme review process, VUWSA and the Programme organised for separate groups of undergraduate and postgraduate students to meet with the review Panel. The Panel met with approximately 18 undergraduate students and then with approximately 25 postgraduate students.

**Written Submissions**

Submissions were invited from staff across Victoria, as well as any people who were unable to attend a physical meeting with the Panel. A total of 3 written submissions were received, which included a submission on the resources available to the Landscape Architecture Programmes through the Victoria University of Wellington Library, and a small number of written submissions from students. Additional written material was provided to the Panel by some of the people who met with the panel.
Oral Submissions

During the 3-day Panel visit, the Panel met with Victoria staff and students associated with the Landscape Architecture Programme. Some of these meetings were with individuals and some were with groups. Those attending included:

- The Vice-Provost Academic
- The Executive Officer to the AVC-Pasifika
- The AVC Mātauranga Māori
- The Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and Design
- The Head of School for the School of Architecture
- The Programme Director for Landscape Architecture
- The academic and contract staff who teach into the Landscape Architecture courses
- The academic staff who teach into the shared undergraduate School of Architecture courses (i.e. SARC courses)
- Students, as described in Student Input into the Review
- The Postgraduate coordinator for the School of Architecture
The Panel’s Findings

Preamble

The Panel has noted that several of its observations were also made in the previous review of the Programme in 2009 (When there was a programme review of Interior Architecture and Landscape Architecture). The Panel will reference these where they occur, but is concerned that several issues remain from this earlier review.

The Panel, and all of the people it met with as part of the review, are all very aware of the staffing context the Landscape Architecture Programme is currently in. The School is recruiting for at least two permanent academic positions, and consideration is being given to additional appointments as well (although they may be for strategic areas, it is likely that landscape architecture would be a key part of their skills base). The Panel believes that for the landscape architecture programme, as well as for reasons that will become apparent throughout the report, the core skillset of landscape architecture for these appointments will be important.

Within this context, The Panel is aware that in some of its recommendations it will be asking a lot of the Programme staff, especially in the time before any appointments are made (i.e. with the current staffing only). The Panel want to be explicitly clear that its recommendations are essential to the future of the Programme, and they will require priority from the School and Programme to address, regardless of the difficulty and irrespective of any additional staffing that is forthcoming.

The Landscape Architecture Programme is scheduled for a re-accreditation process by the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA) in 2019. While this programme review is not an accreditation visit, the Panel feels it is appropriate to highlight some areas that it feels the Programme should note in relation to accreditation, as the timing of this programme review roughly a year beforehand will allow the Programme to be well prepared for the upcoming review.

The panel considers accreditation with the NZILA is an important requirement for the programme as it provides a globally recognised benchmark for the quality of landscape architecture delivery within a professional context and more critically for students, provides for cross-crediting to other accredited programmes and reciprocation in membership to other professional institutes globally.

Programme design

(ToR 1: To what extent is the design of the overall programme and its courses comprehensive, current, coherent and clearly communicated to all teaching staff and students?)

The Panel heard that “Buildings are a central preoccupation of the School” and found this to be reflected in several places; the marketing material for the School, the graduate attributes for the Programme, the curriculum, and the list of recommended Faculty-focused electives. This is reflective of the Landscape Architecture Programme’s setting in a School of Architecture, and as an example, landscape students have to do applied physics (subjects very relevant for architecture and building science), but they are not covering ecology, geology, hydrology or planting in any great depth (core subjects for landscape architecture).
A specific concern identified by the Panel and confirmed in discussion with staff and students was that the electives reflect the stronger School-focus on buildings and building science and are of limited utility (and interest) to students in the Landscape Architecture Programme (either in theory or in practice). Some students identified courses from outside the Faculty that they had serendipitously found, and that were relevant, while other students also described finding electives outside of the Faculty but which were not relevant. Students (and staff) explicitly mentioned a desire for electives focusing on ecology and botany, and the Panel strongly endorse this as particularly relevant.

The School as a whole needs to recognise that within the current elective suites, Landscape Architecture is not sufficiently developed and it’s therefore important that the Programme director is able to recommend courses beyond the faculty and that the structure of the programmes within the faculty allow for integration of such opportunities. The School needs to let the Programme pull on existing expertise at Victoria where possible, to let it offer professionally relevant content.

The Panel recommend a stock take of relevant electives within and outside of the Faculty. This stock take can include a scan of potentially useful courses, but could also be conducted most usefully with input from students and involving academics from other Faculties able to make an informed contribution to this discussion. Thought may potentially be given to developing modular courses that draw from expertise across a range of disciplines and relevant to Landscape (e.g., “Landscape, Humanities, and Science”? and the creation of undergraduate Special Topic Landscape Architecture courses. There could also be benefits to having landscape-focused elective courses available for other students in the University, to develop awareness of landscape issues by architects, and other environmentally-focussed professions. The Panel suggests that that promotion of landscape electives will also be highly important.

**Recommendation 1:**
Conduct a stock take of relevant electives within and outside the faculty. This would strongly benefit from the knowledge of current students who have taken outside electives and of staff in other programmes.

**Suggestion 1:**
Consider development of modular courses that draw from a range of expertise across a range of disciplines

**Suggestion 2:**
Consider undergraduate special topic courses for the Landscape Architecture Programme that can be offered as electives and modified to fit the needs of students or visiting expertise.

The Landscape Architecture Programme offers a range of skill development to the students who progress through it, and the Panel was particularly impressed with the communication skills that students are developing. The Panel was informed that students receive dedicated training to presentation skills, which is a critical part of their training for their academic study as well as their future professional career.

**Commendation 1:**
Commitment to and following through the development of strong and effective communication skills in students.
The Panel does also want to suggest to the Programme that students should be encouraged to develop their own communication styles, and avoid formulaic/generic infographics. The Panel noted that there was a very consistent style in the exhibition of student work, and while all the projects were clearly communicated, the panel did note some similarities in the student work.

The Faculty of Architecture and design provide and maintains a high quality workshop for the students in the various Programmes. All students, including those in the Landscape Architecture Programme, are inducted into the safe use of the tools and machines available, so that they can complete projects involving things such as physical modelling. The Panel was impressed by the facilities available and would like to commend the Faculty for the presence and maintenance of this.

**Commendation 2:**
Providing effective workshop facilities for students with training on the safe and effective use of a wide range of tools and equipment.

In relation to the Landscape Programme, students that talked to the Panel made it clear that they did not feel any of their courses required, or even encouraged, the use of the workshop. The Panel suspects that while the courses in the Programme may not refuse some assignments that are completed using physical models, students will need active encouragement to use this as a method of exploring landscapes and structures within them. The Panel feels that encouraging use of the workshop facilities will allow Landscape Architecture students to learn from their fellow students in other disciplines in the Faculty, such as the Architecture Programme and Design Programme. Having a landscape architecture programme with access to these kinds of facilities is also a potential point of distinction for the Programme.

**Suggestion 3:**
Build more opportunities for students to explore and experiment with the use of those facilities in applications of landscape architecture.

There are some skills relevant to landscape architecture that the Programme is not currently providing sufficiently to students (or is unable to provide sufficiently to students). The Panel would again like to note the staffing context for this review, and understands the pressures on the Programme staff and what they can deliver. However, students expressed to the panel that there were several skills that were introduced within the undergraduate Landscape Architecture Programme that they did not have any assessment or training to use later in the Programme or upon graduation.

These skills included the use of digital modelling software (such as Rhino and Grasshopper), skills in sketching/hand drawing, and physical modelling (utilising the Faculty workshop facilities to model projects discussed above). Students felt that sketching, hand drawing and rendering was in a similar position to physical modelling; that there are limited assignment tasks that required the use of these skills which were developed at 100-level.

In relation to the use of digital software, students felt that they were introduced to the skills required to use digital modelling software at 100-level, but these skills were not expanded upon or developed until they had significant assignments due at 300-level in SARC courses, which students from the Architecture Programme were better able to complete as they had
received greater scaffolding of these skills during their own second year, which Landscape Architecture students did not. The Panel's perception is that the digital tools used by designers are treated as 'technical' information by the Programme and it receives less focus in the design-heavy nature of the Programme at Victoria. The Panel believes that students need to know how to appropriately apply these tools to the discipline, but does note that the Programme should not move to being entirely digital – a balance should be struck that is somewhat more in favour of digital tools than it is currently.

**Recommendation 2:**
Review the skills development in the undergraduate curriculum with a view to ensuring there is appropriate skills development.

**Suggestion 4:**
Consider whether planting and/or ecological content would better serve landscape architecture students at 100-level than structural focused topics such as applied physics

In addition, the Panel feels that some other content areas should be included, which it could not identify as being in the current Landscape Architecture offerings to the required, or expected, degree. The Panel notes that some of these skills will be looked at in the NZILA accreditation next year.

It is the Panel’s view that the Landscape Architecture Programme does not contain sufficient content in the areas of:

- **Construction**
  Landscape Construction appears to be a significant gap in the current offerings. It appeared to the Panel that this content, including grading and earthworks, needs to be embedded into more of the studios, and appear more than once in the set of courses. The Panel suggests that one way to achieve this might be to have some projects that start with the traditional wide-scope to go quite quickly down to the smaller scale. (e.g. Group work on large scale, work individually on small parts of that large scale)

- **Planting and ecology**
  Planting and ecology are core to the skills and knowledge of landscape architects, but appear to be poorly covered in the Programme. While there have been valuable opportunities given by visiting lecturers, the application of this material does not seem to be systematic. Hydrology, including aspects such as stormwater management, is also a critical skill for landscape architecture and needs to be included in ways which allow for the learning of skills and their application.

- **Landscape Planning**
  This area currently receives a very light touch approach in the Programme. Students recognised the lack of landscape planning in the Programme and informed the Panel that they desired more of it. The Panel advises that this area should cover landscape planning theory, the Resource Management Act and local government planning.

- **Geology and Land Systems**
  The Panel believe that currently, landscape students (except those who independently seek out these subjects as electives) are not developing an understanding of the underlying systems of landscapes, such as knowledge of topography, soils and the cultural associations of places to landscape. The Programme should consider this area in relation to Recommendation 1 above, in that there may be appropriate elective offerings outside the Faculty that could provide this content.
The students in the Landscape Architecture Programme expressed their satisfaction at having the latitude to develop their own briefs and strategies. The Programme needs to take care that this freedom is balanced against ensuring that students gain specific skills and can respond to directions effectively.

In terms of the overall curriculum for the Landscape Architecture Programme, the Panel commends the definite synergies that benefit the Landscape Architecture Programme from some of the interdisciplinary offerings. While some parts of the interdisciplinary connections realise greater benefit than others, Staff outside of the Programme acknowledged the valuable contribution that Landscape teaching staff and students make to the broader School. Students provided anecdotes reflecting the contribution that they, their knowledge, and their skills, were seen to provide to students in other disciplines.

However, there is a proviso to the use and success of interdisciplinarity in the Programme - it needs to be very carefully coordinated and reflected upon, and feature constant, strong communication, to ensure that the teaching is truly interdisciplinary and truly provides benefits to all students, particularly those in Landscape Architecture.

The Panel recommends that the Programme and School undergoes a process of identifying the critical pieces of knowledge for scaffolding Landscape Students through to Masters study and professional practice. The Panel believes that there will be some critical areas that are shared among the disciplines, which landscape can utilise the shared SARC course model, but some pieces of knowledge will be discipline specific.

**Recommendation 3:**
Identify the critical pieces of knowledge to Landscape Architecture that students must gain through any shared course(s) throughout their study in the undergraduate and postgraduate offerings.

The Panel also advises that staff members contributing to interdisciplinary courses need to be open to the knowledge and practices of other disciplines. In an ideal scenario, for any interdisciplinary course it should not matter which programme the staff member teaching it is from, as the teacher should pull in all the knowledge and material from across the School that all of the students need. The Panel heard that this was not happening in one 400-level course (discussed in the section Integration of research into learning and teaching activities below), and advise the School to actively ensure (and review) that this happens in the first year courses.

The Panel was informed that the Faculty of Architecture and Design is considering whether shared Faculty courses (different to the current practice of shared School of Architecture courses) are an appropriate way to provide students with the design foundation considered common to all the programmes in the faculty. The Panel believes that there are some skills common to ‘design’ generally in the faculty, but that this would not be appropriate for an entire first year and programmes should be introducing their own content as needed. Given the concerns articulated in this review regarding the extent to which Landscape Architecture is currently seen to be prioritised, the Panel were wary of this suggestion. The way any Faculty-shared courses are implemented will be crucial for the success of all the programmes in the Faculty, as students need to have clearly visible pathways for how they can make it to their preferred outcomes. A shared year needs a very clear objective. (Don’t break something that is working).
Several submissions to the Panel also asked for advice in relation to new programmes or offerings that the Faculty/School/Programme could run, that were either focused on or connected to Landscape Architecture. The Panel suggests that, given the current staffing of the Programme, new programmes are not the main priority right now. Once the Programme gets new staffing, the Programme could then consider new programmes that can tie into the research interests of the (current and new) staff. The Panel also wishes to note that there may be a lack of communication of longer-term strategic directions between the Faculty, the School and the Landscape Programme. Understanding of strategic directions and imperatives were inconsistently articulated and shared depending on who the Panel spoke to, and depending on their roles.

**Integration of research into learning and teaching activities**

*(ToR 2: To what extent does the Programme integrate research into teaching and learning activities?)*

The Panel was impressed with the emphasis of community involvement present in student research projects. This provides students with the skills to undertake research through community collaboration and consultation and provide good training for the consultation common in the professional sector.

The Panel received some worrying submissions from postgraduate students about the 400-level course SARC 491 *Research Methodologies*. This course is absolutely critical for the success of all School of Architecture students going from their completed 3rd year as undergraduates to the final year project/thesis. The Panel are concerned that this importance is not reflected in the learning experience. Landscape students did not feel that SARC 491 scaffolds them towards a successful fifth year, and reported being passively (and sometimes actively) discouraged from exploring methodologies appropriate for Landscape Architecture. The Panel also feels strongly that it is not enough to have a tutor familiar with Landscape be part of the course to offset this lack of relevance. Importantly, we were told this would likely not be limited to the students in Landscape, but all students from disciplines different to that of the coordinator taking the course. The Panel also felt that issues and practices around ethics approval might usefully be part of content in this course.

The Panel recommends a School-wide review of SARC 491 to develop a course that can achieve what is needed by all students, potentially co-taught across the Programmes to ensure relevance and inter-disciplinary fertilisation, and staffed in a way that provides continuity from year-to-year (rather than reflecting who is available to teach after other responsibilities have been determined).

**Recommendation 4:**

That SARC 491 *Research Methodologies* receive a School-wide review to ensure it meets the needs of all students in the School.

The Panel also suggests that the content of the research methods course be considered more broadly, as it was unsure if topics such as understanding the processes for ethics approval were included.

In regards to the final year of the Masters (500-level), the Panel has several comments to make:
• It believes that the cohort and cluster-led approach utilised in the School is good for the students in Landscape as it enables synergies between students and staff.
• It supports the move to the portfolio model (instead of the thesis model) but was not clear on whether students in the future will be still be able to take the thesis as an option or if the portfolio will be the only 500-level piece of Masters work.
• It strongly supports the Programme’s belief that the Masters projects should be focused on completion within 9 months instead of 12. The Panel suggests that even if this does not change formally in the rules, that staff and supervisors can and should set expectations for completion within 9 months.
• Student comments verified its concerns that there can be a loss of momentum in students projects when they take place over such a long time period. The recurring three-monthly reviews/presentation of student progress are a good process and could be adapted to increase student engagement.

Quality of the learning opportunities

(ToR 3: What is the quality of the learning opportunities provided by the Programme?)

A common topic of discussion during this review was the benefits and challenges of field trips, which are a common and important learning opportunity in landscape architecture programmes across New Zealand and Australia. The Panel wants to make clear here that it is talking about 2-3 day and sometimes week-long (or similar) immersive trips to sites, not month-long trips overseas or one day site visits.

The Panel received strong positive feedback from a number of sources on the current cultural studio run in the Wairarapa. The Panel understands that this involves a week-long field trip to the Wairarapa, and is based at a Marae. This is an excellent practice and immerses students in the landscape and cultural context of the project. The Panel suggests that this course be an exemplar for other field trip courses in the Programme and School.

Commendation 3:
For the popular, immersive and effective learning environment provided by the field trip to a Marae in the Wairarapa

This field trip is one demonstration of the wider strength of the Landscape Architecture Programme in teaching cultural landscapes. The Panel will cover this in more detail in the section on Links to Community below, but wishes to draw the university’s attention to this success which is also recognised by the success of the Programme’s students, one of whom has received the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) President’s prize.

The Panel believes that the School of Architecture needs to have a better understanding and recognition of the fact that meaningful, direct, immersion in sites and places with people is a foundational imperative for Landscape Architecture study and practice. Field trips to achieve this are an essential component of a landscape architecture education, and not ‘just’ an option. It was not clear that the School understands that trips are an essential and critical part of having landscape students get the required immersion and experiences in the locations they work on. The Panel were told variously that field trips were “against the University’s rules”, “bureaucratically impossible”, “prohibited by TEC”, or “impossible to schedule.” We were left uncertain as to the extent to which these issues are as intractable as they were presented, particularly in a context in which other New Zealand and Australian
Landscape Programmes routinely include field opportunities and courses in their degrees. The Panel understands that there are logistical difficulties in scheduling alongside other courses. However, in recognising the importance of the field trips, structural adjustments to the timetable may be required to ensure a quality learning experience.

**Recommendation 5:**
Urgent consultation be undertaken to understand and mitigate the challenges to embedding meaningful field trips in the Landscape Architecture curriculum.

A point of difference to be celebrated in the Landscape Architecture Programme is that its focus is not on cities alone. The current Programme has a good mix of rural, urban, semi-urban content. This is appropriate as Landscape Architecture is inherently around working at different scales and in different contexts. Underpinning this is the students appreciation that they were taught to appreciate the whole landscape and developed a very broad social, environmental understanding of landscapes and places.

**Assessment**

*(ToR 4: How well does assessment align with programme learning goals and foster learning?)*

The Panel heard no concerns from students about the extent and timeliness of feedback on work and assessment and where students mentioned feedback it was typically positive. Some frustration was articulated around hand-in bottle necks, not within the LAND courses (as this was described as quite well coordinated) but for SARC courses taken in third year alongside those disciplinary courses. Whilst it is difficult to balance hand-in times for four programmes (Architecture, Interiors, Landscapes and Building Science) that have students taking the shared courses, the Panel suggests that this should be looked at and coordinated across all the programmes, consistent with the expectations outlined in the *Assessment Handbook*.

**Suggestion 5:**
Review the assessment in the 300-level SARC courses with a goal of minimising overlap in assessment due dates with landscape (and other programme-specific) courses.

Students did inform the Panel that some of them felt like they were being assessed very frequently, in the vein of once per week. The Panel suspect there’s a difference between milestone setting/checks and actual assessment times. The Programme may want to undertake a review of its assessment practices and make sure they are contributing to student development. This could include making sure that key content, such as the limited number of guest lectures on hydrology, are assessed to signal the importance of that material to the students.

**Suggestion 6:**
Review assessment throughout the Landscape Programme to ensure that all assessments are contributing to the development of the students

---

1 Section 3.3 ‘Assessment timing’, Assessment Handbook, pp. 13-14
Engagement in learning/academic community

*(ToR 5: To what extent has the Programme developed a learning and teaching environment that effectively promotes engagement in learning and a sense of academic community?)*

The Landscape Architecture Programme has developed a very strong sense of community among the students, who explicitly and spontaneously expressed that this sense extended to the academic staff. There was a strong feeling of shared endeavour. One piece of evidence for this is the unusually large number of students who took time, during their preparation for final hand-ins, to meet with the Panel.

During the meeting with staff from outside the Landscape Architecture Programme who teach into SARC courses, it was clear that they recognised this as well, and the value of the positive impact that the Landscape Programme had made to the broader School and its Programmes. The Panel was also impressed by the spaces dedicated to Landscape students, and were convinced that this is a significant part of that sense of community and preparation for practice. As well as our recommendations about raising the visibility of the Programme, we would strongly oppose any initiatives that would, however well-intended, dilute this.

**Commendation 4:**

A strong sense of community between all Landscape Architecture students and staff

The Panel hastens to add that this sense of community is enabled in substantial part by the physical studio space for the students. Having a dedicated physical location for landscape architecture - including space for ‘spread’ of drawings and material – gives the space the atmosphere of a studio in professional practice, and sets students up very well for their work environment after graduation. The location is also in close proximity to the Academic staff. It is even a space “that students at Melbourne University would be jealous of”. As such, this space should be maintained/preserved at all costs.

The Landscape Architecture Programme is challenged, sitting within the wider School of Architecture, to clearly distinguish itself as a distinct discipline. The profile of its research, and its profile generally, are obscured by the size of the Architecture Programme and the School’s preconceived focus on buildings.

It was clear to the Panel that a pecking order is perceived by students among the Programmes, and students within those Programmes, in the School. The Panel would also be surprised if this is limited to the students in the Landscape Programme. For example, while passing the exhibition of Landscape work we overheard two students make derogatory comments about Landscape work, and another student informed the Panel that a fellow student asked them “Are you doing landscape architecture because you couldn’t get in to architecture?” On the one hand, the Panel acknowledges that Architecture is the most preferred course of study for students entering Year One, but it is concerning to hear that it is assumed by students that if you proceed to Landscape Architecture it is because you were not good enough for Architecture.

Students also reported that during the shared first year there was no breaking of the myth that landscape architecture is ‘just gardens’, in any of the courses, so it wasn’t until second
year when preferences for majors in the degree were already made that students really got to know what the subject was about.

The Panel has noted the concern about visibility of the Landscape Programme both to current and prospective students. A staff member from outside the Programme recommended “recognising and celebrating the unique voice of landscape architecture”. One way to address this is through appropriate staffing (discussed in more detail related to the panel comments on staff in the section *Exploration and reflection on learning and teaching within the Programme* below), and consideration should also be given to ensure that all Programmes (not just Landscape) are appropriately introduced as legitimate and distinctive parts of the teaching and learning, research, and practice activities of the School.

This relates not only to the advertising materials but also the website, as a search for [Victoria landscape architecture] leads to the Bachelor of Architectural Studies relegating Landscape Architecture and Interior Architecture to subjects underneath architecture. This is despite the website’s claim that “Architecture is much more than just designing buildings. It is about understanding what the building is for, who is going to use it, how the structure works and how it will fit in with the surroundings”, which clearly expresses the validity of all avenues of architectural study.

The division perceived between the Programme and cohorts was also visible to the students when they compared their course of study to that of other programmes. They reported that at 200-level, there were shared courses between the Interior Architecture and the Architecture Programmes, which allowed them to develop a stronger sense of inter-programme collaboration than the Landscape students. Landscape has no shared courses, which led to them articulating feelings of relative isolation from the other programmes.

The Panel feel it is important to recognise that Landscape Architecture (and perhaps other disciplines) may be held accountable for failure to meet projected student numbers when Landscape Architecture is not sufficiently visible for prospective students to proactively choose to come to Victoria, or to actively choose once in first-year to proceed to 200-level and beyond. The Panel was informed that the Faculty now has a marketing group able to emphasise the design nature of programmes in the faculty, but the Landscape Programme needs to be advertised and celebrated as a unique offering, not as a subset of another programme.

**Recommendation 6:**

Actively and explicitly celebrate the uniqueness of Landscape Architecture and how landscape architecture knowledge contributes to designing for changing environments. This should aim to raise its profile as more than a subset of another programme.

The Landscape Architecture Programme, as well as the School and Faculty, asked the Panel to provide advice on how the Programme could best respond to the university’s desire for growth in international students.

The Panel advises that the Programme needs to be realistic, given that there are Programmes in Australia in which international comprise the majority of students already. It was not clear that there is a carefully-developed and well-informed strategy about how to find markets of students, recruit them and how the Programme can/should accommodate any differences needed for an increased international cohort. Universities with high numbers of international students will face a different set of challenges to the domestic
market, as well as different demands of content and cultural expectations. This contrasts with the success of the Programme in the Māori space and their desire expressed to expand this to the Pasifika space as well.

The Panel suggests that if the Programme wants to pursue international students, the best first step would be the development of a strategy that clearly identifies and justifies who should be recruited, how the Programme will change to attract them while continuing other objectives, and why that group/country/region is the Programme’s best source of international students.

**Exploration and reflection on learning and teaching within the Programme**

*(ToR 6: How effectively and efficiently does the Programme manage, explore and reflect on learning and teaching in relation to its learning and teaching goals?)*

It is the Panel’s view that the Programme needs to be better managed in terms of its staffing in order to perform an optimally effective learning and teaching role. Whilst aware that additional appointments are pending, the Panel has several comments to make on this topic.

First, as everyone is involved is likely aware, the Programme is currently at great risk and vulnerable to any additional staff losses. A major sickness or departure would severely impact the ability of the Programme to deliver the qualifications.

Everyone the Panel spoke to acknowledged that the Programme is not staffed in the manner and to the level desired, or sustainable in the short-term. Everyone acknowledged that the successes we observed have been strongly supported by the efforts of sessional staff, and we would commend the permanent and sessional staff for building a cohesive group of educators, which were appreciated by their students. However, the challenges for sessional, part-time staff, did not seem fully appreciated outside of the Programme.

There was some disagreement presented to the Panel as to the appropriate level of staffing. The Panel suggests that, in conjunction with Faculty HR, there be a review of current needs and consideration around developing a workforce strategy looking to the future. Decisions about appropriate staffing **must** allow for Landscape to be able to do several key things:

- to visibly and productively contribute to the common first-year (to clearly foreground the value of Landscape as an option for students, as well as its value to practice in other disciplines)
- to contribute effectively and appropriately to SARC 352 and SARC 491
- to have appropriate balance in skillsets of the Programme, considering how many (or if) staff should have PhDs or be predominantly teaching focused
- with an eye to the future, to provide capacity for postgraduate supervision (and specifically PhD supervision).

The Panel suggest that consideration be given to having an appropriate practitioner representative involved in selection of current and future Landscape hires, in order that relevant discipline knowledge can be identified accurately. This would also provide confidence to the Programme that appropriate discipline knowledge is on the panel.
Recommendation 7:
Develop a workforce strategy for future recruitment into the Landscape Architecture Programme, informed by national and international benchmarks for Landscape Architecture Programme staffing levels.

Suggestion 7:
A practitioner in Landscape Architecture should be involved in the appointment process for new members of staff.

Suggestion 8:
Consider if alternative positions may be suitable for having practitioners appointed as academic staff. These might include:
- an ‘Adjunct professor/Professor of Practice’ for a practitioner.
- an ‘Assistant Lecturer’ role, where the person has 50% of their time dedicated to PhD study, and 50% of their time to teaching and Programme support.
- Early identification of, and support for, promising Māori and Pasifika students to whom the options for academic roles might be highlighted (“growing your own”).
- support for academic staff to continue professional practice in some capacity alongside their academic role.

The current staff in the Landscape Architecture Programme have, in the Panel’s view, effectively adapted their curriculum to the loss of the senior staff and are providing an appropriate set of offerings in landscape architecture. Staff have proactively undertaken their own review of the Programme to ensure they have an effective offering. These decisions made around the curriculum have manifested into a cohesive, whanau based culture, including both staff and students. This environment nurtures landscape architects in the best way.

Individual and Collective Research

(ToR 7: To what extent is individual and collective research fostered in the Programme?)

The Panel commends the Landscape Architecture Programme for their collaboration with students on producing research. There was good evidence that students and staff collaborate to produce research outputs, which is another sign of the tight, productive sense of community in the Programme and gives students a visible research base from which to proceed into academic or professional careers.

The Programme is also taking advantage of the research clusters in the School. The Panel found that there are research streams relevant to landscape architecture, that seem to be working well and relevant to staff and student interests. This may become more of a challenge as Programme staff and student numbers grow, but should be maintained where possible.

Commendation 5:
For a collaborative research culture which effectively utilises the School’s research clusters and encourages co-publication with students.

The PhD cohort in the Landscape Architecture Programme is currently very small, and is not enough to create the same sense of cohort that the masters and undergraduate students
experience. They are also formally located in a different location to the undergraduate and Masters students, which creates a perception of separation from the other qualifications.

The Panel suggests that, while the Programme does not have enough PhD students to support them having their own cohort, that there may be opportunities tied to the research clusters and Masters students to the benefit of all. PhD students may be able to realise synergies if they were allocated to research clusters alongside staff and masters students, and the Panel feel this is an option worth exploring.

The Panel did not feel that the masters students were aware of the possibility of ‘upgrading’ their Masters to a PhD. Whilst this may only be suitable for some of the students who are motivated and performing well, the Programme staff should (selectively) communicate to students that they can progress their Portfolio work into a PhD. The Panel does note that this option is constrained by staff availability and suitability for supervision, so advises that this is done only when the Programme has sufficient staffing capacity to do so.

**Suggestion 9:**
Improve the experience of the PhD cohort, through better integration with the Masters students and research clusters of the School, as well as encouraging upgrades to PhD from suitable masters students.

The Panel were provided with some limited information concerning staff research output. Staff research outputs are, in the panel’s view, not reflective of the same quality as the teaching and learning experience they provide. This is understandable given the pressures on a small number of staff to deliver the teaching of the Programme, but should be an area of focus that grows alongside the staff numbers.

**Recommendation 8:**
Improve the quality of staff research outputs in proportion to the expected increase of staff in the Programme.

**Links to community**

*(ToR 8: How clearly and effectively is the Programme linked to and responsive to its relevant academic, social and professional communities?)*

The Panel would like to commend the staff of the Landscape Architecture Programme for their commitment and engagement with increasing the amount of Māori knowledge – Mātauranga Māori – in the Programme and undertaking professional development to increase their own skills and confidence in this area.

The Panel was initially concerned that a superficial consideration of the staff profile within the Landscape Architecture Programme appeared to be disproportionately male and from international backgrounds. However, this does not appear to reflect anything problematic in the Programme as there is a healthy diversity in gender amongst the students and the Programme includes substantial Māori content. The staff clearly demonstrate commitment to cultural considerations within teaching and learning (and research) opportunities. The Panel was told “What’s remarkable is that there are almost 100% Māori pass rates” in the undergraduate programme and that they were role-models for engagement with Iwi.
Commendation 6:
The staff are engaged in Mātauranga Māori and have committed time and effort to upskilling in this area.

The Programme’s focus in future should, based on the information provided to the panel, be focused on maintaining and consolidating the presence of Māori knowledge and experiences in the curriculum, and to take what steps it can to increase its recruitment of Māori students. The Programme’s success in Māori content and Māori student retention/achievement mean that the Programme’s focus should be getting additional Māori students interested and undertaking Landscape Architecture. This is tied into the marketing issues highlighted in section Engagement in learning/academic community, as the Programme’s lack of distinctiveness from Architecture may be a factor in recruitment of Māori (and other) students.

The Programme’s other area of focus should be on replicating its successes in the Māori space with success in the equivalent Pasifika space. The panel has the impression that currently ‘Māori’ and ‘Pasifika’ are treated as interchangeable. The Programme should aim to do what they’ve achieved beautifully with Māori content and students’ success for Pasifika content and students.

Recommendation 9:
Replicate the successes of Māori content and student success for Pasifika content and students.

The Panel notes that its impression of the Programme is that staff are carrying on a legacy that established the good practice for Maori students and knowledge. This is not to denigrate the efforts of the current staff in any way, but to note that this appeared to be the origin of the Programme’s success in this area and may influence how new staff perceive this as a priority. It may also be an influence as to why Pasifika did not seem to be prioritised as a different world view that’s being embedded in the Programme.

The panel also notes that, in relation to its discussion on electives in the first section of this report (Programme design – ToR1), the School should also consider if there are appropriate options for Māori content and Pasifika content, which will help to build interdisciplinary knowledge in students.

The Panel was informed that the Landscape Architecture Programme and the School of Architecture is considering the establishment of a professional advisory group in some form. The Panel strongly supports this idea, and believes that individual boards for each of the disciplines will be necessary. Some submissions to the Panel indicate that a School-wide advisory group is/was utilised but that it could not focus on the individual needs of each of the programmes in the School.

The Panel believes that a professional advisory group should be in a position where they can discuss their perceived gaps in course content and reach an understanding with the Programme on what is offered. This group should be able to make clear to the leadership of the School what the Landscape Architecture industry requires, and also provide assurance to students that they are learning material that will be valuable in practice.
Recommendation 10:
Continue with plans to create a professional advisory group for the Landscape Architecture Programme.

In relation to the Programme’s links to the Professional sector, the Panel acknowledges again the commitment and value that sessional staff provide for the Programme. The Panel notes that the current positions of ‘teaching fellow’ do not get support for having input to the curriculum. The Panel would like senior management in the School and faculty to recognise the complexities of the profile of the academic/practitioner nexus in the Programme, and come to grips with their staffing strategy, particularly in regards to retention and development of all staff. Both students and staff see the professional input as important, and industry would value connections to the teaching and research of the discipline.

Issues raised in the Review Processes

(ToR 9: Has the Panel identified any examples of good practice in learning and teaching that it feels should be shared more widely?)
(ToR 10: Where appropriate, what comment can be provided on additional issues raised by the Programme in their self-review document, or by the Dean of the Faculty?)

Some very good practice that the panel believes the university should acknowledge and celebrate include the overwhelming recognition from students of the support that staff provide, and the entire Programme’s very strong sense of community. This was made clear to the panel from the comments of students, who felt treated as equals with their teachers and fellow students, from staff outside the Programme who recognised this strong sense of community, and from the interactions the panel observed while visiting the Landscape Architecture studio space where the students were based. The combination of factors that have led to such a strong and supportive community should be shared across the university, so that other programmes may be able to potentially replicate this success.

The Panel also noted some areas of confusion in the submissions, verbal and written, it received. These include:

- **The end of year exhibition**
  This issue is tied to the duration of the masters (discussed in the section Integration of research into learning and teaching activities) and whether student are finishing their projects at an appropriate time to present and celebrate their theses/portfolios, but it was not clear to the Panel based on what staff and students said that there is an end of year exhibition to celebrate student work, nor who organises and resources such an exhibition.

- **Counselling services available on the Te Aro campus**
  The Panel was informed that there were not counselling services (run by the central university) available on the Te Aro campus, yet when it was taken on a tour through the building, it learnt that there is at least some counselling service run there.

- **The availability of ‘Lynda.com’ (a training platform for digital modelling technology)**
  Students were not certain of the availability of Lynda.com on campus, and this confusion was exacerbated by the Wellington City Library apparently offering access to this site for residents of the city.
The Panel strongly believes that there should be clarity provided to students and staff on each of these areas so that confusion can be avoided in future.
TO  Academic Board

FROM  Professor Stuart Brock, Vice Provost Academic

DATE  13 September 2019

SUBJECT  2019 Graduating Year Reviews (GYRs)

Executive Summary

The Graduating Year Review is an important step in monitoring the impact of new programmes offered at the University after the first cohort of full-time students in a new programme have graduated. Each report is submitted to the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) for approval\(^1\) following consideration by the Academic Board.

The GYRs involve the programme completing a self-reflection exercise, followed by review by an evaluation group including academic representation from outside the faculty and discipline in which the programme is offered.

The reports for qualifications requiring Graduating Year Reviews that Victoria University is due to submit to CUAP in 2019 are attached:

1. Master of Political Science (MPols), and associated PGDipPols
2. Master of Teaching and Learning, Primary and Secondary (MTchLrn(Pri)(Sec))
4. Master of e-Government (MEGov)
5. Bachelor of Education (Honours) (BEd(Hons))

The decisions in these reports were endorsed by the University Academic Committee, as well as by the Senior Leadership Team. The decision has been made to continue four of the qualifications, and one (the Bachelor of Education (Honours)) will be discontinued due to a lack of enrolments.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

- Provide feedback on the Graduating Year Review reports
- **Approve** the Graduating Year Review reports for submission to CUAP.

\(^1\) If a Graduating Year Review is not provided, CUAP may suspend approval of the programme meaning that no new students can be enrolled.
Graduating Year Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current year</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of programme</td>
<td>Master of e-Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier for the original proposal</td>
<td>VUW/13-MEGov/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of self-review coordinator and position held</td>
<td>Dr Karl Lofgren, Deputy Head of School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Programme Statement

(a) Description
The Master of e-Government (MEGov) was approved in 2013. It is a 180-point programme, which can be completed within one year. The programme consists of six mandatory courses (each 15 points), electives worth 60 points and a research component with 30 points. The programme provides post-graduate level training to graduates with a cognate disciplinary background (e.g. public policy, law or information systems) relevant for people seeking to better lead and manage digitally-enabled changes within public sector organisations, and/or who are pursuing an academic career in the academic study field of e-government. The programme is closely aligned with the research of the Chair in Digital Government so that research-led teaching can be offered through the programme. The programme was aimed particularly at public managers from overseas jurisdictions in the Asia-Pacific region. The programme was launched in 2014 and saw its first graduate in 2015. The directorship of the programme was transferred to the School of Government Director for professional programmes in 2016. Much of the actual coordination has arisen from meetings with the involved teachers. With the new structure within the Faculty, an Academic Programme Leader under Professional Programmes Board (PPB) will provide academic leadership to the programme from 2019. However, the programme will remain aligned with the Chair in Digital Government, and with the involved teaching team working to secure alignment between the different courses.

(b) Changes
Before 2019 there were no changes to the programmes, or to the core courses. However, the School made minor changes to the titles, the prescriptions, assignments and course learning objectives for the three EGOV courses 501, 502, 503, primarily to replace “e-government” by “digital government”.

(c) Achievement
The specific goals of the programme are to:

- Foster the knowledge, capacity and understanding to collaborate across a range of disciplines involved in the management of ICT-enabled public sector reform initiatives;
- Develop and build international capability in managing transformational e-Government in Australasia and developing countries, with a particular focus on the urgent need of countries from the Asia-Pacific region, including, where relevant and appropriate, the Pacific Islands, to build public management capability focused on ICT-enabled public sector reform initiatives to achieve good governance; and
- Further enhance Victoria University’s international profile as a leading research-intensive university in the emerging field of e-Government.

While the goals of the programme have largely been met, the low enrolment numbers to the programme (see below) present a challenge to the future growth of the programme. Some conclusions with respect to each of the three goals are:
#1 The programme has succeeded in creating a learning space for issues around digitally enabled platforms spanning across existing disciplinary boundaries, providing the students with a theory-informed practical training for future career opportunities in managing e-government projects and draft policies in that space.

#2 Most of the students have come from countries in Asia (e.g. Cambodia, India, and Indonesia), and while the teaching has revolved around New Zealand examples, the courses have provided good learning spaces for sharing experiences between developed and developing jurisdictions (in particularly through the group-based assignments).

#3 While there have been many discussions and attempts to use the programme as a stepping stone for enhancing the university’s international profile, it has until now been hard work to increase the intake of international students. However, this is likely to change with memorandums of understanding signed off with University of Indonesia (2018) and with Evan’s School of Public Policy, University of Washington (2019), with the goal of allowing for collaboration between Masters degrees.

2. **GYR Review Processes**

   Dr Karl Lofgren, Deputy Head of School, and course coordinator for EGOV 501 and 502, was the self-review coordinator for this process, supported by Dr Peter Hodder, Advisor Accreditation and Projects.

   The evaluation group for this GYR was composed of the following members:

   - Paul Teesdale-Spittle, Associate Dean – Academic (Programme Development), Faculty of Science (Convenor)
   - Dr John Randal, Associate Dean, Students, Victoria Business School

3. **Review Outcomes**

   (a) **Acceptability**

   The MEGov programme received strong support from external stakeholders both before and after its launch in 2014. Government actors in both New Zealand and overseas have voiced their interest in and support to the programme as an alternative to existing master’s qualifications in public management and information systems. However, these pledges have not been reflected in more direct support to candidates wishing to enrol. There has not been a huge international market for the programme beyond students on various scholarships. However, the programme content has more recently been reviewed by overseas universities and based on what they found; the university has signed two agreements on collaborative master’s programmes (see above).

   The programme has attracted 2-4 new students a year since its inception. It currently has 3 students enrolled. Student feedback was obtained for this review from VUWSA and was available to the evaluation group.

   With respect to the graduate attributes the programme has succeeded in achieving the profile in the CUAP application with a good alignment between attributes, assignments and actual students results. We have also received feedback from our students that the programme is filling a gap in qualifications in demand in the public sector labour market. To take two examples:

   *Completing the Master of e-Government really lifted my sights. I have greater confidence in my ability to find and understand great ideas about, and approaches to, humanity’s most pressing challenges.* - (Graduate 2016, NZ)

   *The courses have combined important disciplines, particularly from public policy and management, information management and other e-government-related aspects [...] The integration of these are crucial as it provided me insight into particular e-government challenges as well as the relationship between ICT and policies and governance issues, which are closely related to the success of e-government initiatives and implementation.* (Graduate 2015, Cambodia)
Evaluation Group comments:
Whilst attracting few students at this stage, the programme appears to provide an important contribution to the digital government field. There is potential for increasing numbers as the programme becomes more widely recognised in the public sector in NZ and abroad, and the international links indicated suggest that this is beginning to occur. The benefit of reviewing the reasons for low recruitment are noted below.

(b) Assessment and moderation procedures
The assessment and moderation procedures for the MEGov programme are identical to the MPP/MPM programmes with the study board of the two programmes reviewing the individual courses at the end of each trimester. All these procedures are in line with Faculty processes and the University Assessment policies (as stipulated in the handbook).
While the vast majority of assessments are individual ones, there is also one group assessment in EGOV 501 (10% of the course assignments) and individual online assessments in EGOV 503 (50% of the course assignments).
Assessments (including specific questions) are vetted by a colleague prior to provision to students. All students are given written feedback in addition to marks/grades for their course work.
The final research essay is marked and assessed in the same way as the research component for the MPP/MPM programmes. That involves designing a piece of original research and conduct a fresh, theoretically informed, critical examination of a specific topic in digital government.

Evaluation Group comments:
Assessment and moderation procedures are appropriate.

(c) Data
As shown in table 1 - and discussed above, the predicted enrolments have been far lower than predicted, and with some fluctuation filling the individual courses with students from other programmes. While we can only speculate whether the school/university’s efforts to recruit student have been enough, the School has spent significant resources on attracting both domestic students (open days, websites etc.) and international ones. Still, it should be emphasised that the number of dedicated core courses of the programme is low, and that these courses have attracted interest from students from the established MPP/MPM programmes as well as the school of information management programmes. Consequently, the cost of running the programme is relatively low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years (from and including the first)</th>
<th>Predicted enrolments (headcount)</th>
<th>Actual numbers enrolled</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>EFTS</th>
<th>Numbers completed</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (45)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (45)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 (45)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Group comments:
The low numbers compared to anticipated enrolments is disappointing. However, as the document notes the cost of delivery of the programme is offset by significant student numbers (an average of 66%) taking the courses as part of their study towards another qualification (such as the Master of
Public Management). While these are supporting the enrolments in other programmes then there is no urgent reason to make dramatic changes. 

Whilst the marketing of the programme is an obvious target for critique, the programme team should also evaluate whether the difference between a predicted 45 people enrolled and an actual 3 (down from 10 in 2017) is because there is a disconnect between the needs of their target recruitment group and what the programme is providing. Could this lie in a problem of content not matching needs of the anticipated potential students, internal professional development in the employers already meeting anticipated demand, or a lack of interest of potential students in committing to a masters rather than doing shorter elements of professional development?

(d) Programme evaluation and review

The programme has not been subject to any specific independent review. However, some individual courses can be taken for the MPM and MPP degrees, which were successful in gaining NASPAA accreditation in 2017, and the programme has naturally been involved in the Faculty’s overall review activities including accreditations.

In 2019 the three dedicated core courses (EGOV 501, EGOV 502, EGOV 503) underwent an internal review with the group of teachers involved in the programme. This resulted in minor changes to these courses. E-government has been proposed as a specialisation in the faculty MGBus degree (approved, CUAP R1) and MPP/MPM (in train, VUW internal process).

Evaluation Group comments:
Given the continual shortfall in enrolment compared to predictions over 6 years of data available, it is a little surprising to find that no significant review of the underpinning reasons has been completed. It is noted that the next section includes an intention to carry out such a review.

It would be worth evaluating whether the e-government courses in the programme are leading to an increase in enrolments in partner programmes. An alternative option is that there are no new enrolments in the partner programmes. That could imply students are taking the e-government courses without adding new EFTS to the school, meaning an increase in delivery that is not matched by EFTS.

(e) Continuation or discontinuation

Victoria Business School will be exploring major changes in the structure of the programme going forward to make the offerings in e-government/digital government more attractive to students.

Evaluation Group comments:
Continuation is recommended at this stage, given that the cost of delivery is offset by students from other programmes taking the e-government courses. The idea of undertaking a review to evaluate the programme structure is endorsed, as part of the larger programme of work to refresh postgraduate offerings Faculty wide.

PVC approval for continuation

PVC:  Associate Professor Jane Bryson
       Acting PVC and Dean of Commerce
Date:  14 August 2019
Graduating Year Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current year</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of programme</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education (Honours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier for the original proposal</td>
<td>(04) VUW/13 – BEd(Hons)/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of self-review coordinator and position held</td>
<td>Mary Jane Shuker, Programme Director, Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Programme Statement

(a) Description

The BEd(Hons) was designed to build upon the existing BEd(Tchg)ECE degree and the Early Childhood Education (ECE) major within the BA, enabling students to engage in advanced, specialised study in ECE, as well as providing an option for graduates from relevant undergraduate degrees.

As an emerging discipline, the wider ECE sector needs a stronger, broader research base and better educated teachers if it is to ensure that all children are confident and competent learners in their early years. In building upon the initial teacher preparation provided by the BEd(Tchg)ECE degree, the BEd(Hons) programme was designed to enable teachers to develop expertise required by the sector in areas such as leadership, infant and toddler pedagogy, and advocacy.

The programme offered a pathway into post-graduate study and research, thus building post-graduate ECE enrolments and future research capability. In addition to attracting current BEd(Tchg)ECE students into the programme it was envisaged that previous graduates and teachers holding other equivalent teaching qualifications would be attracted to the Honours programme because of its specific emphasis on early childhood issues and research.

The Faculty of Education recognised that providing a route whereby students could embark on a three-year degree with the potential to continue into the Honours programme offered flexibility and kept their future choices open. Alongside this, it was envisaged that the access to allowances that an Honours programme provides would encourage students to continue their study. These factors were also thought likely to increase the numbers of Māori and Pacific students engaged in study in early childhood education at VUW.

(b) Changes

There have been no changes to the regulations.

(c) Achievement

The goal of the qualification, as articulated in the original CUAP proposal, was to provide a pathway for graduates of the BEd(Tchg)ECE to undertake advanced study that would enable them to move into Masters or PhD study, and to undertake leadership roles within education.

The goal has not been met. There has been very little demand for the programme, with just one full-time and one part-time enrolment, resulting in a single graduate. No further enrolments are being accepted and there is an intention to engage in a CUAP process to delete the programme.

2. GYR Review Processes

The Evaluation Group for this GYR comprised the following members:

- Dr Michael Johnston, Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Education (Convener)
• Dr Anita Brady, Associate Dean (Teaching and Equity), Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
• Joseph Habgood, Student Representation Co-ordinator, VUWSA

There is no intention to continue with the programme, there are no current students and only one graduate. Therefore, the evaluation group was minimally constituted.

3. Review Outcomes

(a) Acceptability

There was a strong positive response to this programme from the members of the ECE advisory board when it was mooted. However, as noted above, the programme did not achieve its projected enrolments, with just two enrolments and one graduate over three years.

The Evaluation Group notes that, while the programme was established with reason to believe that it would succeed in its goals, it has not attracted sufficient enrolments to justify its continuation.

(b) Assessment and moderation procedures

Course outlines were peer reviewed prior to publication. Assessment tasks and marking were moderated by academic staff from the School of Education.

The Evaluation Group notes that assessment and moderation procedures were in line with faculty and university policy.

(c) Data

The predicted enrolments for this programme were not met. Only one student has successfully completed this qualification. A possible explanation for the much lower-than-anticipated enrolments is that its benefits were not clearly understood by teachers in the ECE sector, despite initial endorsement by the ECE advisory board.

Table 1: Summary information on numbers enrolling and completing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years (from and including the first)</th>
<th>Predicted enrolments (headcount)</th>
<th>Actual numbers enrolled</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>EFTS</th>
<th>Numbers completed</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The part-time enrolment in 2017 was terminated following fail grades in EDUC 466 and EDUC 489.

The Evaluation Group notes that the programme has fallen far short of its predicted enrolments.

(d) Programme evaluation and review

Course and teaching evaluations were not sought from students. The programme has not attracted sufficient students for an evaluation or review to be meaningful.

The Evaluation Group notes that no meaningful evaluation can be carried out and that, with an intention that it be deleted, there would be little point in any case.
(e) Continuation or discontinuation

It is intended that the BEd(Hons) qualification be discontinued due to lack of enrolments.

The Evaluation Group endorses the intention to discontinue the programme.

PVC approval for discontinuation

PVC: Prof Jennifer Windsor
Date: 9 July 2019
Graduating Year Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current year</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Name of programme** | Master of Teaching and Learning (Primary)  
Master of Teaching and Learning (Secondary) |
| **Identifier for the original proposal** | (01) VUW/14 – MTchLrn(Primary)/1, MTchLrn(Secondary)/1 |
| **Name of self-review coordinator and position held** | Jae Major, Senior lecturer (Programme Director, Primary)  
Margaret Gleeson, Senior lecturer (Programme Director, Secondary) |

### 1. Programme Statement

**a) Description**

The Master of Teaching and Learning (Primary or Secondary; MTchLrn) at Victoria University of Wellington is a 180-point initial teacher education programme developed in response to a Ministry of Education pilot initiative, to provide high achieving teachers for the New Zealand context. The programme is accredited by the Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand (Teaching Council) and has been taught since 2015. It is a research-led programme that brings together the expertise of teacher practitioners and University educators. Graduates from this programme have developed skills for making evidence-informed decisions and work to bring about better educational outcomes for all learners, especially those identified as underachieving.

A unique feature of the programme is that student teachers are placed within a host school, with the same specialist teacher mentor for the duration of the academic year, supplemented by three weeks in an alternative school context. They work alongside their teacher mentor for two days each week. Students are also assigned an academic mentor, with whom they meet in small groups weekly to discuss their academic and professional learning. The academic mentor also conducts observations of the students’ practice in their host schools. The triadic partnership between the student teacher, the academic mentor, and the teacher mentor is a particular strength of the programme.

Coursework for the programme is at Level 9 of the Qualifications Framework and requires a high level of critical thinking and reflection. There is a rigorous selection process in which participating schools collaborate. This process includes a written application with referees and interviews with a panel of academic mentors and teacher mentors. The Programme Directors facilitate a series of hui for academic and teacher mentors to develop the programme and their mentoring skills.

**b) Changes**

Since the 2014 programme approval, minor adjustments – such as the timing of practical and practicum visiting arrangements – have been made in response to feedback from Advisory Groups, Teaching Council monitoring reports, student representatives, teacher mentors and academic staff.

A more significant change was that TCHG501: Challenges and Opportunities in Teaching and TCHG502: Creating and Sustaining an Effective Classroom Learning Environment were re-sequenced such that TCHG502 was taught at the beginning of the year (Trimester 3) and TCHG501 was taught in the Trimester 1 following. This was done to allow students to acclimatise to their host schools and to get to know their own students before embarking on TCHG501, which requires them to gather data and observations on specific students. The resequencing necessitated a change to the pre- and co-requisites of three courses.

In 2019, small changes were made to the assessment requirements of the practicum courses (TCHG522 and TCHG525 in the primary programme and TCHG513 and TCHG516 in secondary programme). This was to ensure that all students engage in the same assessment processes towards certifying that they meet the standards for graduating teachers, as specified by the Teaching Council.

**c) Achievement**

The key goal of the MTchLrn qualification is to provide high-quality and highly-educated teachers for the primary and secondary teaching workforce. This goal has been met: The MTchLrn has developed into a strong and reputable programme of teacher education that prepares student teachers to work collegially with a diverse range of learners and peers. Graduates from the programme are highly regarded by principals and
almost all are employed by schools upon completion. Indeed, most secure full-time jobs well before the end of the programme, many in the schools in which they undertake their teaching placements. Schools are enthusiastic to participate in the programme and the integration of school-based practice alongside coursework has proven very successful. Student representatives have consistently reported that the practicum model and teaching/academic mentoring have particularly supported their success.

Assessment across the MTchLrn focuses on practical and authentic tasks that connect strongly to the work of teachers and applying new knowledge and skills in practice. There is a general expectation that candidates selected for the MTchLrn will have a minimum GPA of B+ and participants continue to strive for high grades in the programme. For some, the more applied nature of the programme and assignments can be a challenging change from their previous tertiary education experiences. Maintaining a balance between the demands of coursework and those of the practicum in schools is also challenging, and something that we continue to strive to manage. Overall, the achievement level of students is high, and a table of grade distributions in core courses was provided to the Evaluation group to demonstrate this.

2. GYR Review Processes

The Evaluation Group for this GYR comprised the following members:

- Dr Michael Johnston, Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Education (Convener)
- Dr Anita Brady, Associate Dean (Teaching and Equity), Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Ms Kimaya McIntosh, Graduate of MTchLrn (Secondary)
- Mr Tim Corbett, Graduate of MTchLrn (Secondary)
- Mr Shaun Bishop, Current student in MTchLrn (Primary)
- Mr Joseph Habgood, Student Representation Co-ordinator, VUWSA

Student feedback was sought through the graduate and current-student members of the evaluation group. Due to workload commitments in schools, it proved difficult to find anyone to attend the evaluation group meeting to represent the primary section of the programme. Hence, Shaun Bishop’s feedback was provided in writing. Kimaya McIntosh and Tim Corbett, who attended the meeting, represented the secondary section of the programme. They were invited to be part of the evaluation group because they were class representatives and therefore have wide-ranging knowledge of the kinds of difficulties faced by students in the programme.

3. Review Outcomes

(a) Acceptability

There has been regular external monitoring of the programme since its inception by (a) the Ministry of Education who have required detailed reporting at different stages of the programme, and (b) the Teaching Council, through an annual report and monitoring visits in 2016 and 2017. The most recent monitoring report made only minor suggestions for improvement, for example, a refinement of the selection process.

The MTchLrn has been strongly supported by schools in Wellington, with more schools offering placements than can be accommodated. This and the very high rate of graduate employment are strong testaments to the acceptability of the programme to the school sector. Advisory and Principals’ groups strongly support the continuation of this programme past its pilot phase. A national evaluation conducted by Martin Jenkins in 2018 found that a key reason for the acceptability of this programme has been the significantly enhanced partnerships between the University and schools. Teacher mentors are also positive about contributing to the development of new teachers through a programme that has a strongly practice-focused element. While other institutions have chosen to withdraw from this kind of programme, the Faculty of Education at Victoria University of Wellington is committed to continuing with the MTchLrn, largely because of its high level of acceptability in the Wellington region and the reputational risk that would be associated with discontinuing the programme. The 2017 Monitoring Report by the Teaching Council stated: “There is very good ‘buy in’ by schools and they want to be involved in this model of ITE.”
preparation for entering the teaching profession.

The graduates also noted that the experience of students differs across host schools and mentor teachers and asked whether all mentor teachers attend the hui organised by the programme directors. Finally, they noted that guidelines for participants in the secondary section of the programme, who are undertaking preparation to teach a second subject additional to the one for which they are assigned academic and teacher mentors, are unclear and that there is typically less support for undertaking a second subject than there is for the first one. The evaluation group member representing the primary section of the programme noted some gaps in the coverage of the programme.

(b) Assessment and moderation procedures

The programme adheres to the University’s assessment policies and Faculty moderation policy, which includes a policy for moderating practica. In addition, course information, including assessments, are peer reviewed and monitored by the Programme Director to ensure consistency and to monitor the spread of assessment tasks and due dates. All assignments are moderated by academics teaching on the programme. Teacher mentors write regular weekly formative assessments of the student teachers’ engagement in the classroom, and both teacher mentors and academic mentors write summative reports each trimester using the graduating teacher standards.

This year we have entered into an agreement with AUT, Otago University and Canterbury University with regard to external moderation. A rotational programme for review will commence in 2019, with each university reviewing a selection of courses for another provider, with full coverage of all year courses over a six-year cycle.

Evaluation group graduate members commented that the assessments for the programme covered the course material and were well integrated with practica. They also noted that, since their participation, the timing of assessments has been revised to accommodate students’ concerns over pressure points in workload.

The evaluation group member representing the primary section of the programme raised some concern regarding the relevance of some of the assessment, commenting that greater clarity is needed regarding the extent to which students can adapt assessment criteria for courses in the programme, “to fit the parameters of [their] … placement schools’ processes”.

The graduate members noted that not all mentor teachers provided “weekly formative assessments of the student teachers’ engagement in the classroom” (see above and that practice regarding the granting of course assessment extensions was not consistent across the programme.

(c) Data

Table 1 (primary) and Table 2 (secondary) summarise enrolment information from 2015 to 2019. The high retention rate is testament to the strong mentoring aspect of the programme, which includes elements of pastoral care by the academic mentors.

Table 1: Summary information on numbers enrolling and completing the MTchLrn (Primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years (from and including the first)</th>
<th>Predicted enrolment s (headcount)</th>
<th>Actual numbers enrolled (headcount)</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>EFTS</th>
<th>Numbers completed</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary information on numbers enrolling and completing the MTchLrn (Secondary)
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>s (headcount)</th>
<th>enrolled (headcount)</th>
<th>d</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The predicted enrolments were for 60 students combined across both the Primary and Secondary versions of the MTchLrn. The eight withdrawals from the MTchLrn (Primary) in 2015 were all part-time. Enrolments are not always equal to the sum of completions and withdrawals because some students have not completed, nor formally withdrawn.

The evaluation group noted that the numbers of enrolments have been consistent, reflecting high demand for limited places. The group also noted that apart from the initial year, withdrawals from the programme have been minimal, despite a minor spike in the secondary programme in 2018.

### (d) Programme evaluation and review

The programme is meeting its aims, has a high rate of completion and is responsive to students, with various changes having been made to accommodate concerns and pressure points. The title, regulations, aims, stated learning outcomes and internal coherence of the programme remain adequate and appropriate.

The programme is currently being reviewed in light of The Teaching Council’s new requirements for initial teacher education programme reapprovals. Many of the existing features of the programme strongly align with the shift in focus signalled by the new requirements, for example, enhanced, enduring partnerships and mentoring relationships with schools. In this respect, the programme is a model of the kinds of initial teacher education programmes that the sector envisions for the future.

The evaluation group agree that the title, regulations, aims, stated learning outcomes and internal coherence of the programme remain adequate and appropriate.

### (e) Continuation or discontinuation

Victoria University of Wellington intends to continue the programme. Actions to ensure continuation relate to ensuring that graduates of the programme continue to meet changing Teachers’ Council requirements for registered teachers. Academic staff will work with mentor teachers to address inconsistencies in their practice and to encourage all to attend the regular hui for the programme. Specific issues raised by the student representative of the primary section on the evaluation group, relating to literacy pedagogy (see 3b, evaluation group comments) are likely to be addressed following imminent changes to the academic staff involved with the programme.

The evaluation group recommends that the programme be continued.

**PVC approval for continuation**

PVC: Jennifer Windsor  
Date: 4 July 2019
1. Programme Statement

(a) Description

The MPols and related PGDipPols were introduced in 2016. The MPols is a taught Master’s programme defined as 180 credits over a full-year period.

The course of study for the MPols consists of:

Part 1:

(a) POLS 586 (Approaches to Comparative Political Science); and
(b) 60 points from POLS 400-489; and
(c) 30 further points from POLS 400-488, INTP 400-488, or STRA 530-539.

Part 2:

Either;

(a) POLS 593 (a dissertation of 60 points); or
(b) POLS 589 (a 30-point research essay) and 30 further points from POLS 400-488, INTP 400-488, or STRA 530-539.

With the Head of School’s permission, a candidate may replace Part 1 (c) and Part 2 with POLS 595 (a 90-point thesis).

The PGDipPols is a 120-point Diploma that also contains POLS 586, acting as a ‘step-down’ qualification for those unable or unwilling to complete the MPols or, in some cases, as a potential ‘step-up’, allowing a student with marginal performance to be accepted into the Diploma with the option of switching to the MPols if their performance improves.

(b) Changes

No significant changes have been made although there have been minor amendments to the POLS 586 title (from Theoretical and Methodological Approaches to Political Science to Approaches to Comparative Political Science), its course learning objectives and its assessments. POLS 586 has also become a component course of the Master of Philosophy, Politics and Economics, considerably boosting its course enrolments.

(c) Achievement

As the proposal stated, the MPols is intended to provide students with an advanced knowledge of the political science discipline, which will give them the knowledge they require for a career in public affairs, broadly defined. An MPols graduate is expected to:

- have advanced knowledge and understanding of the political science discipline, including theoretical aspects of the discipline;
- be able to evaluate and critically analyse empirical evidence and findings and discussions in the political science literature;
- be able to conceptualise problems in political analysis and political practice in a logical way;
- be able to conduct sophisticated independent research on topics in political science, applying appropriate knowledge and methods to new situations;
- demonstrate skills in debating and negotiating political issues in a persuasive, sophisticated and respectful manner; and
- be able to communicate ideas in a way that is sophisticated and adapted to the intended audience.
As of April 2019, 24 students had successfully completed the MPols. Three students completed the PGDipPols. Twelve students completed POLS 428 Directed Individual Study: Parliamentary Internship as part of their MPols: six in 2015, two in 2016, two in 2017 and two in 2018.

2. GYR Review Processes

The self-review component of this review was coordinated by Professor Jack Vowles, in consultation with course coordinators in the programme.

The Evaluation Group for this GYR was composed of the following members:

- Dr Joost de Bruin, Associate Dean (Academic Programmes), Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (Convener)
- Dr Jan Smitheram, Associate Dean (Academic Development) (Member), Faculty of Architecture and Design
- Rob Salmond, Director of Labour Leader’s Office, Parliament (Professional Representative)
- Jacqui van der Kaay, current MPols student (Student Representative)

The Evaluation Group met on 10 June 2019. Catherine Townsend, Academic Programmes Coordinator, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and Joseph Habgood, Student Representation Coordinator, VUWSA, were in attendance to provide, respectively, administrative support and support for the student representative on the Evaluation Group.

Student feedback was incorporated into the GYR at the meeting of the Evaluation Group. VUWSA aimed to organise a focus group but received only one response. The student who responded was invited to act as student representative. Before the Evaluation Group meeting, the student representative spoke with current MPols students about how they experience the programme.

3. Review Outcomes

(a) Acceptability

The MPols qualification is a very valuable qualification for students seeking a postgraduate degree containing a research component that allows them to enter the workforce after one year’s study. It builds valuable skill sets in terms of critical analysis, theoretical and methodological awareness, and the ability to design and conduct a research project. It is therefore attractive to stakeholders in government, NGOs, the media, and the business community.

The Evaluation Group comments that while it is clear that the first four bullet points of the Programme Graduate Profile as represented in section 1(c) are achieved through the courses that are part of the programme, it is less evident how the final two bullet points are addressed. The group requested more data on how many students completed the parliamentary internship as part of their course of study, which was subsequently added to section 1(c). It also requested more data on employment outcomes of graduates of the programme, which was provided by the programme. The group notes that the introduction of the Master of Philosophy, Politics and Economics (MPPE) in 2018 seems to have had a large impact on the MPols, particularly because the core course, POLS 586, is also a required course in the MPPE.

(b) Assessment and moderation procedures

The programme is subject to the regular Victoria University of Wellington moderation processes. Moderation processes for the programme are subject to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Assessment and Moderation Requirements and Victoria’s Assessment Handbook.

The courses included in the MPols programme are also offered to students in the BA(Hons) and Master of International Relations programmes as well as to students directly enrolling in the MPols. The assessment practices are thus coordinated and moderated by academic staff in the programme in the course of our broader postgraduate assessment procedures. Academic staff teaching on all of the programme’s postgraduate qualifications meet at the end of each trimester to moderate that trimester’s grades. Grades for each course are considered and moderated, taking into account a report from the course coordinator and the individual students in the course. If a course uses an examination, it is peer reviewed before being submitted to the Faculty Office. Once a year, a selection of postgraduate students’ work is sent to the University of Canterbury for external moderation. Dissertations and theses are marked by an internal examiner and moderated by the programme coordinator or another member of staff selected by the coordinator.
The Evaluation Group notes that the programme did not comment on student achievement in the self-review. Considering the spread of grades in the core courses in the programme, it was noted that in 2017, when the student cohort was the largest, there was a wide spread of final grades with some students finishing with a C, C+ or B- for a core course. There was also a concern that students may not receive enough written feedback on their work in Part A of the programme to appropriately prepare them for Part B.

(c) Data

Table 1: Summary information on numbers enrolling and completing the MPols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years (from and including the first)</th>
<th>Predicted enrolments (EFTS)</th>
<th>Actual numbers enrolled</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>EFTS</th>
<th>Numbers completed</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Several completions in 2016 were from students who converted prior study in 2015 into the MPols as soon as the option became available in 2016. These students have been recorded as part-time as they only needed 60 points to complete the qualification in 2016.

Table 2: Summary information on numbers enrolling and completing the PGDipPols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual numbers enrolled</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>EFTS</th>
<th>Number completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MPols was introduced as an addition to the BA(Hons) programme in Political Science that, as of the time immediately prior to its introduction, was attracting between 18 and 20 students a year. To allow students choice and test the market, we continued with the BA(Hons) programme. We expected that the MPols would attract some, but not all, of these students. As it has turned out, except in 2017, the BA(Hons) programme has continued to attract more students than the MPols. Students in the BA(Hons) programme may be eligible for a student allowance whereas those in taught Masters’ programmes are not. This may partly explain the continued relative popularity of the BA(Hons). The introduction of the MPPE programme in 2018 is another likely explanation.

As of June 2019, our completion rate was 24 out of 31.

The Evaluation Group notes that while the programme achieved projected enrolments in 2016 and 2017, the enrolments in 2018 and 2019 were significantly lower than projected. It believes that the introduction of the MPPE degree in 2018 is a logical explanation for the decline in MPols numbers, a trend that was also forecast when the MPPE was introduced. It also comments that while students may prefer the BA(Hons) for financial reasons, a Master’s qualification provides significantly better prospects in the job market. The group requested data on the number of students who enrolled in a MA by thesis or a BA(Hons) in Political Science from 2013 to 2019 and notes that from 2016 to 2019 the number of MPols students was larger than the number of MA students, but smaller than the number of BA(Hons) students (except 2017 for the latter).

(d) Programme evaluation and review

The Political Science and International Relations programme had its last academic programme review in 2013, before the introduction of the MPols. As such, no significant changes have been made to the programme’s title, regulations, aim and stated learning outcomes since its introduction, aside from some minor changes to POLS 586. The School’s Learning and Teaching Committee regularly reviews student progress, pass rates, retention and student satisfaction. Courses within the programme are individually evaluated at least once
every two years, and students consistently evaluate the overall quality of the MPols courses highly. In his
moderating and sometimes supervisory roles the Programme Director has often been impressed by the quality
of research conducted by students in POLS 589 and POLS 593. The majority of students doing these research-
based courses receive first class marks. However, examination of the grades for POLS 593 indicates a few that
are lower than desirable, indicating that a slightly higher standard should be applied for approval of students
into the 60-point option.

The Evaluation Group notes that the introduction of the MPPE has changed the context of the MPols. POLS
586, which was introduced as the core course for the MPols, has an enrolment of 35 students this year. Of
those students, 26 are taking the course as part of the MPPE and 7 as part of the MPols (and 2 as part of a
PhD). This makes it relatively difficult for the MPols students to experience a sense of an MPols student
cohort. It would be important for the programme to emphasise its differences from the MPPE in terms of
graduate outcomes and strategic value. It was also noted that there is a lack of politics-focused courses
that students can choose from.

(e) Continuation or discontinuation

There are no direct costs for delivering this programme, since all courses are already offered as part of other
postgraduate programmes. POLS 586 is a required course for the new MPPE programme, and as a result had a
very high enrolment in 2019. Overall, the administrative costs are very low. As such, the School strongly
supports the retention of the MPols. It provides students with a very useful pathway into employment,
deepens and broadens their understanding of the discipline, and in some cases could encourage strong
students to continue at university by providing an excellent foundation for expedited entry into a PhD. In
addition, POLS 586 provides a stronger foundation for advanced study in political science than the BA(Hons),
which requires no course focussing on theory, research design and methodologies. We also note that several
students, having begun a BA(Hons) degree, have applied to transition to the MPols after having become more
aware of its advantages after having begun 400-level courses. This can present problems as POLS 586 is
normally taught in the first trimester. We recommend stronger marketing of this one-year degree option as an
attractive alternative to the BA(Hons).

The Evaluation Group concludes that there are good reasons for the programme to be continued. The
Political Science and International Relations Programme is invested in offering the programme, student
feedback has been positive, and the graduating students employment outcomes provided by the
programme show that the degree provides an excellent pathway to employment. The Evaluation Group
notes that enrolments for the degree decreased after the introduction of the MPPE. It also voices its
concern that POLS 586, the core course of the MPols and the only new course when it was introduced, has
attracted a high number of MPPE students which has had an impact on how MPols students experience
the programme as a whole. The Evaluation Group recommends that additional tutorials or study groups
should be organised for the MPols students in POLS 586. It also suggests that the relative strengths of the
programme compared to other postgraduate offerings should be clearly addressed in advertising to
potential students.

PVC approval for continuation

PVC: Jennifer Windsor
Date: 4 July 2019

In endorsing the MPols GYR to move forward to Academic Committee, the FHSS Faculty Board also noted the
apparent impact of the MPPE on MPols enrolment. While the MPols has minimal administration, continued
scrutiny is needed to ensure that there are indeed students wishing to enrol in the MPols who would not
otherwise take a 180-point degree. I would suggest that there is another examination of enrolment in ~2 years
time (2021).
1. Programme Statement

(a) Description

The Master of Applied Statistics programme was introduced in 2015. It is a 180-point taught Master’s degree in applied statistics. There is a growing national and international demand in government, the social and physical sciences, business and finance for statistics and quantitative analysis required for policy analysis, planning, and interpretation of the great variety and quantity of data now available.

The programme has a professional focus, notably through the inclusion of practicum and consultancy components. These give the programme unique characteristics among applied statistics programmes internationally. It also exposes students to important fields of official statistics, computational statistics, reliability, demography, financial statistics and sampling. In the practicum and consultancy components, we have been working with government and industry partners. It provided an avenue direct to the workforce and therefore was attractive to students who might have developed good quantitative skills but need practical experience. Additionally, the programme has attracted existing staff at workplaces who are keen to up-skill in applied statistics.

The programme that was approved by CUAP capitalised on existing 400-level courses and introduced three new courses. In addition to 120 points worth of courses that students could normally take for an Honours in Statistics, candidates are required to enrol in three courses introduced at the start of the program: STAT 480 Research Methods (15 points); STAT 501 Statistical Consulting (15 points); and STAT 581 Statistical Practicum (30 points).

(b) Achievement

The primary goal of the programme was to train graduates in a range of advanced techniques of applied statistics and to provide them with an appreciation of the variety of work undertaken by professional statisticians through the Statistical Consulting and Statistical Practicum components. This goal was achieved, with a number of domestic and international students attracted to the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute for the Master of Applied Statistics</th>
<th>Discipline knowledge</th>
<th>Creative &amp; Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Intellectual autonomy</th>
<th>Intellectual integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate analytical techniques to identify a problem, generate and compare alternatives and develop a solution.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct and adapt statistical models to apply in the professional practice of statistical consulting.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use statistical computing software to analyse data for a variety of problems.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate and comprehend appropriate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
statistical methodologies for projects in the professional practice of statistical consulting.

| Use advanced written and verbal communication skills for the presentation of reports in a variety of contexts (e.g. commercial or academic). | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Evaluate the full implications (mathematical, economic, ethical and social) of adopting a particular statistical model. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Work effectively in a problem-solving team. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

The programme required students to undertake all of the following to learn the skills of a professional applied Statistician: (i) a practicum, in the form of a placement in a relevant government department, business or research institute; (ii) a statistical consultancy course, including training in providing statistical advice to clients together with supervised practical experience involving external clients or postgraduate students/staff from another School; (iii) a research methods course to develop skills in problem solving, research proposal writing and oral presentation.

While it was not designed for the purpose, the programme has been successful in attracting students who are capable of and have proceeded to higher level tertiary study: four graduates are completing PhDs in Statistics, all at Victoria.

The programme has been successful in improving industry engagement through the student placements. This is in line the University’s strategic goal to improve industry engagement. There are currently 12 organisations involved in the student placement programme, ranging from government ministries, Crown Research Institutes and private consulting companies. Examples include NIWA, Harmonic Analytics, Dot Loves Data and the Ministry of Business, Innovation, and Employment. Several graduates of the programme have subsequently been employed by the organization of their placement, demonstrating success of the programme in imparting the intended skills to students.

(c) Changes
No changes have been made to the Programme.

2. Review Processes

GYR Process: This self-review has been coordinated by Master of Applied Statistics Programme director Ivy Liu, and Nokuthaba Sibanda in consultation with colleagues and the Science Faculty Office.

The GYR Evaluation Group consisted of:
1. John Randal (convenor), Associate Dean - Students, Victoria Business School
2. Associate Professor Paul Teesdale-Spittle, Associate Dean - Academic, Faculty of Science

3. Review Outcomes

(a) Acceptability
The programme imparts students with highly sought-after skills in industry. Consultation with external stakeholders indicates that graduates from this programme are sought after by a number of organisations, with some having been employed by the placement hosts before or soon after graduation. Four students from the programme have proceeded on to PhD, showing that the programme does not preclude students from proceeding onto a research degree, if their ability level is suitable.
Consultation with external stakeholders: DotLovesData and Harmonic Analytic host students from the programme on placement every year. Feedback from these external organisations is very positive. Paul Bracewell of DotLovesData and Shirley Wu of Harmonic Analytic rated the performance of our students as 5 (very good) on a 5-point scale (1=very bad; 5=very good). Paul had this to say: “We are delighted with the quality of students coming through the Master of Applied Statistics programme. The students we engage with from Victoria University of Wellington’s Master of Applied Statistics programme enable us to delve more deeply into our technical challenges. Having access to these students enables us to move our research programme faster and explore connected concepts that are not necessarily on our product development road map. We encourage the students that come to us for either a project paper or work experience to collaboratively publish the work in peer-reviewed academic journals, this has the added benefit of demonstrating the rigour that goes into our product development. Of the latest group, we’ve hired two students as data scientists.”

Shirley had this to say on the benefits of hosting our students at Harmonic Analytic:
- Helping with progressing work / projects
- Bringing in new ideas
- We get a chance to learn about skillsets and capabilities of future University graduates
- Adding to the diversity of the team

Consultation with students in the preparation of this GYR: VUWSA provided a summary of student feedback, based on a student feedback survey. Overall, the feedback showed that the programme seems to be performing well in terms of Teaching and Learning. Concerns were raised that although student feedback was frequently sought, there was less visibility for students that their feedback was used to improve courses. An excellence in preparing students for practical work was noted, and associated with that, less focus on preparing students for further study. As the programme was designed primarily for preparing students for practical work with no intention to focus on preparation for further study, it means the programme is functioning well as designed.

GYR Evaluation Group Comments: The evaluation group note the ongoing relationship between the programme and two external entities and commend the programme for this initiative. Based on feedback from the external partners and students, the relationships would appear to be mutually beneficial.

(b) Assessment procedures and student performance

The assessment methods are using in course assignments, projects and final examinations – usually with in-term assessments forming 25-30% of the final grade. A research project (15 or 30 points) is a compulsory part of Master of Applied Statistics: each is individual to the student and is supervised by one staff member and assessed by a colleague. In addition, students give a presentation of their work placement experience as part of the assessment for STAT 581 (Statistical Practicum). For STAT 501 (Statistical Consulting), students give a group presentation of their consulting project to the client and are assessed on the presentation as well as their individual contributions to the project. Master of Applied Statistics students complete at different times of the year depending on when they commence the programme. All final grades and the award of a Distinction, Merit or Pass are discussed for each student by the Statistics Group.

GYR Evaluation Group Comments: The assessment tasks seem appropriate to the field, and the level of the qualification. The amount of research is consistent with the 180-point master’s framework, with a larger research option available for students wishing to progress to PhD.

(c) Data

Table 1: Summary information on numbers enrolling and completing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years (from and including the first)</th>
<th>Projected numbers (from original proposal)</th>
<th>Actual numbers enrolled</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>EFTS</th>
<th>Numbers completed</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The international enrolments in the programme have been between one and seven students per year. As a percentage of the overall cohort, international students made up 11% in 2015, 50% in 2016, 33% in 2017, 29% in 2018, and 8% in 2019. The MAppStat programme is doing well on recruiting international students. When the programme was established, a partnership was established with United International College (UIC), a university based in Zhuhai, China. The UIC agreed to promote the programme to their students to aid recruitment from their undergraduate programme. Maintaining this relationship through regular visits will help improve the number of international student enrolments.

GYR Evaluation Group Comments: The enrolments in the programme are very close to target. The programme would benefit from greater stability in international recruitment numbers to help ensure sustainability of the programme in future.

(d) Programme evaluation

Courses within the programme have been subject to regular course evaluations, which were provided to the evaluation group. STAT 501 and STAT 581 are compulsory for all students in the programme. Low student satisfaction has been identified in STAT 451, which is taught jointly across several NZ universities as well as Statistics New Zealand. Further evaluation of the course will be undertaken to identify whether the survey response reflects accurately on the course. Anecdotally, students continue with official statistics find the course valuable.

In 2016, Professor Mark Bebbington (Massey University) reviewed the Master of Applied Statistics programme. In general, the feedback from Mark was very positive based on the breadth and standard of the programme. He particularly mentioned that students praised the structure of the Master of Applied Statistics, which consists of both course work and practical training components. The programme has been reviewed again in May 2019 as part of the Mathematics and Statistics programme review. Although the review report hasn't been received, the panel gave positive views about the programme at the debriefing session.

A further measure of the programme success is subsequent employment. The professional focus of the programme gives students exposure to practice as a professional statistician and for many students has provided a clearer pathway to employment. This has led to the programme being successful in attracting domestic and international students who have all been successful in finding employment or continuing to advanced study. We anticipate continued interest and enrolments in courses in this programme. Anecdotal evidence from Postgraduate Information evenings attended by the Programme Director shows more enquiries about this programme than any other within the School during those evenings.

GYR Evaluation Group Comments: The programme appears to be delivering good outcomes for its graduates and this has been reflected in positive programme reviews.

(e) Continuation or discontinuation

It is our intention to continue to offer the programme. The demands of the programme are met by the current staff available and there is no need to recruit new staff.

GYR Evaluation Group Comments: The evaluation group supports continuation of the programme.

PVC approval for continuation

PVC: Professor David Harper
Date: 2 August 2019
52.19 Welcome to new members
Professor Guilford welcomed Dr Ocean Mercier, new Head of School (Te Kawa a Māui) and Professor Donald Maurice as acting Head of School (New Zealand School of Music). Professor Guilford acknowledged the death of Dr Ken Bates in the School of Accounting and Commercial Law. He also thanked Heather Kirkwood in her last meeting as secretary to Academic Board.

53.19 Part C of the agenda
It was resolved that non-members be excluded from this meeting for consideration of items 10 and 11, for reasons of personal privacy.

54.19 Oral report from the Vice-Chancellor
Professor Guilford noted the following points:

- **EFTS:** We are currently 27 EFTS ahead of the same time last year. However, the University is forecasting to be 170 domestic EFTS and 44 international EFTS behind budget at year end. Māori and Pasifika EFTS have increased by 30 compared with the same time last year.
- **Revenue:** We are on target to achieve our budgeted revenue. However, we will need to decrease expenditure during the remainder of 2019 to achieve our required surplus. Growth in expenditure has been largely due to an increase in staff costs.
- **Strategic Plan:** The Strategic Plan refresh is making good progress. Professor Guilford thanked all staff who attended the forums. Feedback received in those sessions revealed that the aspects of the Plan that resonated most with people were: 1. Looking at how we work 2. Sustainability and wellbeing. 3. Placing the marae at the heart of the University. The aspects that people would add to the refreshed Plan are a greater focus on people and more project details. Professor Guilford confirmed that details of the projects and other initiatives underpinning the Plan will be made available in the next stage.
- **Brand refresh:** The marketing team are preparing for rollout of the brand refresh later this year.

55.19 Oral report from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Māori)
Professor Higgins noted from the following points:

- A draft has been completed of the handbook to help people understand ways to give effect to our Te Tiriti o Waitangi Statute, which was adopted by Council earlier this year. The draft handbook has been to SLT and Te Aka Matua and will be sent out for feedback from the wider University later this month. Details will be made available through the “What’s out for consultation?” page on the University website.
- Some analysis of our Taihonoa Māori partnership scheme has revealed:
  - There are 33 iwi who have cohorts of 25 students or more at this University; together, they account for 78% of all Māori enrolments.
  - Of the 33, we have signed Taihonoa agreements with 25; of the remaining 8, we are currently in talks with six of them to become Taihonoa partners.
  - In response to a query, Rawinia said that data analysis of these iwi and their students has just commenced and agreed that this work could include exploring age profiles.
- Our Living Pā project continues to advance:
  - Thanks to everyone who visited the Design Office at 44 Kelburn Parade over the last three weeks. The Office received lots of positive and constructive feedback, which will now be fed into the business case development and planning;
  - The Design Office has now closed, but there will be a stall at Te Aro Campus during Sustainability Week in September;
  - For more information about the Living Pā project, search “Living Pa” on the University website.
- Māori Language Week is coming up on 9 September and plans are well underway for activities and events across the University that will promote the use and valuing of te reo Māori.
- Rawinia remains keen to work with faculties and schools to talk about how they are progressing the Māori Outcomes Framework. Please contact her to discuss.

56.19 Oral report from the Vice-Provost (Academic)

Professor Brock noted the following points:

- **Personal Courses of Study Regulations:** Feedback on a proposed change to these Regulations is sought by midday Wednesday 21 August. Comments should be sent to Jenny Christie in the Academic Office.
- **Postgraduate Working Group:** The recommendations of this Working Group have been discussed with most Faculty Boards. A lot of feedback has already been received. Any further feedback should be sent to Charlotte Partridge by Friday 30 August.
- **New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF):** The NZQA has released a consultation paper and seeks feedback on proposed changes to the NZQF. Feedback closes Friday 30 August and should be sent to Jenny Christie.
- **CUAP Round Two:** The University has five proposals under review in Round Two, including the new Diploma of University Study (Pasifika Pathways). There are approximately 80 proposals from other universities. Initial comments on these proposals are due by Thursday 29 August.
- **Academic Audit:** The University is preparing to undertake a self-review for the Cycle 6 academic audit and will be seeking people to be engaged in the self-review process. Professor Brock will be talking to Deans and PVCs about this process and encourages staff who are interested to talk to their Dean or PVC.
- **Entry:** Professor Brock reminded Board members that programmes cannot unilaterally change entry or IELTS requirements. Anyone with concerns should talk to him directly.
- **Trimester 3:** The webpage for Trimester 3 will soon be launched.

57.19 Oral report from the Vice-Provost (Research)
Professor Hyland noted the following points:

- The Research Office has been working through changes to the structures of the Human Ethics Committee subcommittees, with mergers of various subcommittees intended to align with best-practice multidisciplinary decision making.
- The Office is working with the web team and ITS to enhance Researcher profiles on the website with an intention that these will be more informative, easier to update and more accessible.
- The Research Office is currently supporting submissions to the CoREs funding round which opened at the end of July.
- The Mātauranga Māori research fund is now open for applications.
- At the July meeting, the University Research Committee discussed the University’s draft primary research strategy, the Academic Integrity Framework, and advised PGSA on their proposed changes to the University’s postgraduate research excellence awards.

58.19 Provost’s Forum: Student Success and Retention

Professor Brock introduced the discussion paper which followed a recent lecture from Professor Tim Renwick (Georgia State Universities). Georgia State and other universities are seeing huge improvements in their retention rates as a result of a series of data-driven measures and interventions.

Professor Brock provided Victoria University of Wellington context, drawing on an analysis undertaken by PaMI and Student Academic Services which found a 33% attrition rate (19% within the first year). This rate is worse for Māori and Pasifika (40% attrition, and 24% within the first year). Most New Zealand universities are also struggling with this with only the University of Auckland and the University of Otago having lower attrition rates.

Professor Brock described retention as a proxy for success and said a low retention rate is a sign that students are not fully engaged with their university studies. He mentioned that there are many good things we are already doing to improve retention rates and the success and wellbeing of students. He drew attention to two things we know already to make a difference: engagement (with social life at university, as well as with academic studies) and access to useful information, including about how to engage.

Professor Brock asked for members’ feedback on three questions in the discussion paper, namely:

1. What new ways could we support our students so they succeed in their academic studies and do not attrit from the University?
2. What are the barriers that currently exist at the University that inhibit student success?
3. How can academics, advisers, and student support services best work together to provide holistic support for our students to facilitate their academic success?

Comments and suggestions were received as follows:

- How well do we understand the experience students now have in their final years in secondary school? It was suggested that we need to do more to apply that knowledge to our methods and content when bridging students.
- Dr Anita Brady provided an update on a 3-year strategic project on transitions from different learning environments to university, currently underway in the faculties of Humanities and Social Science, and Education. The project commenced this year and
is working on the basis that the first year is critical and that pedagogical experiences are fundamental to those transitions. Dr Brady stressed that NCEA is explicitly designed to set students up in a way that runs counter to their experiences at university. In response, the faculties are trying to set up a comprehensive programme across all first-year courses designed to support the transition for every first-year student. The focus this year has been on staff training, resource development, and the identification of champions. They do not have data yet but there has been enthusiastic buy-in from staff and plenty of positive feedback, particularly regarding the opportunity for staff to talk about what they're doing to support first-year students. They hope the results will be of use to other faculties too.

- Knowing more about student motivation is critical to understanding engagement. In any early warning system, we need to have knowledge of student motivation as this will inform what type of interventions are most likely to work.

- Feedback to VUWSA suggested that external factors, in particular, the cost of accommodation, are behind a lot of students choosing not to continue with their studies. This is made worse by public transport issues with unreliability of transport limiting student ability to move further afield to more affordable housing options. The University should work with the City to develop good external infrastructure for our students. Within the classroom, students want more flexibility with their learning including making better use of technological platforms. This is particularly important for students who can’t live close by, experience unreliable public transport or are struggling with their mental health. The Vice-Chancellor provided an update on student accommodation, confirming that the University is in negotiation with three offshore providers who they will partner with to provide more accommodation. This accommodation will include bespoke options for students who are not domestic school leavers.

- The financial cost of mirroring Georgia State’s success with retention was queried. Professor Brock agreed that there are many complex components to the work undertaken but noted that the interventions led to revenue higher than the associated costs. More analysis is required to understand how long it takes to see a positive revenue stream. Professor Brock highlighted that Georgia State only introduced one intervention at a time. He said that a staged approach would be the right way to go about this work.

- It was noted that the slightly better retention rates of the University of Auckland and the University of Otago might be due to higher GES for admission. It was suggested that we might not want to follow their example by setting a higher GES, but it would be useful to be clear about why their retention rates might be better than ours.

- It was noted that tutor training increases engagement in the classroom and queried what emphasis might be placed on tutors in any planned work. Professor Brock agreed that tutor training makes a difference. He highlighted the recent review of tutor practices. Some of the recommendations have recently been implemented; but there are more ways we can do better with regard to tutors.

- It was noted that we don’t want to lose sight of the fact that good teaching and good assessment motivates students.

- Professor Brock and PaMI were commended for fronting this piece of work. Student recruitment is difficult, and word of mouth is very important. We need to look at why students should stay and how we add value. We need to grow value with our alumni,
including existing staff. How are we championing alumni and staff? Are we drawing on these?

- Need to rethink how we present lectures to make them interesting enough to turn up to. Are we making the best use of face-to-face time? Do we have too many in-person lectures? Reusable lecture recordings give us the opportunity to record ahead of time and to then have fewer, in-person, high quality discussions with lecturers. There are IP and other issues to work through, but this would take a lot of pressure off the timetable.
- We need to look closer at the data on who uses lecture recordings and when; school level analysis suggests they are mostly used immediately before exams.

Professor Brock thanked members for their input. He said that this is the beginning of a conversation which will be progressed this year. Any further feedback can be emailed to him directly.

59.19 Education Academic Programme Review

Professor Stephen Dobson and Dr Carolyn Tait spoke to the Education Academic Programme Review and Implementation Plan. They thanked the Review Panel and Edward Schofield in the Academic Office for their work and assistance.

The Review was seen as encouraging and helpful for the programmes concerned. The curriculum mapping exercise recommended by the Panel has already been undertaken and has provoked many interesting discussions. The Faculty is now experimenting with different approaches to tutorials, with this exercise prompting consideration of different student views of lectures and tutorials more broadly.

60.19 Farewells

Professor Guilford thanked and wished farewell to Professor Steve Warburton, departing Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Digital Futures). He also thanked Professor Peter Whiteford, stepping down as Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Research.

61.19 Part B of the agenda

No further items having been brought forward—

1. the minute of the 23 July 2019 meeting was confirmed (excluding Part C which was held at this time for reasons of confidentiality);
2. an extract from Part C of the minute of the Academic Board meeting held 25 June 2019 was confirmed;
3. the 12 non-CUAP proposals summarised in the Academic Committee report were approved;
4. the other matters approved and discussed by the Academic Committee at its 30 July meeting were noted;
5. the Terms of Reference and Standing Orders of the Faculty Board, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, were approved.

At 1.46pm, non-members left the meeting to allow members to discuss confidential further items.
Part C

62.19 Emeritus Professor

Professor Dave Harper and Professor Lou Moses spoke in support of a nomination that Professor John McClure be awarded the title of Emeritus Professor.

The Board unanimously endorsed a recommendation by the Vice-Chancellor that Professor John McClure be awarded the status of Emeritus Professor.

The Minute related to 63.19 is excluded at this time due to confidentiality.

The meeting concluded at 1.53pm.

Attendance

52 members attended; 15 non-members were in attendance; 25 apologies were received (refer to Appendix 1 for detailed record).

Signed: ________________________________________________________________

Professor Grant Guilford, Vice-Chancellor
Appendix 1: Academic Board attendance 20 August 2019

Members attending
Professor Grant Guilford, Convenor

Professor James Bell  A/Prof Nikki Hessell  Professor Lou Moses
Professor Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich  Professor Rawinia Higgins  Elizabeth Olsen
Dr Anita Brady  A/Prof Sally Hill  Tamatha Paul
Professor Stuart Brock  A/Prof Flaviu Hodis  Petra Reichart
Professor Daniel Brown  A/Prof Kathy Holloway  Professor Alex Richter
A/Prof Urs Daellenbach  Dr Michael Homer  Geo Robrigado
Professor Simon Davy  A/Prof Val Hooper  Professor Martha Savage
Heather Day  Professor Margaret Hyland  Professor Marc Aurel
Dr Joost de Bruin  Dr Carwyn Jones  Schnabel
Dr Joost de Bruin  Professor Sarah Leggott  Dr Jan Smitheram
Professor Kevin Dew  A/Prof Ivy Liu  Dr Carolyn Tait
Professor Stephen Dobson  Dr Giacomo Lichtner  Dr Janet Toland
Professor Neil Dodgson  Professor John Macalister  Professor Kathryn Walls
Janet Fletcher  Dr Joanna MacKichan  Professor Colin Wilson
A/Prof Nicholas Golledge  Dr Xavier Marquez  Professor Marc Wilson
Professor Michele Governale  Dr Stuart Marshall  Professor Jennifer Windsor
Professor Dave Harper  A/Prof Robyn Maude  Professor Michael Winikoff
Dr John Haywood  Professor Donald Maurice *

* Also Acting Head of School for Professor Sally-Jane Norman.

Attending under s3.2 of the Standing Orders of the Academic Board
A/Prof Nicola Nelson for Professor Simon Davy.

Non-members in attendance
Paul Altomari  Heather Finn  Cathy Powley
Sarah Boyd  Angela Geerts  Edward Schofield
Jenny Christie  Rebecca Hisolp  A/Prof Kathryn Sutherland
Tayla Cook  Heather Kirkwood  Dr Sue Walbran
Karen Davis  Dr Diane Ormsby

Apologies
Professor Siah Hwee Ang  A/Prof Catherine Iorns  Professor Jim McAloon
Professor Richard Arnold  Magallanes  Professor Miriam Meyerhoff
A/Prof Jane Bryson  Laura Jackson  Professor Sally-Jane Norman
Professor Petra Butler  Professor Annemarie Jutel  Professor James Renwick
Professor Dale Carnegie  A/Prof Hon. Dame  Professor Harry Ricketts
Professor Martyn Coles  Luamanuva Winnie Laban  Dr Kirsten Smiler
Professor Gregor Coster  Professor Wendy Larner  Te Mapihi Tutua-Nathan
Professor Carmen Dalli  Ali Leota  Professor Peter Whiteford
A/Prof Carolyn Dalli  Professor Antonia Lyons  Professor Ian Williamson
Professor Mark Hickford  Professor Meredith Marra
It is expected that the Board:
   a. endorse the 5 Graduating Year Review reports
   b. approve the 16 non-CUAP proposals; and
   b. note the other matters discussed and/or approved by the Committee at its 3 September meeting.

Note: Items that are included in this report are available from the Academic Office upon request.
Memorandum

To Academic Board
From Paul Altomari, Academic Programmes Coordinator
Date 11 September 2019
Subject Report of the Academic Committee

This report covers the 3 September 2019 meeting of the Academic Committee.

A. Academic proposals for endorsement (CUAP)
There were no CUAP proposals on the agenda for endorsement.

B. Graduating Year Reviews for endorsement (CUAP)
The Graduating Year Reviews listed below were endorsed by the Academic Committee for submission to the Academic Board. Academic Board endorsement for submission to CUAP is sought.
1. Master of Political Science
2. Master of Teaching and Learning
3. Bachelor of Education (Honours)
4. Master of Applied Statistics
5. Master of e-Government

C. Academic proposals for approval (non-CUAP)
The proposals summarised below were endorsed by the Academic Committee for submission to the Academic Board. Academic Board approval is sought.

1. BA(Hons)/4 (Conversion of a special topic)
   In response to its increasing popularity, this proposal makes the special topic CRIM 417 permanent as CRIM 402 *Crimes Against the Environment* and retains the CRIM 417 special topic slot. The new course will offer a critical perspective on matters related to environmental harm, complementing the existing range of topics offered at Honours level. In particular, the course will extend thinking beyond the boundaries of conventional criminological ideas and encourage students to engage with and apply non-traditional perspectives to address injustices experienced by humans, non-human animals and ecosystems.

2. BA/15 (Amendments to LING major requirements)
   This proposal amends the BA in Linguistics by adding a further major subject requirement of ‘20 further points from LING 100-399’. Under the current regulations, students complete one core introduction course at 100-level (LING 111), three core courses at 200-level in the three main areas of Linguistics that make up the programme (LING 221, 227 and 228), and a selection of two 300-level courses. Inclusion of a further course in Linguistics will give
students a stronger foundation across a broader range of sub-areas in the discipline, while still allowing a good degree of flexibility as to which courses they take to complete the major.

3. BA/18 (Removing MUSC 105 from the BA schedule)
This proposal responds to the 2017 BA review requirement that the number of 100-level courses to be offered towards a BA major in any one year be restricted to two by removing MUSC 105 *Music Now: Understanding Music Through the Lens of the 20th-21st Centuries* from the BA schedule. There are currently four 100-level courses that can be taken towards the Music major in the BA: CMPO 186, MUSC 105, MUSC 120 and MUSC 150. All of these courses are also on the BMus Schedule. Removing MUSC 105 from the BA Schedule will ensure that it can still be offered towards the BMus in any given year.

4. BAS/18, BBSc/11, MIA/2 (Amendments to the Interior Architecture programme)
This proposal makes updates to the titles, prerequisites and restrictions for several courses within the Interior Architecture programme. The title changes provide a clearer sequencing for students moving through the programme and identify INTA 312 as a capstone course. The proposal reduces prerequisite requirements for several courses placing a more specific focus on the core skills needed to progress through studio courses, and removes outdated restrictions for two 400-level courses.

5. BAS/23, BBSc/16, MLA/5 (Amendments to Landscape Architecture courses)
Responding to several recommendations from the 2018 Landscape Architecture programme review, this proposal: (1) updates course titles in order to make them more distinct from each other, (2) updates prerequisites to provide a more logical pathway for students, (3) removes outdated restrictions, (4) modifies course prescriptions, learning objectives and assessments clarifying content and scaffolding knowledge, skills and attributes in a logical order, and (5) adds components of ecology, geology, hydrology and planting into the teaching of several courses.

6. BBSc/12 (Amendments to the Bachelor of Building Science)
This proposal modifies the general requirements for the Bachelor of Building Science, clarifying entry, modifies the prerequisites for two courses, clarifying pathways for students, and removes outdated restrictions for two courses.

7. BC/1, BSc/7 (Amendments to the Bachelor of Communication)
In addition to prerequisite updates for several 200- and 300-level COMS course, this proposal amends the requirements for the Science Communication major in the BC and BSc, and the requirements for the Media Studies major in the Bachelor of Communication and Bachelor of Arts. The amendments respond to issues identified by staff teaching Science Communication, and intend to make the major requirements for Media Studies and Science Communication the same in different degrees. Issues being resolved by this proposal include ensuring the requirements address students who enrol in Science Communication as an outside major, and more evenly distributing the Science Communication major requirements within the Bachelor of Communication.

8. BCom/3 (Amendments to the INFO specialisations regulations)
When originally proposed, the two specialisations within the Information Systems (INFO) major were available only to students “completing a major in Information Systems for the BCom degree”. This proposal removes the BCom degree constraint. Once implemented, any student majoring in INFO, whether as a first major in the BCom, or an outside major in any
other degree, may be awarded either of the specialisations if they complete the required
courses. The proposal also allows INFO 320 Projects in Information Systems to be used for
both the ISBA and ISSO specialisations

9. BCom/4 (Amendments to the HRIR major requirements)
Following an internal review, it was identified that the current mandatory course HRIR 320
Human Resource Strategy, initially intended to be an integrated course taken as a cohort, is
no longer serving as a distinct capstone. This proposal removes HRIR 320 from the BCom
HRIR major core requirements and consequentially updates the BCom(Hons) HRIR entry
requirements in addition to the prerequisites and restrictions for HRIR 320. The proposed
amendments would provide HRIR students with greater flexibility and choice in completing
their HRIR major and make the course more available to other BCom students who have
successfully completed HRIR 201, which is traditionally available both in T1 and T3.

10. BE(Hons)/1, BSc(Hons)/3 (New course COMP 420 Artificial Intelligence)
This proposal introduces COMP 420 Artificial Intelligence, a 400-level introduction to the
area of AI, designed for graduates of other programmes who do not have the equivalent of
COMP 307 Introduction to Artificial Intelligence. The course will provide a clear pathway
into the advanced 400-level AI courses (currently COMP 421 and 422). The prerequisites of
COMP 421 and 422 are updated to reflect this pathway, and the prerequisites of COMP 423
are made explicit, rather than inheriting from COMP 421.

11. BMus(Hons)/1, BA(Hons)/6 (New course NZSM 487)
Music Technology is a key growth area at the New Zealand School of Music – Te Kōkī
mirrored by significant growth in enrolments in recent years. It is seen as crucial to build on
the success of the undergraduate Music Technology curriculum revision in 2018, by
developing further offerings at honours level. In response, this proposal introduces a new
course NZSM 487 Advanced Stereo Audio Production to the BMus(Hons) and BA(Hons)
schedules.

12. BSc(Hons)/2 (Three new 400-level ESCI courses and deletion of four courses)
This proposal introduces three new core courses into the Environmental Sciences programme:
ESCI 451 Active Earth, ESCI 452 Earth History and ESCI 453 Earth Materials and
Resources. ESCI 451 addresses the principles of the physical and chemical processes
governing tectonism, magmatism, and active margins from both local and global perspectives.
ESCI 452 reviews stratigraphic principles and approaches used to reconstruct past
environments using geochemical and paleontological proxies to identify change. ESCI 453
explores the origin, extraction, uses and sustainability of a range of Earth resources, including
both conventional energy resources such as hydrocarbons and our transition to alternate
resources, such as the metals required for modern energy storage solutions. The proposal also
deletes four 400-level ESCI courses and makes consequential changes to the subject
requirements of the BSc(Hons), MSc, PGCertSc and PDipSc.

13. BSc/8 (Amendments to Environmental Studies major requirements)
This proposal updates the Environmental Studies major requirements and makes
consequential changes to course prerequisites. The new structure offers three focuses, leading
to 300-level optional courses in earth sciences, mātauranga Māori, and policy and politics.
The new structure also ensures that students have the necessary prerequisites, which begins
with the addition of appropriate 100-level options.
14. MHlth/3, MNS/1, PGDipHlth/1, PGCertHlth/1, PGCertMid/1 (Amendments to subjects and core course requirements)
The current Master of Health programme (and associated PGDipHlth and PGCertHlth) comprises seven highly specialised subjects: Health Leadership and Management; Health Policy, Planning and Service Delivery; Health Promotion; Midwifery; Nursing; Professional Practice; Workplace Health and Safety. This proposal converts the current subjects into optional specialisations within the MHlth and PGDipHlth (but not PGCertHlth) providing a route for students to explore areas of health outside the current subjects. It also makes minor changes to the details of several 500-level courses.

15. MIS/1, PGCertIS/1, PGDipIS/1 (Amendments to INFO 539)
This proposal amends the title, prescription and course learning objectives for INFO 539 Archives: Access, Advocacy, and Outreach in order to broaden its focus to include libraries. The course is considered to be a valuable and important addition to the Information Studies programmes and responds to industry demands for skills in public programming development and management as well as abilities in advocating for library and information services and demonstrating their value to stakeholders.

16. MMHP/1 (Amendments to the MMHP)
This proposal deletes six existing MHST 30-point full-year courses, replacing them by twelve 15-point courses covering the same content in order to give students more flexibility around the combination and timing of the courses they take. The proposed new 15-point courses will essentially deliver the same content as the previous 30-point courses, in two parts offered in consecutive trimesters. The proposal also adds two new 15-point special topic slots and makes the special topic MHST 520 Heritage Practices permanent as MHST 510, retaining the MHST 520 special topic slot.

D. Academic proposals approved by the Academic Committee (for noting)

1. BA/10 (Amendments to 200-level ENGL prerequisites) AC19/105
The proposal updates the prerequisites for 200-level ENGL courses from '40 100-level ENGL points' to '20 100-level ENGL point and 20 further points from Part A of the BA schedule'. The change intends to reduce barriers to entry to 200-level ENGL courses, in response to the reduction in number of 100-level courses following the BA Review of 2017.

2. BMus/2 (Amendments to CMPO 201) AC19/106
This proposal makes minor updates to the title, prescription, prerequisites and restrictions for CMPO 201 Instrumental/Vocal Composition 2: Form, Process and Materials. The changes intend to open up CMPO 201 to a wider range of students, in order to help the course meet minima, and to encourage a more interdisciplinary cohort of students to engage with composition at second year.

3. BA/19 (Amendments to MAOR 222 prerequisites) AC19/107
This proposal amends the prerequisites for MAOR 222 in order remove unnecessary limits and responds to increased student interest following a redesign of the course in 2014.

4. BHlth/9 (Amendments to HLWB special topic prerequisites) AC19/108
Since prerequisite requirements for special topic courses are approved on an individual basis per offering, this proposal removes the standard prerequisites for a set of HLWB special topic...
courses as they are considered unnecessary.

5. BE(Hons)/10 (Adding ENGR 201 to ENGR 301 prerequisites) AC19/109
This proposal therefore adds ENGR 201 to the prerequisites of ENGR 301 as it has become clear that the communication skills developed in ENGR 201 are highly advantageous for ENGR 301, which has a significant report-writing and oral presentation component.

E. Other Academic Committee approvals (for noting)

1. School of Architecture memorandum to add the GCertDE to the entry requirements of the Graduate Certificate and Diploma in Designed Environments – AC19/110
The memo adds the GCertDE to the entry requirements of the Graduate Certificate and Diploma in Designed Environments, ensuring that the two qualifications have the same entry requirements as intended by the initial proposal.
MEMORANDUM

To Academic Board
From Professor Stuart Brock, Vice-Provost (Academic)
Date 16 September 2019
Subject Academic programme reviews updates

Executive Summary

Three programmes who went through a review in 2016 or 2017 are providing an update on progress for noting by the Academic Board.

An update on progress to the implementation plan for the programme review of Interior Architecture and Architecture History and Theory is attached, and has been approved by the Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and Design.

Similarly, an update on progress to the implementation plan for the programme review of Science in Society is attached, and has been approved by the Dean of the Faculty of Science.

Likewise, an update on progress to the implementation plan for the programme review of Initial Teacher Education is also attached. This has been approved by the Dean of the Faculty of Education.

Enclosed

1. A programme review progress update for the Initial Teacher Education programme
2. A programme review progress update for the Science in Society programme
3. A programme review progress update for the Interior Architecture and Architecture History and Theory programmes
ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORT

Review of Initial Teacher Education Programmes

Date the Implementation Plan was approved by Academic Board July 2018
This progress report covers the period: July 2018 to August 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Recorded by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td>5 August 2019</td>
<td>Edward Schofield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVC/Dean</td>
<td>5 August 2019</td>
<td>Edward Schofield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please send this progress report in electronic form to the Reviews Advisor, Academic Office edward.schofield@vuw.ac.nz

Progress Report

These recommendations are being implemented alongside the ITE Programme approval, monitoring and review requirements (2019) from the Teaching Council which will take effect in 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Actions update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Articulate a shared overall vision for the Initial Teacher Education Programme as a whole.</td>
<td>A vision for transformative and Treaty led ITE has been developed in collaboration with staff and the professional community in schools. This will be finalised by November 2019 in preparation for accreditation of new programmes by the Teaching Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Subsequent to articulating a shared vision for ITE, develop a conceptual framework for achieving the vision, a plan for applying the framework, and an approach to evaluate the impact of the framework.</td>
<td>A review of relevant literature was undertaken. This has informed an overarching conceptual framework for all ITE programmes and will have considerable significance for the shape of our programmes from 2021 onwards. This plan for applying this framework and the evaluation of its impact are embedded within the new accreditation process from Teaching Council. The programmes will be applying for accreditation in November 2019 with a new programme to be implemented in 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Further improve and maintain processes, practices and structures in the ITE Programme as a whole to actively honour the intent of the Treaty of Waitangi principles</td>
<td>The Māori Teacher Education Advisory Committee has led the development of the vision for all ITE programmes. This way of working has put the intent of the Treaty of Waitangi principles at the forefront of the development of programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Actions update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Appoint, as practicable, a Professor of Māori Education, who could contribute to or lead the implementation of Recommendation 3 (and sub recommendations).</td>
<td>The process of appointment of a Professor of Māori Education is now underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Conduct a mapping exercise of both the current Māori content across the ITE Programme and the resources available to support and provide this content. ‘Available support’ may include the resources available in other areas and levels of the university.</td>
<td>Programme directors and staff have worked on mapping course learning outcomes and course content in the redesigned programmes which will be taught in 2021. The programme directors are considering resources to provide this content and we are looking forward to input from the future professor of Māori education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Ensure that all course content and approaches used throughout all courses are consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi relationship.</td>
<td>The Treaty of Waitangi relationship is now evident in the learning outcomes of all of the redesigned courses in a consistent way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Formally incorporate the knowledge of the Kōrero Mai course into the ITE programmes. Review the ordering of Mātauranga</td>
<td>Kōrero Mai will be formally incorporated as a credit bearing element in the redesigned programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Māori courses and knowledge within the programme offerings.</td>
<td>The Mātauranga Māori courses have been reviewed, the content of them has been repositioned and redesigned as part of the review of programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Review the system/style of practical experience used in the Programme to align with the vision and conceptual framework in recommendations one and two.</td>
<td>There has been a key shift from a practicum placement in school as an apprenticeship model with a one associate teacher to a wider mentoring relationship in which the whole school or centre works in partnership in the development of student teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Develop a clear Policy or Process that codifies the existing good practice in how the Teaching Experience Office manages placements, school relationship and support for issues.</td>
<td>The teaching experience office have developed and documented clear processes for the operations fo the office in consultation with the legal team at VUW. The placement handbooks are being reviewed and standardised. These will make policies and processes evident to schools, teachers, students and VUW staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Actively engage all staff in the coordination of assessment setting to ensure that there is appropriate timing between assessments, Teaching Experiences, and that there is sufficient time for marking and feedback.

Programme directors meet monthly to discuss and plan matters such as the timing of the assessments. The removal of examinations from most of the courses and the repositioning of the practicum in the Graduate Diploma of Teaching have changed the pressure points for students but we are sensitive to student feedback around these changes.

7. All staff in the ITE Programme actively engage with opportunities to use facilities on the Kelburn Campus, including Te Herenga Waka Marae, supported by their peers and the School.

We have been delighted to use Te Herenga Waka Marae for programmes. The students in all our ITE programmes are welcomed to the programmes on the marae. We also make use of the marae for our teaching in the programmes.

8. The University communicate with the School, as a matter of urgency, the timeframe and strategic plan for development of appropriate ITE facilities, and that the ITE programme, School and Faculty of Education work together with the University to ensure there is input into future building developments.

The University has provided access to some facilities in Kirk which have been made available for specialist teaching such as a science laboratory. We await the opportunity to have input into purpose-build specialist facilities both for teaching and for staff.

9. In collaboration with the appropriate University services, develop a customised suite of student data that can inform the School and ITE Programme.

We are in the process of doing this though upskilling of our staff in using Cognos. There is further work in developing the customised suite.

10. Consider the appointment strategy of the School with a view to appointments at Associate Professor and above with relevant experience for the Programme, and in supporting staff career development in line with the university promotion criteria.

We now have five associate professors in the ITE programmes and one professor. There has been a stronger focus on career development and mentoring though the PDCP process. This process has included engagement with the Academic Careers Framework at all levels.
ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORT

Review of Science in Society undergraduate programme

Date the Implementation Plan was approved by Academic Board:  May 2017
This progress report covers the period:  December 2017  to  July 2019

Approval  Date:  Recorded by:
Head of School  31 July 2019  Rebecca Priestley
PVC/Dean  22 Aug 2019  Simon Davy

Please send this progress report in electronic form to the Reviews Advisor, Academic Office edward.schofield@vuw.ac.nz

Progress Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Actions update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>There is a need for senior leadership and mentorship in the Science in Society group to prepare them for future successes in teaching, research and engagement, as well as a need to recognise the leadership that has already been shown.</td>
<td>Rebecca Priestley and Rhian Salmon are now Director and Deputy Director, respectively, of the unit that is now the Centre for Science in Society. Both have access to mentoring services (provided by Paul Pringle and Bronwen Anderson, respectively) and to professional development opportunities offered at faculty and university level, including through the Head of School programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Because of the new Master’s programme, rapid growth at the undergraduate level and future potential growth, the Science in Society Programme urgently requires capacity of at least four FTE academic staff members. Presently it is below two FTE.</td>
<td>The Centre for Science in Society now has four full time permanent academics, two part-time academics, and one fixed term academic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Given its interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary status bridging the Faculty, there is no obvious School in which the Programme should be housed. It is therefore recommended that the Programme remain as a stand-alone programme within the Faculty, but with adequate administrative support and with a line manager that reports to the Dean. If a decision is made for the Programme to be housed in a School, it is recommended</td>
<td>All staff of the Centre for Science in Society now report to the Director of the Centre for Science in Society, who reports to the Dean of Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Actions update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that this be the School of Chemical and Physical Sciences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To establish a research centre for Science in Society to raise the research profile of the university and to focus and develop pre-existing strengths in this area of applied research. The centre will serve as a vehicle for engaging with other research institutions, industry and other stakeholders to facilitate interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary relationships.</td>
<td>The Centre for Science in Society was approved by SLT in October 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Important curriculum gaps should be filled by academic teaching staff with expertise in the following areas: science communication, science and technology studies, and Asia-Pacific science.</td>
<td>Since the last update, new staff have been recruited with expertise in STS, communication studies, cultural anthropology and environmental humanities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Once the additional academic positions have been filled, a Programme strategy should be developed along with an accompanying review (and benchmarking) of: a. The graduate profile of the Programme b. Courses across the university that could contribute towards both the undergraduate minor and the Master’s Programme c. The existing course content d. The course codes for courses and names of the subjects in the Programme with an eye to making pathways through the degree and onto further postgraduate study clearer. e. Comparable university programmes (e.g. Australian National University, University College of London, Imperial College London, Cornell, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Arizona State, Duke, Brown)</td>
<td>Since the last report, the Centre for Science in Society has developed a major in science communication, which will be offered under the Bachelor of Science and the new Bachelor of Communications developed by FHSS. A full programme strategy is in development and will be informed by an upcoming Operational Review. a. The graduate profile is outlined in the documentation for the Master of Science in Society. b. CSIS wants to be open to student suggestions as to electives they want to include in their degree, rather than be prescriptive about it. That said, the course list for Science in Society does provide lists of electives that past students have taken. c. The content of all courses is reviewed annually and with new staff coming on, and taking over course coordination and lecturing duties, there has been significant changes to course content. This is ongoing: course content is not static. d. Science in Society courses are now offered under the code SCIS rather than SCIE. There have been some changes to course names to better reflect course content and better signal pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Actions update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through the various offerings. Unfortunately this did initially result in a drop of EFTS through students being unable to find the courses they were looking for – the web team were unable to direct students looking for the old SCIE courses to the new SCIS courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>That some thought be given to how assessment tasks are structured and marked in light of the fact that this Programme has a large number of assessment items and a large, growing number of students (especially in SCIE 211 and SCIE 212), with a small number of permanent academic staff.</td>
<td>There has been on-going work in this regard with all assessments being re-considered in this light each trimester prior to “going live”. There are now more permanent academic staff so there is less reliance on tutors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Serious consideration should be given by academics and Faculty management regarding the true cost of online courses when deciding on course development.</td>
<td>This is something that needs to happen at faculty or university level. We are not aware of any developments here but would comment that, in our experience, developing and coordinating a new online course is considerably more time consuming than developing and coordinating a regular classroom course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>An evaluation of Māori and Pasifika student success should be completed by the Programme on the basis of detailed and robust data.</td>
<td>Action in conjunction with recommendation 10 below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The Programme should undergo a scan and evaluation of courses for Pasifika and Māori content in consultation with Te Kawa a Maui and Va’aomanu Pasifika.</td>
<td>This was done by Pauline Harris, a Maori scholar on a fixed term contract with CSIS. This was not done in consultation with Te Kawa a Maui and Va’aomanu Pasifika as Pauline’s expertise was seen as sufficient, and we did not want to burden these units with additional workload. A document summarising the results is available on request from the Programme or Academic Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>In order to ensure a sustainable model for interdisciplinary teaching across schools and faculties within the university, a formalised ETFS sharing arrangement (or a similar alternative) should be developed.</td>
<td>No further developments as far as we know. We do note, however, that with our expanded academic team we now have much more capacity to teach and rely less on academics outside of CSIS, or outside of the Faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Progress Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Actions update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>That a leader and “champion” for the Interior Architecture Programme be located, and that the staff in the Interior Architecture Programme collectively support this person.</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong>&lt;br&gt;It was noted last year that Antony Pelosi became Director of the Interior Architecture programme in December 2016 to provide this Leadership. As part of his role as Program Director he is taking up a proposal from the Head of School to investigate Professional Accreditation for this degree. This has now become a joint project with the School of Design; we are jointly seeking accreditation from the American organisation NASAD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>That the 100-level programme be reviewed by the School’s Learning and Teaching Committee to identify and set the purpose and ethos of a common first year.</td>
<td><strong>Ongoing</strong>&lt;br&gt;An internal review of first year was undertaken in 2017 with changes being made to the Interdisciplinary courses SARC 111 and SARC 112. As part of broader initiatives in the school there is a plan to review all of the interdisciplinary (SARC) courses in the coming year. This review will involve CAD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>That the current benefits and good practices present in the postgraduate programme be adapted for use in the undergraduate programme.</td>
<td><strong>Ongoing</strong>&lt;br&gt;This process has continued. It is notable that the number of students choosing the Interior Architecture major in year 2 increased substantially last year. The Review mentioned in 2 above will have good practice as a particular aim and focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Actions update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>That the Interior Architecture Programme expand their perception of the discipline to consider a broad range of the future directions, and to adjust the curriculum accordingly with those directions</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong>&lt;br&gt;This was previously reported as completed. As noted above this seems to be reflected in student discipline choice in year 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>That the Programme (and School) place emphasis on the vocations available within the discipline and ensure that these vocations are visible to students through linkages to industry partners.</td>
<td><strong>Completed but also ongoing</strong>&lt;br&gt;The work in this area has continued. We have several students entered in major design competitions that relevant Industries are closely involved with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>That the graduate outcomes be redeveloped. This should be done at an appropriate time after the Programme has defined its future directions and emphasised the students’ possible ultimate vocations (in recommendations 4 and 5 above). The graduate outcomes should be aligned to teaching into those areas and preparing students for those vocations.</td>
<td><strong>Ongoing</strong>&lt;br&gt;The work that had been undertaken in 2017 and 2018 and was reported last year. The SARC review mentioned above will be accompanied by curriculum review. The strategy is driving this review are being discussed at these School Academic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>That more community building needs to occur within year groups, particularly at 200-level, to encourage relationships and collegiality amongst the students.</td>
<td><strong>Completed but also ongoing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Social events have continued and have been expanded. As noted in the 200 level course is now significantly expanded to around 40 students – representing a very healthy cohort. Planned and social events for this year include taking advice from Georgia Andrews, the new Rainbow and Inclusion Adviser, on appropriate events and activities. Equally, we have been involving the Pasifika and Maori Student Success Officers in meetings and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>That the research streams in the school be incorporated into the future directions of the Programme.</td>
<td><strong>Completed</strong>&lt;br&gt;The recommendations from the Research Identity Working Group are now being implemented according to an agreed timetable. This is a comprehensive piece of work that considerably improves the organisation of our research activity by identifying three major Research Clusters, within which there are the number of Streams or Labs. Research Cluster Directors will be appointed to oversee and manage the operation of each cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>That if the Architecture History and Theory Programme is to continue at</td>
<td><strong>Ongoing</strong>&lt;br&gt;As part of the Research Identity project History and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Actions update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria, it should have a clear lead person within the School and should primarily be focused at PhD and research levels. Linkages to other programmes at Victoria could provide an undergraduate pathway.</td>
<td>Theory has been identified as a research area. There was a Graduate Diploma in place that apparently was intended to be a bridge between the Bachelor degree and the Master of Architecture. This diploma had never actually been used and is being removed from our offerings since students can, and do, progress directly to the MArch from a Bachelor degree. The MArch is a non-Professional degree that can be taken by History and Theory students. A History and Theory working panel with external input did not meet last year, but a group is being formed internally to discuss the future plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10. | That the Interior Architecture Programme explore additional methods to include Māori, Pasifika and other international knowledge into the future directions of the Programme. | **Completed**  
As noted in last year’s report Māori and Pasifika content has been introduced into several studio courses. Further positive development is being enabled by changes in academic staffing. |