A meeting of the Academic Board will be held on Tuesday, 25 August 2020 at 1:00pm via zoom.

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 RESOLUTION CONCERNING EXCLUSION OF NON-MEMBERS
   To resolve: that non-members be excluded from this meeting for consideration of items 11 to 14, for reasons of confidentiality.

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

5 PROVOST’S FORUM:
   To discuss: the Provost will lead a discussion on the Assessment Framework Discussion Paper.
6 **ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW**

*To receive:* the report for the academic programme review of the Linguistics and Applied Language Studies Programmes;  
the implementation plan for the academic programme review of the Linguistics and Applied Language Studies Programmes;  

*To advise:* the Pro-Vice Chancellor/Dean on any academic matters arising from the review.

**PART B**

7 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

*To confirm:* the minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 21 July 2020 (Nos. 39.20-51.20).  
*Note: Excludes Part C for reasons of confidentiality*

8 **REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC COMMITTEE**

*To approve:* the 8 non-CUAP proposals;  
*To note:* the one proposal approved by the Committee at its 04 August meeting; and  
*To note:* the other matters approved and/or discussed by the Committee at its 04 August meeting.

9 **ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW**

*To receive:* a programme review completion report for the Geography Programme.

10 **ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW SCHEDULE 2021**

*To note:* the 2021 Academic Programme Review Schedule.

11 **MEMBERS ONLY (PART C)**

The next meeting will be held at 1:00pm on Tuesday, 22 September 2020 in the Hunter Council Chamber (TBA).
The Provost Forum will discuss the discussion paper on the development of an Assessment Framework. This has been developed as part of the Te Herenga Waka Resilience Programme (THWRP) - Teaching Resilience Workstream 1.

To discuss: the Provost will lead a discussion on the Assessment Framework Discussion Paper
Assessment Framework discussion paper

Executive Summary

This discussion paper explores assessment through research and presents the draft foundations for the development of an Assessment Framework for the university. It is intended that the Framework will be the principle document to support assessment practice as well as the development of assessment policy and procedures. The draft foundations build upon our existing traditions and at the same time provide future-proofing towards on-going developments in assessment.

The literature is clear that there has been a significant shift in the purpose of assessment over the last 20 years from assessment of learning (summative), toward assessment for learning (formative) and furthermore to assessment as learning (literacy in assessment). Therefore, the paper raises questions about the emphasis on exams, especially in first year courses where first year is about foundational discipline skills and understandings, and academic conventions and integrity. It is proposed that four foundations for the framework should be; that assessments are

1. fit for purpose, meaning it is valid, reliable and authentic.
2. inclusive, fair, equitable, and accessible, in assessment of all students.
3. transparent, so that assessment and information about it is understood.
4. sustainable and manageable for students to complete and for staff to assess.

These are woven with the practice of assessment, i.e:

- Assessment as learning;
- Assessment for learning; and
- Assessment of learning.

A series of questions are posed in the document to stimulate the discussion.
Background

This paper is designed to move forward a conversation about assessment that has been on-going for some time. In the context of the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, our assessment practices have come under pressure from a resilience perspective, but more importantly it has turned the conversation towards what good assessment judgment and practice looks like in a modern, digitally connected world. Discussions about what a new assessment framework, underpinned by research, might look like have also begun to take shape. The intention is that any framework for the university should take into account the future of assessment to ensure resilience and be flexible enough to meet those challenges.

The pandemic caused a significant, and sudden, disruption to teaching and learning and created additional pressures on the approach to assessment. It was not possible to conduct in-person invigilated examinations and alternative forms of assessment had to be implemented at very short notice. Discussions around the use of on-line exams became commonplace as staff grappled with issues around the technology itself, academic integrity, student and staff readiness and practical matters relating to connectivity and access to technology.

A 2015 working group also made several recommendations including that an assessment framework be developed to assist course co-ordinators to select the best type of assessment for their course. The working group also commented that “the current administrative constraints [outlined in the Assessment Handbook] placed on examinations to be excessive....” and that those surrounding tests is less constraining than they should be. Discussions continued and in 2019 came to the fore again but this time somewhat more focussed on the role of examinations in the context of a changed academic year to incorporate a 3rd trimester.

A number of challenges with respect to assessment have been voiced in the course of recent events:

1. The relationship between summative and formative assessment;
2. ‘Teaching to the test’ assessment and assessment driving learning can lead to too much assessment, which impacts motivation to learn and teachers only transmitting knowledge;
3. The extent to which online assessment can/should be used;
4. Assessment that privileges certain cultures or socio-economic backgrounds;
5. How important less traditional assessment methods such as oral and performance-based creative assessment are;
6. Over-assessment and/or ensuring assessment is fit-for-purpose;
7. The assessment skills (literacy) of students, professional staff and academics;
8. Ensuring academic integrity;
9. Ensuring assessment is accessible and that it takes account of disability needs;
10. The separation of an assessment framework from the assessment regulations, assessment practice and supporting resources;
11. Assessment practices at different levels, going from course-level to, minor/major, work-integrated learning and practicum/internship levels to programme-level;
12. Discipline specific assessment traditions and the external assessment requirements of accrediting bodies or their equivalent, such as industry-based norms.

As a result of these challenges the proposed assessment framework intends to be accessible and interactive and meet the needs of ‘any time, any place, just in time’ assessment that is relevant to the needs of all students, irrespective of their background. We also acknowledge that accessible
assessment is a central premise and that in some instances there can be reasons to justify face-to-face learning and teaching and assessment.

The following includes a discussion of literature around modern trends in assessment practice and the major elements that might form the basis of an assessment framework that would be enabling rather than prescriptive and provide guidance to academic staff across all disciplines. It also raises a number of questions regarding the future of assessment practice in the university, including but not limited to the role and use of exams.

**Purpose and context of Assessment**

Over the last 20 years, there has been a noticeable shift in the purpose of assessment from the dominance of assessment of learning (i.e. determining whether the student has achieved the objectives of the course after learning has ceased) towards assessment for learning (i.e. to support the student to take agency over their own learning). In the last decade assessment as learning has also become more prominent in the design of assessment frameworks in higher education i.e. where both student and lecturer develop greater skills in self-reflective understanding of respectively, progress in learning and ongoing teaching activities (Schön, 1983, 1987).

The use of assessment of, for and as learning has become increasingly responsive to concerns with inclusion, cultural sensitivity, fitness of purpose and assessment principles such as fairness, validity, reliability, transparency and accountability. Advances in learning analytics and higher education research offer new opportunities to ensure that data is constantly available to students and lecturers to support in real time their assessment and learning activities.

Assessment of student knowledge, skills and attitudes/values is closely connected with teaching and learning pedagogies, curriculum design and the overall student experience within courses and across the program in which they are enrolled. The interconnection between these elements is visualised in the figure below. Each point of the pyramid will be discussed in turn with the understanding that there is always a relationship with the other points.
What is the role of Student Agency in assessment?

The student-centred approach to learning and assessment is founded upon the view that student agency and motivation involves actively taking part in not only learning, but also assessment. In future-proofed student-centred learning, students are actively involved in the choice of their learning resources, lectures and accompanying assessment criteria, rubrics and assessment situations. Much is also to be gained by understanding the student as more than the self-directed, autonomous individual. The student is always inter-connected in some way with other students (e.g. encountering the same learning resources) or with whānau, iwi and communities. This is a central premise in a successful student-centred learning and assessment environment, where students are supported and not over-whelmed by responsibilities placed upon their shoulders to be self-directed and motivated learners (Damşa and De Lange, 2019). Moreover, learning is both reinforced and enhanced when opportunities for differentiated learning and assessment trajectories are offered to students in accordance with their interests, skills, needs and cultural backgrounds.

Learning and the way in which it is assessed can privilege and influence the agency of students according to their cultural and academic backgrounds or in terms of special or diverse needs. Research (Levine and McGuire, 1970) suggests that orals are particularly valid for the measurement of communication skills and privilege those who have built up these skills in their courses or come from cultures with strong oral traditions. Portfolios and ePortfolios are considered fair, useful and relevant in the areas of arts, design, performance and enquiry-based work, where a project of some description is the learning objective. Multiple choice can support the measuring of recall, but it is
important that other forms of cognition on Blooms taxonomy are balanced. The taxonomy moves across cognitive levels, through remembering, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating, synthesising and creating. Examinations or tests are set by the teacher and thus, remain teacher-centred and well-suited to those students who can work quickly in a time-constrained environment.

The use of digital assessment will privilege those who have access to better digital connectivity and a higher level of digital literacy, although it empowers students to experience any time, any place assessment and in this sense is more inclusive. It also anticipates the move towards greater use of scenario and simulated learning and assessment, while saving on the need for physical resources and on campus provision of resources.

For students with one or more of learning, mental and physical disability needs, the effective use of online and digital assessment can be important for enhancing their agency. Coaching of students and the professional development of staff are important for introducing and making use of adaptive technologies that realise the intent of allowing for accessible assessment systems. Regular weekly tests might provide formative feedback, but they can prioritise working to tight time constraints, and alternatively week-long assignments or longer exams prioritise endurance. The transparency and communication of opportunities for accessible assessment on all courses and programs of study are essential.

Humboldt (1767–1835) understood the student journey through the university as one of self-cultivation and cultural maturation (bildung). This signals how learning and assessment can be connected beyond a single course and provide an active sense of belonging to the university, while strengthening wellbeing, motivation, retention, completion and sensitivity to cultural inclusion. This journey begins both before entrance to the university and lasts as a lifelong engagement, as visualised below with assessment points (Dobson, 2013).

Another way of conceptualising student agency is through looking at their study as a journey of self-development through their time at University. While students take many individual courses, through those courses they connect the content together and develop an active sense of belonging. Their journey also strengthens their wellbeing, motivation, retention, completion and sensitivity to cultural inclusion, as they self-cultivate and mature over their course of study (bildung). This journey begins both before entrance to the university and lasts as a lifelong engagement, as visualised below with assessment points.
Figure 2: Student Journey

High School → University Entrance or Portfolio Assessment or Interview → Course (feedback and single grade) Minors and majors (feedback, grades, transition to higher levels) Program (final GPA) → Graduate Attributes Employability Skills Lifelong Learning

*Bildung* is built upon a foundation of the student actively learning and being assessed on their knowledge and skills, but it also refers to the learning and assessment of more intangible attitudes and values and what is commonly referred to as 21st Century softer skills, such as critical thinking, creativity, team work, cultural and social understanding. As such, the student defining their journey through the university (*bildung*) can be understood “as what remains after we have forgotten everything we have learnt.” - Ellen Key (cited in Steinsholt and Dobson, 2011).

This conception of students being inter-connected people on a journey to build both their discipline knowledge as well as less specific soft-skills, such as those found in the Graduate Attributes for the University, should inform educators decisions about assessment design, alongside other considerations such as discipline specific knowledge and skills.

Knowledge, skills, attitudes and values – how can they be assessed in and between disciplines?

The historical division of university knowledge into disciplines has led to assessment traditions, which might be similar or slightly different to those in related disciplines. For example, in the science disciplines assessment tends to be weighted towards inquiry–based calculations, while in creative subject areas the assessment of performance and design is not about calculations, but about the holistic look and feel of learning outputs as they are developed. Professional knowledge in the discipline might be aligned to and draw upon an assessment of traditional disciplinary knowledge, but by its very definition, its assessment seeks to meet standards as defined by external professional accrediting bodies, commonly through forms of work integrated learning (like internships/practicum). Of course, some programs of study will be a mix of disciplinary, performance-based and professional knowledge and accordingly, the weighting given to the assessment of each of these component parts will vary. Moreover, a common theme across all these different kinds of knowledge is that they include and are informed by attitudes and values to differing degrees. These may or may not be the subject of direct assessment. Once again this will reflect assessment traditions and the attitudes and values which are largely taken for granted, and the degree to which they can and should be made visible and assessed.
Solving wicked problems with interdisciplinary problem-based or inquiry-based skills and knowledge has been around for some time (Huutoniemi, 2016). More recently we find tertiary level courses teaching students interdisciplinary skills and knowledge, such as synergy and integration of disciplinary knowledge through innovation or design challenges. As much interdisciplinary learning is taught as a group endeavour, the starting point is often to consider assessing the process as much as the product and the soft skills associated with the culture of group work (Oliveira, et. Al., 2019). A tension exists between making assessment judgments of the group and its individual members, including how to make holistic (phronesis) as opposed to itemized and atomised judgements with clearly defined rubrics (Aristotle, 1981). Assessors need to balance knowledge and experience of making assessments in individual disciplines with the need to bring these together to make holistic judgments. Those skilled in these kinds of holistic assessment are known as connoisseurs and they can be summed up by the adage ‘, I cannot speak easily of quality, but I know it when I see it.’ (Eisner, 1999; Nichols and Dobson, 2018). Moreover, students entering university with International Baccalaureate for example, possess experience of integrating two or more sciences in their investigative project.

What is the connection between pedagogies and assessment?

Assessment must be considered not just in the context of the discipline, but also in the context of how the learning is conceptualised. It is a way for both the teacher and the student to understand the progress towards meeting the learning goals of the course or programme. A number of learning theories have informed educational developments over the years and shaped the way educators approach assessment. Each have quite different characteristics underpinning them for example:

- Behaviourism; which preferences the overt observable actions as the more reliable way of measuring learning. This approach led to educators writing hundreds of objectives to provide the specificity against which assessment would take place.
- Social learning theory/connectivism; considers learning to be the result of an interaction between cognitive and personal influences as well as external influences (e.g. group activity in tutorials/group assessments).
- Cognitive theories of information processing and constructivism; cognitive theories put the focus on learning and assessment as an active process of knowledge construction. Information processing models rely heavily on trying to explain how memory works. Overall, constructivism represents cognition as a collaborative process (Rogoff 1998) involving social processes, interactions with the environment, and self-reflection.

Many of the early theories such as behaviourism tried to explain learning in terms of mechanical actions by breaking it down into manageable chunks with a pre-determined understanding of the outcomes for students. However, as we now know not everything can be broken down into measurable items, taught in a similar way and result in the same assessed outcomes for all learners.

These early theories provide an important foundation for understanding assessment today. However, more contemporary theories are also helpful, such as integrated-holism, “a part of complexity theory that recognises the variety of factors that influence learning and which cannot be separated from each other without losing a grasp of the whole” (Walbran 2007). This approach makes it possible to take into account learning factors within the learning situation both before and after the learning situation, such as culture, access to resources and technology, socio-economic background. However, the key point of holism is a way of understanding the students learning as a whole, not as a broken-down set of items around a set of discrete objectives.
How might curriculum design(s) affect assessment practices and student agency?

Several curriculum models have been promoted over the years. These range from learning objectives models based on a sequential approach of setting objectives in courses, to more dynamic interactive models where knowledge, skills and pedagogies bridge courses or programs.

Highly prescriptive learning objective models are less responsive to incorporating new material as it becomes available and useful in the curriculum. Cyclical or ‘spiral’ models tend to not only embrace the changing nature of knowledge but also recognise the interdependency of each stage of curriculum development by revisiting knowledge in courses at more advanced levels. Capstone courses may be used to draw knowledge and skills together so as to provide an “aha” epiphany experience. Self-designed are programmes ‘designed’ by the student (e.g. out of micro-credentials) across a wide, flat range of worldwide options (future oriented). From a Matāuranga Māori perspective, programs understanding ākonga (the student) is always inter-connected with four pō:

a) He tangata; as a holistic person taking responsibility for their journey (bildung) through the program and university,
b) He puna kōrero; as a communicator of knowledge, skills, attitudes and value,
c) He uri whakaeke; as a descendent with a history and knowledge and connections to whanau, iwi, community and place and,
d) He ākonga; the student as a learner who also acts as a teacher (e.g. in group works with other students).

Badging provides a way of recognising small, discrete pieces of work and attributes a ‘badge’ or similar digital artefact to students. This is an emerging way to provide a feedback strategy to guide the process of learning. This can feasibly sit alongside existing recognition of achievement; such as grades, GPA, and degrees. They can also provide a different way recognising the kind of curriculum that has been selected and followed by the student, in that a cyclical model might best be recognised with a Bachelor degree, while a selection self-designed by the student might be more easily recognised through a collection of badges. The creation and gradual increase in the use of badging allows for a level of individual recognition for students that traditionally credentialing systems have not been able to provide.

Assessment

The choice of assessment is usually made on a number of different factors, including those discussed above (factors of student agency, knowledge/skills being taught, pedagogies used, design of the curriculum), as well as learning from previous experience, custom and practice in the discipline and an understanding of any inherent biases from assessment practice during their own study. The educator has to rely on their understanding of these influences (while balancing manageable for tutors, markers and students) to determine the best form of assessment to use, which varies by course, cohort and even by individual student.

Considerations of how manageable assessment tasks will be, in terms of both completion time for students and marking time for staff, are a very genuine concern which can limit the possibilities of assessment. This includes issues of scalability for assessments and marking, that allow for some forms of assessment that function better in small class sizes and become untenable for large class sizes.
sizes. Assessment technology will, in future, involve increased use of technology and digital marking, and some forms of assessment may become easier to achieve as a result of this.

Current Practice

Our current Assessment Handbook focuses mainly on the rules and regulations of how and what can be assessed within a course. It does however include sections on assessment theory (the purpose and principles sections). In an analysis of the current handbook, a number of key assessment and learning and teaching areas were identified along with their inter-connections to other areas.

Figure 2: Diagram of content in Assessment Handbook

As discussed above in the section on student agency, different assessment tasks naturally privilege certain types of knowledge and certain types of students. In a few cases, this privilege may be a necessary part of the topic – for example an assessment that privileges presentation skills might be essential for a presentation-focused discipline such as performance arts – but for the majority of subjects and courses, having a variety of tasks allows for students with different backgrounds and skill sets display their knowledge effectively to allow accuracy in feedback for formative assessment and accuracy in judgement for summative assessment. A strength of the current Assessment Handbook is the wide range of assessment types that could be used.

Such variety is also beneficial for students with disabilities. Several forms of assessment, notably 3-hour exams and tests, create significant barriers for these students and can act more as tests of endurance and support services than of the skills and knowledge developed in the course. Having variety, or even choice, in assessment tasks can allow students to demonstrate their learning with less bias to the form that learning is presented to the assessor in. For example, having the variety of a traditional written assessment (for students strong in written communication) as well as an oral assessment (for students strong in spoken communication) as well as a visual essay (for students strong in visual communication) would allow this.
One of the goals of the assessment framework is to provide a foundation to help staff build their understanding of why we assess and guide good practice that fits with the learning and teaching context. This would be accompanied by regulations (the Assessment Handbook) and guidelines to provide a full set of resources for staff.

Course/programme/graduate level assessment

Current assessment practice is heavily focused on the idea of assessment within a course. A student’s achievement within a programme is the culmination of completing the course learning objectives of the component courses. To a lesser degree we integrate and interconnect the learning outcomes between courses, and formatively assess what lies across courses (majors/minors/degree). Therefore, the assessment framework should be applicable to the assessment of these broader skills and capabilities.

There is a tension between over-assessing and its opposite, and the need for students to have the opportunity to revisit the development of skills and knowledge throughout their university experience (bildung). Students need time and the opportunity to assimilate and accommodate new knowledge. This might also require academics developing their assessment skills in order to bridge the demands outlined above. Some programmes have a capstone course that goes some length towards this, requiring students to complete a piece of work that draws on knowledge they have gained throughout their other courses.

The framework should also address the question of how to assess work integrated learning of which there are many kinds. It can be attached to meeting a set of professional standards, assessing an experience with a pass or fail grade, or developing an industry output (for example, a Law student proposing a law change, or an ICT engineer developing a game). There is an emerging interest in documenting experience, performance or outputs through an ePortfolio, which has a use beyond the student’s time at the university. The ePortfolio can potentially be a mix of formative process and summative outcomes.

As graduates of Victoria University of Wellington, students should take with them authentic assessment and learning experiences that have prepared them for a contribution to society and the world of work, with knowledge, skills and experiences they can immediately develop and apply upon graduation.

What is the changing role of Exams?

A common form of assessment across the University is the use of examinations, which have been a traditional form of assessment in higher education for a long time. There has been considerable debate about the purpose, definition and how we undertake exams in different programmes across the university. This has mirrored the considerable global debate about these issues.

A scan of the data related to the use of exams at this university shows only a slight decline in the emphasis on examinations at undergraduate level from 39% of courses having exams in 2015 to 33% in 2019. The spread across 100, 200 and 300 level courses reveal the greatest decrease at 300 level from 52% to just 39%, whereas the exams at 100 level have decreased by only 4% and 200 level by 2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Courses with Exams</th>
<th>Overall Level</th>
<th>100 Level</th>
<th>200 Level</th>
<th>300 Level</th>
<th>Postgraduate Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 T1&amp;2 Avg</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 T1&amp;2 Avg</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The current Assessment Handbook requires examinations to be worth at least 30% of the course grade, centrally timetabled during the examination period at the end of each trimester and either 2 or 3 hours in duration. Pragmatically, this creates many tensions in the ability to provide meaningful feedback to students and puts pressure on staff to grade exams in time for the next trimester.

Along with the small reduction in the use of exams, there has been a small shift - approximately 3% - towards 2-hour exams (from 3 hours) over the past 3 years. Tests (as distinct from exams) on the other hand, are managed by the school, take place within the teaching period and no single test can be worth more than 50% of the course grade. This rules-based approach to categorising types of assessment may be at the expense of thinking about the alignment between learning objectives and assessment and the appropriateness of the pedagogy chosen. It is also possible that this may inadvertently contribute to situations of over-assessment, which increases pressure on academic and administrative staff and students.

Several arguments are regularly made in favour of examinations. This includes noting how they discourage/identify cases of cheating and how they assist in ranking students for scholarships. However, as Marshall (2019) points out “examinations (as opposed to tests) are generally recognised as lacking authenticity as a form of assessment for learning objectives other than the recall of declarative knowledge in examination conditions”. Various authors have also criticised examinations as providing an artificial environment lacking in authenticity. As a consequence, students are limited in their ability to demonstrate the wide range of capabilities required of graduates who go into employment. There have been significant advances in proctoring software to mitigate some of these challenges, however it needs to be kept in mind that not all students have the same digital connectivity.

Whilst there may be situations where external influences (e.g. accreditation requirements) or where there is a particular need to identify mastery of certain types of knowledge (e.g. where there may be safety concerns), the case is not strong to preference examinations over formative feedback and learning and the use of alternative forms of assessed outputs such as essays, projects or oral individual or group presentations, particularly in 100 level papers. Even in relation to the detection of cheating at first year, Marshall suggests that students in first year who cheat are just as likely to experience problems with achievement later in their studies. It is more important that formative feedback be used during that time to create self-directed learners for the future in a context of ethically informed practice. Research also indicates that the grades have greatest effect on the future directed learning and thinking of students, when they are released with a time lag after students have received commented feedback (Butler, 1986).

With the global move to include more assessment for learning (formative assessment) and assessment as learning, there has been a trend to decrease the role of examinations at the end of a period of study. This has, in some instances, led to an increase in the use of tests for formative and summative purposes within courses. Reducing the emphasis on exams, particularly at 100 level, could be accompanied by a shift to emphasise first year as foundational to learning basic discipline skills and understandings, and academic conventions and integrity, as outlined in the Programme and Course Design Handbook. Retaining exams at 200 and 300 level would mitigate concerns regarding the maintenance of standards and potential dishonest practices.
Digital assessment

The use of digital technology has become a central thought in considerations of assessment. Staff and students have had to quickly increase their familiarity with digital/technological forms of assessment. As we continue into the future it remains a question how much we should continue to utilise digital technology in assessment, and if it should be required, encouraged, or avoided.

Making sound judgements about assessment can involve digital technology. The best perspective to hold on this is to recognise that digital assessment is a tool that allows for more options in assessment. There are numerous possibilities that digital technology can allow, but they are only options that should be considered by educators. The existence of digital assessments does not mean that an all-or-nothing approach to adoption of them is required. The options that technology allows need to be factored into the judgements made about assessment at the University.

From a resilience perspective, being able to use digital technology for assessment allows for increased resilience in our assessment practices, when used alongside non-digital technologies as well. In the context around Covid-19, on-campus delivery was severely effected and should such a situation arise again, we need to be able to utilise digital technology in all learning and teaching (and assessment). However, a resilient university will also be able to quickly adapt to a situation where the opposite occurs – imagine some kind of cyber-disaster that renders the internet unusable for a period of time – and be able to operate its learning and teaching and assessment with a minimum of digital technology. This means it is vital for all forms of assessment (including digital) to be available in the repertoire of academics, to allow for flexibility to adapt to all foreseeable situations.

In order to be responsive and future-proofed to changes in assessment, it is essential that a research informed evidence base is generated and maintained concerning assessment (and learning and teaching) within the university. This will draw upon but be separate to the current collection of data and the more applied work undertaken by CAD. Many universities have a dedicated academic unit embedded within faculties, dedicated to higher education research.

How might we enhance the foundations of our assessment framework?

In order to make robust decisions on assessment for, of, and as learning, it is essential that staff are equipped and skilled in the judgements required in assessment and how this responds to changes in teaching, learning and research. As well as clarity around its purpose, the design and practice of making judgements is often based on a set of principles aligned to teaching and learning pedagogies, curriculum design, student agency and knowledge skills, values and attitudes.

The Assessment Handbook currently lists six key principles for assessment. These are validity, reliability, fairness and inclusivity, contribution to learning, manageability and transparency.

The publication *Assessment and feedback in higher education conducted by the Australian Council for Educational Research for the Higher Education Academy (2017)* is a meta-synthesis of 650 papers, *books and chapters and summarises the fundamental principles of assessment in the following groups:*

- Assessment for learning; The notion that Learning and assessment should not be separated (HEA 2016a, p.19) with assessment for learning having been an increasing trend over the last 20 years resulting in a reduction in the heavy reliance of examinations and greater emphasis on consistent and timely feedback to assist student learn more efficiently and effectively (Richardson and Healy 2013).
• Aligned and fit for purpose assessment; where constructive alignment, at the programme level, exists where learning outcomes, curriculum, teaching and learning strategies and assessment are all aligned. (Biggs and Tang 2011; Boud and Falchikov 2006). Fit for purpose assessment being when the assessment tasks themselves are valid, relevant and authentic.

• Collaborative construction of standards; where staff and students engage in an on-going dialogue about standards to understand what is required from, and entailed in, the assessment process. It recognised that the establishing standards in an inexact process of professional judgements requiring constant review.

• Integrating assessment literacy with learning; developing the students’ assessment literacy i.e. an understanding of the purpose and process of assessment so they can accurately judge their own work. This supports the use of transparent and fair processes. Assessments should not disadvantage particular groups of students e.g. gender, socio-economic status, ethnicity. Self-reflection and peer assessment tasks are useful ways of achieving improved literacy. The assessment literacy of academics also needs to be developed.

• Defensibility of professional judgements; Despite all best attempts there will be variability throughout the assessment process (setting the task to marking). Such ‘biases’ can be addressed to a large degree through a peer review scrutiny as well as collaborative marking, random checking and consensus moderation discussions. Bloxham, Hughes and Adie, 2016 suggest that “the process of moderation with a focus on community building has been shown to add to assessors’ assessment literacy as well as knowledge of standards” (p.648).

• The limits of assessment; recognises that no assessment is exact. No number of standards or learning outcomes can compensate for the complexity of learning.

A scan of the principles of other universities around the world identifies similar characteristics, grouped in different ways. Common principles are those of validity, fairness/equality, and transparency. Others frequently mentioned were reliability, manageability and sustainability.

Our existing principles could be enhanced to create the main foundational principles of an assessment framework for the university. These could be ‘woven’ with statements regarding the clarity of purpose i.e. assessment as, for and of learning to complete the framework. The principles could include:

• Fitness for purpose; constructive alignment exists, at the programme level where learning outcomes, curriculum, teaching and learning strategies and assessment are all aligned. Fit for purpose assessment exists when the assessment tasks themselves are valid, reliable and authentic.

• Inclusivity, Fairness and Equity, Accessibility; Assessment and feedback are equitable and inclusive of all learners enabling them to take ownership of their learning and to demonstrate, to the best of their ability, their achievement of learning outcomes, and take account of reasonable adjustments for individual students where appropriate.

• Transparency; Students and teachers can see that there is an explicit and logical relationship between assessment tasks, the criteria used as the basis of assessment judgements, and the grades associated with different standards of performance. Information about assessment processes (such as moderation and grading) is transparent and plainly communicated to students.
- Sustainability (including Manageability); Assessment and feedback promote deep learning, building learners’ capability for self-evaluation and independent and lifelong learning. A programme level assessment design carefully balances student and staff workload within and across teaching periods and within the context of the discipline and/or the profession. The amount of assessed work per point is consistent within and across courses. Assessment is manageable for students to complete and for staff to assess within the timeframe of the relevant teaching period and is timed to maximize opportunities for feedback to enhance learning.

The framework would then link with other documents (such as guidance on how to choose assessments within context, and regulations related to assessment practice e.g. grading and dealing with special circumstances.)

Figure 3: Weave design of foundational principles with practice

**Additional questions**

1. What resources would be useful/necessary to implement and support the assessment framework?

2. What are the implications of viewing 100 level courses as foundational for the curriculum and degree structures?

3. What support would be needed to achieve a significant decrease in the use of exams in 100 level courses?
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SUBJECT       Implementation Plan and Report from the Academic programme review of Programmes in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies (LALS)

The programmes in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies (LALS) were reviewed in October 2019 and the School has finalised its response to the review panel’s report in the form of an implementation plan.

The report made five commendations of good practice, which included the strong professional and collegial community between the programmes, as well as significant engagement across the university and outreach into communities.

The review also made 10 recommendations for improvement, which have been accepted and actions have begun to implement them. Some recommendations were made in relation to the School and University context in which the programmes sit (e.g. relating to facilities and university strategic priorities) and are less actionable at a programme level. Advice from the Academic Board on the direct programme-related recommendations is being sought.

Recommendations

That the Academic Board:

1. Receive: the report and implementation plan for the academic programme review of the programmes in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies.

2. Advise: the Pro Vice-Chancellor and Dean on any academic matters arising from the review.
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Report Completed 5 March 2020
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Summary of Commendations

The Panel wishes to note that the context of this review is ‘making the great better’, and that its commendations are only samples of the excellent baseline of practice in the Programmes.

The Panel would like to commend the programmes in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies for:

**Commendation 1:**
The great richness in the combination of programmes within the School, which successfully connect activities that are different in flavour across the School, and between different levels (for example, between English Language Institute and Academic Researchers).

**Commendation 2:**
The exploration and initiative to pursue collaborations outside the School.

**Commendation 3:**
Initiating and following good practice which has resulted in a fantastic, productive and collegial culture for staff and thesis students in the School.

**Commendation 4:**
The School should be recognised for excellence in research and teaching and its contribution to the national and international reputation of the University.

**Commendation 5:**
The strong community outreach carried out in programmes within the School.
Summary of Recommendations

The Panel wishes to note that the context of this review is ‘making the great better’, and that its recommendations and critique should in no way diminish the quality of the School.

The Panel recommends the following areas for improvement in the programmes:

**Recommendation 1:**
Build and maintain the corpora (data sets) of international significance in the School. In the view of The Panel this must include at least the New Zealand Sign Language Dictionary, and the Language in Workplace project.

*The Panel also made a suggestion linked to recommendation 1, please see this in the text below.*

**Recommendation 2:**
Maintain and enhance reputation, including through the quality of facilities used for research and teaching, to match the high quality of teaching.

**Recommendation 3:**
Undertake planning to ensure that staffing matters, including any new hires and replacements of retiring staff, are aligned to a strategy and direction for the Programme(s) and School.

**Recommendation 4:**
Plan opportunities for course and content review, including full participation of those involved, which includes tutors, senior staff, junior or new staff, as well as students.

*The Panel also made a suggestion linked to recommendation 4, please see this in the text below.*

**Recommendation 5:**
Provide opportunities for professional staff to learn University systems that academics are required to use, in order for them to then efficiently support academic staff in their use of those systems.

**Recommendation 6:**
The School takes action to help its staff understand and be aware of the situation within and beyond the School. This includes, for example, how the School is placed regarding budgeting, workload, how the School compares to others, and the strategic direction of LALS.

**Recommendation 7:**
Introduce a transparent and workable mechanism for measuring workload, including postgraduate supervision, and ensure that it is shared within the School.

**Recommendation 8 (University):**
That the University looks for how it can appropriately incentivise its strategic directions, such as high proportions of international students, for Schools to follow.

**Recommendation 9:**
Incentivise activities related to the University’s strategic goals in a transparent and consistent manner across the Faculty.
Recommendation 10a:
That the School and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences work to improve the new Communication qualifications by including more Linguistics and Applied Linguistics courses within them.

Recommendation 10b:
Engage with students in ALIN/TESOL to understand their interests and academic needs. In particular, ensure that the relationship of theory to practice is clarified for postgraduates in the TESOL programme.

Recommendation 10c:
Support the flagship New Zealand Sign Language programme through dedicated support for the programme’s resources and for NZSL staff to access professional development activities and to engage with the University more broadly.

Recommendation 10d:
Investigate opportunities for creating a dedicated student support position in the Writing programme potentially with a Māori or Pasifika focus.

Recommendation 10e:
Continue to maintain and explore new connections between Writing and other programmes in the University, including a closer link to student support services to ensure that students receive the right support from the right place.
Scope of Review

The Panel has understood that this academic programme review covers all of the offerings in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies (LALS), including several qualifications and all courses taught by the programme that contribute to those qualifications. This includes:

- The subjects in the School offered in the Bachelor of Arts:
  - The Linguistics (LING) major
  - The Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) major
  - The New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL) minor
  - The Academic and Professional Writing (WRIT) courses
- The subjects in the School offered in the Bachelor of Arts (Honours)
- The Certificate in Deaf Studies: Teaching New Zealand Sign Language
- The Graduate Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
- The subjects in the School offered in the Master of Arts:
  - Linguistics (LING)
  - Applied Linguistics (ALIN)
  - Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
  - Second Language Learning and Teaching (SLLT)
- The supervision of PhD study by staff within the School

The Panel notes that other work of the School that was formally outside of the scope of this review was sometimes considered during the review process. This includes the pre-degree English Proficiency Programme (EPP) run out of the English Language Institute housed in the School. The Panel may make some comments on such offerings, but only where it believes that provides relevant context to the areas under review.

Review Procedure

Self-Review

In accordance with the University’s Academic Reviews and Monitoring Policy, the staff of the Linguistics and Applied Language Studies programmes prepared a self-review document. The self-review exercise is designed to involve qualitative reflection by those responsible for an academic programme on issues covered by the terms of reference, including the design, delivery and evaluation of the programmes, how the programmes develop a sense of academic community, how they engage with Māori and Pasifika students and content, and how programmes engage with stakeholders outside the University.

These issues are set within the context of the strategic directions of the School, Faculty and University. The information gathered as part of the self-review process was presented to the Panel in advance of their visit to the University and also included a student profile and staff profile, as well as a reflection on the current challenges and future directions of the programmes.

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 Programme. A total of 159 students participated in the survey which covered students in all parts of the School’s programmes, including both undergraduate and postgraduate students.
Students meeting with the Panel

In accordance with the Programme review process, VUWSA organised for separate groups of students to meet with the review Panel. One undergraduate student met the Panel in one meeting, six masters-level students met the Panel in a second meeting, and six Doctoral students met the Panel in a third meeting.

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, including emeritus staff members of the School. A total of three written submissions were received.

Oral Submissions

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

- The Vice-Provost Academic
- The Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Associate Dean (Academic Programmes) of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
- The Executive Officer to the Assistant Vice-Chancellor Pasifika
- The Assistant Vice-chancellor Mātauranga Māori
- The Head of School and Deputy Head of School for the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies
- The Programme Director(s) and staff in the New Zealand Sign Language Programme
- The Programme Director(s) and staff in the Linguistics Programme
- The Programme Directors and staff in the TESOL and Applied Linguistics Programmes
- The Academic and Professional staff in the Writing Programme
- Staff in the English Language Institute
- Professors in the School
- Academic Staff who were appointed recently to the School
- Professional staff running the administrative parts of the School
- Students, as described above in Student Input into the Review
The Panel’s Findings

Preamble

This report has been structured by the Panel in a way that it hopes will be most effective for making clear how its observations and recommendations should be acted upon at different levels of the organisation – from the central University, to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, to the School as a whole, and down to the level of each academic programme.

To begin with, the Panel would like to note that a very common theme in the feedback given to the Panel was that the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies is high performing. Submissions to the Panel from staff across the University were almost unanimous in first highlighting that the School is performing well in its Learning, Teaching and Research activity. The Panel will make its own commendations on more specific parts of the programmes, but wishes to note that the context of this review is ‘make the great better’, and that its recommendations and critique should in no way diminish the quality of the School.

Another frequent observation of the Panel was that much of the activity of programmes in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies is aligned to the strategies and goals of the University, including (but not limited to) areas such as international student recruitment, taught postgraduate offerings, and ‘non-standard’ revenue generation (e.g. from commercial activity). The recommendations and suggestions from the Panel are made in the hope they may assist the School in increasing their recognition and scope of activity, which is already considerable.

Theme 1: Maintain and Enhance

This theme relates to the following terms of reference:
Delivery and Assessment, Evaluation and Quality, Stakeholder Engagement

As stated above in the preamble, the School is a high-performing group of programmes, and the Panel would like to commend the programmes not only for this high standard of teaching and research, but for the successful combination of these disciplines into something which is ‘greater than the sum of its parts’. The connections between the different areas of the School (which include for example, cross-disciplinary teaching and research links and connections between staff and students across education levels), are generating valuable outcomes and a sense of community.

Commendation 1:

The great richness in the combination of programmes within the School, which successfully connect activities that are different in flavour across the School, and between different levels (for example, between English Language Institute and Academic Researchers).

Equity goals within the University are understood by the Panel to have a strong focus on attracting, supporting and retaining Māori and Pasifika students, and improving the academic success of students in these cohorts. The Panel believe that, while not explicit, this also extends to Deaf students in order to realise the strategic desire for equitable outcomes for all1. The Panel was also informed that the University also has a goal to greatly increase its proportion of international students to 25% of the total cohort by the year 2025, and believe

---

1 Victoria University of Wellington - Strategic Plan 2020-2024
that achieving this goal would require increased academic and pastoral support for these international students.

In light of these objectives, the Panel advises the following:

- That there should be a clear and productive relationship between Student Learning Support and the Writing programme in the School. These two groups both contribute to the equity goal of the University through providing support for students, with for-credit courses offered by the Writing programme and more general non-credit support provided by Student Learning. These groups need to be able to work together in providing the right support to the right students.
- That the potential of offering WRIT courses at different levels or for different cohorts of students be considered. For example, this could be for students at the postgraduate level, or for students in the Faculty of Education. The Panel imagines this could be done by way of elective courses that could be taken in many (or all) Masters degrees. An important outcome of this would be the publicity/promotion of the University as a destination/place that genuinely recognises and promotes international student success, through recognising and valuing developing their writing skills.

Staffing is another issue in the smaller programmes within the School (Writing and NZSL) that will affect the ongoing viability of these programmes. Both of these programmes need to have some succession planning in place, and in the case of the Writing programme, consideration needs to be given to the contract implications of Senior Tutors working within the programme. These staff have recently been placed on permanent part-time positions, but are currently ‘topped up’ with fixed-term contracts when there are additional courses/streams being run. The Panel advises that these senior tutors could also play a greater role in programme meetings and the selection/improvement of course materials within the writing programme. At the present time there seems to be an under-utilisation of the resource these Senior Tutors represent - both have PhDs and have been teaching in the programme for a significant period of time.

There may also be a possibility of exploring offering teaching fellowships for Māori and Pasifika scholars to work in the WRIT program supporting Māori and Pasifika students. The Panel will discuss this position in the section specifically on the Writing programme later in this report (see recommendation 10d and supporting text).

There are several flagship corpora (or data sets) that have been established within the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, which are of high national and international significance. The University’s reputation, as well as that of the School, is closely tied to these collections. They include, but are not limited to, the New Zealand Sign Language Dictionary, the Wellington corpora data, and the Language in Workplace project. The Panel notes that equivalent digital datasets in other countries are housed in national libraries and university repositories, making them visible and accessible and giving them longevity.

These collections should be resourced to allow for archiving and ongoing development. This will ensure that they can continue to be accessed by researchers – both international and local, as well as remaining accessible into the future. The Panel suggests that the School and the University investigate possible resourcing options. One possibility may be to seek further funding from external organisations. This may not be a viable approach but it is worth investigating.
The Panel recommends:

**Recommendation 1:**
Build and maintain the corpora (data sets) of international significance in the School. In the view of The Panel this must include at least the New Zealand Sign Language Dictionary, and the Language in Workplace project.

**Suggestion 1a:**
Explore options of working with relevant external organisations, like the National Library of New Zealand, to support ongoing archiving and development of these data sets.

The facilities available to students in the Linguistics and Applied Language Studies programmes do not match the quality of the learning and teaching experiences they engage in. This is particularly true for postgraduate students. The cramped conditions and poorly maintained physical environments witnessed by the Panel are likely to have an impact on student recruitment (both local and international).

**Recommendation 2:**
Maintain and enhance reputation, including through the quality of facilities used for research and teaching, to match the high quality of teaching.

A significant concern of staff from several programmes in the School when talking to the Panel was the upcoming retirement of several staff. The Panel will comment briefly on this in relation to the programmes specifically later in this report, but the Panel recommends at a high level the School develop a succession plan with the goal of setting out what knowledge and special expertise will be needed in the future, and of determining how replacement appointments can help the School realise that goal.

**Recommendation 3:**
Undertake planning to ensure that staffing matters, including any new hires and replacements of retiring staff, are aligned to a strategy and direction for the Programme(s) and School.

It is the Panel’s view that the way that curricula review of programmes within the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies occurs could be improved. Later in this report the Panel discusses programme-specific recommendations, but at a broad School-wide level, the Panel believe the School’s collegial culture could expand further in the curricula development space.

All staff involved in the teaching programmes within the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies should, in the Panel’s view, be able to contribute their perspectives to the range of courses offered and the progression or scaffolding between courses. Submissions to the Panel indicated that this course prioritisation does not always seem to be as inclusive as the other strong aspects of community in the School. For instance, when the Panel looked at some third-year courses offered, there seemed to be a lack of content relating to the research expertise of newer staff, and suggests that more rotation on two-year cycles might allow for this. All of the programmes need to ensure there is sufficient opportunity for staff to have a chance to teach in an area they are focused on.

**Recommendation 4:**
Plan opportunities for course and content review, including full participation of those involved, which includes tutors, senior staff, junior or new staff, as well as students.
The Panel has some suggestions for the School and the Faculty/University on creating additional interdisciplinary opportunities, but initially wants to note that parts of the School have been active already in pursuing interdisciplinary offerings for students, and in working with colleagues in other parts of the University in the research and supervision areas. The Panel commends the existing activity in this area. One example is the writing programme which has pursued several options in this area, such as the writing for engineering course.

**Commendation 2:**
The exploration and initiative to pursue collaborations outside the School.

The Panel suggests that when course reviews next take place, there should be a strong focus on considering any interdisciplinary opportunities for the programmes and courses in the School. The Panel further notes that this kind of discussion needs to happen at University and Faculty level as well, in order to ensure support is provided to facilitate these relationships.

**Suggestion 4a:**
Integrate exploration of interdisciplinary opportunities into future curriculum review activity.

Professional Staff expressed to the Panel that the School would benefit if training for the systems used by the University (including, but not limited to, technology solutions) could be provided to professional staff as well as academics. This will allow any academic staff who were absent, or otherwise not confident with such systems, to be supported and (re)trained by the professional staff, and also support their own development.

**Recommendation 5:**
Provide opportunities for professional staff to learn University systems that academics are required to use, in order for them to then efficiently support academic staff in their use of those systems.

**Theme 2: Transparency and Misalignment**

*This theme relates to the following terms of reference: Evaluation and Quality, Programme’s Community*

The culture and collegiality within the School, extending across the academic and professional staff as well as to the postgraduate students, is outstanding. The overall impression of the Panel was that this community is very positive, and some of the examples that the Panel saw included:

- NZSL learning is encouraged for staff in the School.
- Regular and frequent informal social events are open to and attended by the entire School, including students.
- A seminar series open to staff and postgraduate students across the School.
- Many staff stated to the Panel that the School was a great place to work, where people respect each other and their work.
- A strong practice of celebrating the achievements of students

A such, the Panel would like to formally commend the School for this collegial culture.

**Commendation 3:**
Initiating and following good practice which has resulted in a fantastic, productive and collegial culture for staff and thesis students in the School.
The School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies has a number of outstanding areas where it could usefully advise the University (or relevant parts of the University, including other schools and central units) on successful approaches. This includes its delivery of distance education, experience in having a large international cohort of students (particularly the cohort taking the MA in TESOL), and the NZSL programme’s community engagement (including but not restricted to the Deaf community).

However, the efforts of the School to maintain its high standards in research, teaching and service, as well as its collegial culture, may be hindered by an apparent lack of transparency at the level of the School, Faculty, and at the University. For example,

- the School appears to be required to work with a somewhat “dynamic” budget where the allocation of funding to the School is not always predictable and consistent. For example, funding formulae (including the deductions made from external earnings) can be changed from one year to the next.
- at the Faculty level, funding allocated and the share of the resources from earnings determined at Faculty level is often not clear to the School. This included a lack of knowledge regarding:
  - the accounting system reducing incentives for growth, such as how money from offshore students isn’t allocated until November, but then may be taken back into central finance in December. Longer budget cycles provide more incentive for growth in different areas.
  - arguments for staff positions not taking into account that a substantial portion of the School’s income comes from non-degree sources, including offshore students and in contract with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
- Workload across schools in the Faculty is not understood by staff in these programmes, who are not aware of the conditions their colleagues in other parts of the Faculty are experiencing.
- at the School level one frequently mentioned issue was the lack of an agreed upon tool or mechanism for measuring workload. The School has previously had a workload measurement “tool”.
- Also at the School level, the Panel observed that not all staff are seemingly engaged in strategic decision making for the School.

**Recommendation 6:**

The School takes action to help its staff understand and be aware of the situation within and beyond the School. This includes, for example, how the School is placed regarding budgeting, workload, how the School compares to others, and the strategic direction of LALS.

An essential part of increasing transparency in the School will be through the adoption of a workload indicating tool. Such a tool will not perfectly record any staff member’s workload, but would provide some transparency that can be used to compare workload with peers and with their own work over time. It is also vital for ensuring workload allocation, particularly equity of class sizes and PhD supervision loads. It can also be used with a view to distributing resources such as tutor assistance or other contracting/marking. In the experience of the Panel members, such a model introduced at a Faculty level also allows for comparability across the Faculty.
Recommendation 7:
Introduce a transparent and workable mechanism for measuring workload, including postgraduate supervision, and ensure that it is shared within the School.

Theme 3: Incentives

This theme relates to the following terms of reference:
Evaluation and Quality

The staff in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies are recognised internationally for producing high-quality research and graduates. The Panel would like to commend the staff of the School for this commitment to research and supervision quality.

Commendation 4:
The School should be recognised for excellence in research and teaching and its contribution to the national and international reputation of the University.

The School also has an active presence outside the University, including both for commercial activity (discussed later in this section) as well as its commitment to community engagement. This includes a strong community thread that is core to the New Zealand Sign Language programme, but also extends to the Language in the Workplace project, as well as activity within the English Language Institute. The Panel commends the School for its existing community activity and encourages the programmes and the University to continue this.

Commendation 5:
The strong community outreach carried out in programmes within the School.

As noted in the preamble to this report, the Panel has heard from a number of sources that the School and its programmes are successful in many areas of strategic priority for the University – in terms of international student recruitment, alternative revenue streams, and distance delivery. This means the School has been somewhat on the “front line” of these initiatives and the Panel wishes to reflect back to the University what it has learnt during this review; that the incentives (or lack of them) offered by the University do not align sufficiently with its priorities in some areas.

The international students coming into the programmes in LALS, at undergraduate and particularly at postgraduate level, are supervised by high quality researchers, but do not enjoy similarly high quality facilities. This is compounded by a perception by some staff that the University does not compensate the School at a rate which adequately covers the cost of postgraduate teaching and supervision.

This misalignment between the stated aim of the University (to recruit and attract many international students) and the reality faced by the School and experienced by its students suggests that the University needs to look at how it rewards or otherwise incentivises this School, and others, to pursue strategic objectives.

Recommendation 8 (University):
That the University looks for how it can appropriately incentivise its strategic directions, such as high proportions of international students, for Schools to follow.

Based on the submissions it has received, the Panel wishes to report that the School does not perceive any benefit to itself for the large portion of international students it regularly attracts. This lack of perceived incentive is a barrier to further growth within the School. The Panel wishes to note in particular that this perception must be overcome in all programmes
across the University, not just within the programmes under review, if the goal for international student numbers is to be achieved. All programmes are likely to achieve higher international student numbers if they are properly incentivised to do so.

The Panel advises that the allocation of international student fees (as a benefit to the University) should be made transparent across the Faculty and University, so that the benefits of this provision are clear and programmes can benchmark their student numbers and revenue against other programmes. Likewise, the demanding international PhD student supervision load carried by staff should be both reflected in workload calculations and in appropriate financial benefit to the department where the supervision is undertaken.

**Recommendation 9:**
Incentivise activities related to the University’s strategic goals in a transparent and consistent manner across the Faculty.

*Also see Recommendation 7 above regarding measuring workload.*

The School also undertakes work that sits outside traditional academic activities. The panel will broadly refer to this as commercial activity – which includes work with government departments and/or ministries and work that generates non-research and/or non-student funding.

While falling slightly outside the terms of reference for this review, there is a perception within the School that this activity is insufficiently recognised as a benefit due to the revenue largely being appropriated by the University. The Panel heard that the School feels it could be better compensated for the time and effort this important work involves.

The Panel’s advice is that revenue from such initiatives should visibly return to School. In a broad sense, the University should support/enable those initiatives that lead to commercial engagement. As an example, the Panel heard that the School is obliged to pay increased levies to the international recruitment arm of the University even when it recruits students through its own contacts and programmes. Where staff are recruiting their own postgraduate students, there should be clear value to the School in doing so and the revenue associated with those students should be weighted towards the School.

**Areas at Programme Level**

These areas, collectively, relate to the following terms of reference: Design, Delivery and Assessment, Evaluation and Quality, Māori, Pasifika

Having covered the high-level issues, the Panel wishes to acknowledge that whilst it discusses each programme individually below, the fact that this review covered the whole School has meant that there are limitations to what the Panel has had time to look into in detail. The Panel will note below places where it has clearly recognised this, and suggest where further investigation may be needed.

**LING - Linguistics**

The overall impression of the Panel is that the student experience in the Linguistics programme is very positive. The Panel received written and verbal submissions from a number of students across the levels of the programme (i.e. 100-level through to PhD), who were all very satisfied with the linguistics offerings.

The Panel understands that the curriculum of the undergraduate linguistics programme was reviewed relatively recently, and the first graduates of the new system are only just completing their majors this year. The Linguistics programme currently has a system of course
rotation at higher levels, which the Panel thinks is an excellent method for ensuring variation in topics for students, for managing workload, and for enabling staff to teach a topic clearly linked to their area of research.

As such, there are no areas in need of “fixing” in the programme, and the Panel instead advises that an important goal for the Linguistics programme is how to grow undergraduate student numbers, in line with the University’s growth strategy. The Panel believes that, in the current context, the best approach to realising this goal will be to ensure that courses in linguistics are also made available to be taken as part of other majors wherever possible.

For this reason, the Panel suggests that the Linguistics programme, and the School as a whole, look to be more strongly included in new initiatives. One example may be the recently developed Bachelor of Communication and Master of Communication. Based on the understanding of the Panel during their visit to the University, it thinks that a version of the Linguistics major may be suitable (and welcomed) into the Bachelor of Communication; that Linguistics and Applied Linguistics courses could possibly form part of the Intercultural communication major (in the Bachelor of Communication); and that the discipline could also contribute to the Master of Communication. The Panel feels it is important and relevant for LALS to include its courses in the Communication degrees. This would not preclude other activity to increase undergraduate student numbers.

The Programme could also consider allowing one or two courses in Te Reo Māori or Samoan Language to count as part of the Linguistics major. This would expand options for students in the major and possibly encourage more Māori or Samoan or Pasifika students to link study in the School with their cultural language.

**Recommendation 10a:**

That the School and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences work to improve the new Communication qualifications by including more Linguistics and Applied Linguistics courses within them.

The taught MA in Linguistics is, in the Panel’s view, attracting a small number of students to a range of courses. The current offerings provide the minimum number of courses required to offer the qualification, but class sizes are still as small as 3 to 6 students in a class. Whilst this allows for incredibly high-quality teaching of small groups, the Panel does not believe it is sustainable.

The Panel suggests that one way to address this would be broaden the Linguistics Masters to include some Applied Linguistics courses as electives, and to consider how much of the research methods courses (or sections of those courses) could be co-taught. If appropriate, this could allow for both programmes to slightly reduce their teaching hours, and still provide student with preparation for further courses.

In relation to the workload issue raised earlier in this report (see recommendation 7), the Panel also suggests that small courses such as those in the Linguistics MA should be appropriately weighted in workload calculations compared to the larger postgraduate courses taught in other parts of the School.

**ALIN – Applied Linguistics and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages**

The undergraduate TESOL major in the Bachelor of arts appears to the panel to be a lean offering, that is making good use of expertise across the School by building content and knowledge from the first year 100-level linguistics courses.

There is some complexity in the two masters subjects in this programme (i.e. Applied Linguistics MA and TESOL MA). This was most visible to the Panel in the way in which the fairly
large student cohort is split, which leads to some variation in the student experience for each group. Students may take:

- subjects available across ALIN or TESOL
- in either distance or on campus modes of delivery
- across the three intake points across each year (each trimester).

The first challenge the Panel identified for this programme was in the differentiation between the ALIN and TESOL postgraduate programmes.

The Panel was only able to meet with a limited number of Postgraduate students from the Applied Linguistics and TESOL programmes. However the Panel did hear from some students (particularly international students) that there is a desire to include more practical content within the TESOL programme. The student views expressed to the Panel were that there is too much focus on the theory behind teaching. While the Panel understands that Master’s level courses need to address theory in a serious way, it would be useful for the programme to address this apparent mismatch in expectations directly. By fully engaging with the student cohort, the programme can both understand its assumptions and needs, and also guide student expectations.

**Recommendation 10b:**

Engage with students in ALIN/TESOL to understand their interests and academic needs. In particular, ensure that the relationship of theory to practice is clarified for postgraduates in the TESOL programme.

The Panel also advises that while it understands that able students at Victoria University of Wellington are able to progress to a PhD from the MA in TESOL, this is always not true at other institutions, who may require a research-specific piece of work (such as a 30-point or greater research project) for entry into the PhD. The Panel therefore suggests that students wishing to undertake a PhD in future be recommended to maximise the research-based project work component of their Master’s programme. If this cannot be done on a case-by-case basis, it may be necessary to consider other measures to ensure students can complete material that will enable them to undertake a PhD in other institutions.

The Panel notes that for some staff the number of PhD supervisions is high, in comparison to their understanding of normal PhD supervisions in other faculties and other universities. As mentioned earlier in this report, PhD supervision is not measured as part of workload by means of a transparent and workable measurement tool, and thus there is a significant impact on workload for those who carry a high supervision load, especially if the students are second language speakers of English.
NZSL – New Zealand Sign Language

It is the Panel’s view that the University should be very proud of its New Zealand Sign Language programme and that it is recognised as the country’s leading centre of teaching and research in the language. The programme is also playing a vital role in the deaf community, through the education of NZSL teachers as well as the undergraduate NZSL minor which helps increase the number of people in the non-deaf population able to communicate with the deaf community. This kind of nationally important engagement with community is clearly emblematic of the University’s strategic desire for engagement that deepens relevance, impact and reputation, and achieving equitable outcomes for all.

The teaching programme is sustained by three academic staff members, the most senior of whom has retired since the Panel visit. The Panel heard the concerns of the Programme and School regarding replacing this position. The concern is that the ideal replacement candidate would be deaf, would be an active academic researcher and have the ability to lead the programme into the future. These are all quite narrow criteria, and additional difficulty is added by the current financial situation of the University and the ability to appoint replacement staff. Unfortunately, the Panel has no advice that it thinks can address the concerns expressed, but agrees with the programme’s concerns.

The Panel does wish to emphasise that the NZSL programme is performing as a flagship programme teaching one of the national languages of New Zealand, and as such deserves greater recognition, promotion and support from the University.

The University could support the work of the programme through providing a fixed and ongoing commitment to supporting the maintenance and updating of learning materials, including (but not limited to) the NZSL online dictionary. The programme should also receive greater support for its staff to access faculty meetings, University events and functions, as the Panel has heard that if staff wish to attend events such as these, there is no formal policy, procedure or budget for providing this and it must be done on an ad-hoc basis. This creates a significant barrier (financially and culturally) to engagement in the broader University community by NZSL staff and in their professional skills development as academics.

Recommendation 10c:
Support the flagship New Zealand Sign Language programme through dedicated support for the programme’s resources and for NZSL staff to access professional development activities and to engage with the University more broadly.

WRIT - Writing

The Writing Programme functions differently to “traditional” academic programmes in the Faculty and University. It has a different target audience, including many international students, minority students and first-in-family tertiary students. The teaching of writing also requires considerable time on task for students, and ongoing and frequent feedback from tutors. Thus a different style of teaching is provided by this programme, compared to the weekly lectures common in other programmes. This brings its own set of challenges and priorities that differ from other programmes in the School.

---
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Because the programme serves as an entry point for many students, who are developing their writing skills (at both undergraduate and postgraduate level), the programme often deals with students who are more likely to need other University support services.

The Panel advises that there is a possibility for the programme and University to embed support within the WRIT programme. This may be especially useful for Māori and Pasifika students. This additional support may be in the form of personal one-to-one or small group arrangements provided by teaching staff, tutors, or the introduction of additional staff such as a PhD student with a specific contract to provide extra support for students. The Panel believes that such a PhD role, if filled by a Māori and/or Pasifika student, could provide a role-model for those groups of students and potentially provide targeted support as well.

**Recommendation 10d:**

Investigate opportunities for creating a dedicated student support position in the Writing programme potentially with a Māori or Pasifika focus.

The Panel has also considered the possibility of more linkages between the Writing Programme and other programmes at the University as well as other parts of the University that offer writing support. The programme has been reasonably active in the past on exploring catered writing courses with other programmes, and while these have not always led to consistent courses in the long term, the Panel believes this kind of activity should continue, perhaps pitched at a faculty-wide level (such as exists with Engineering) to provide a broader base of students who may take the course(s). Other possibilities for provision to targeted cohorts were discussed, for example covering groups within the Faculty of Education.

It is also the Panel’s view that there needs to be a clear interaction between the Writing courses and the services provided by Student Learning Support, to ensure that their services are complementary, and that each promotes the other to students.

**Recommendation 10e:**

Continue to maintain and explore new connections between Writing and other programmes in the University, including a closer link to student support services to ensure that students receive the right support from the right place.

It is also the understanding of the Panel that the University does not currently have dedicated “professional teaching” positions – such as those that exist in the Language Institute, that recognise the expertise of the teaching staff and the special nature of the teaching.

While the University is investigating how it can provide teaching focused positions, the Panel suggests that the Writing programme should aim to adopt the teaching focused ELI model for relevant teaching staff in the WRIT programme, if it is better suited than the current senior tutor arrangement.

**Miscellaneous:**

Reflecting on insights from the review, the Panel has identified the difficulty faced by a very busy and high-achieving workforce to work collaboratively on challenges outside of their own particular contexts. The University can further support the breaking down of the silos within which academic experts work and actively foster interdisciplinary collaboration, by ensuring transparency of budgets, consistency between its goals and the incentives provided to academics and departments, and reducing replication of activity where it occurs.
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Recommendations

The School wishes to note that the Review and recommendations were produced in the pre-COVID-19 environment, while we are formulating our responses and action plans given the impact this has had on all University activities. We have therefore tried to acknowledge the constraints of the new environment in the implementation details section by giving longer timelines for implementation and recognising the high level of uncertainty currently about implementing recommendations that require funding at the School, Faculty or University level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Build and maintain the corpora (data sets) of international significance in the School. In the view of The Panel this must include at least the New Zealand Sign Language Dictionary, and the Language in Workplace project</td>
<td><em>Accepted.</em> As the Panel notes, the corpora in the School, particularly the New Zealand Sign Language Dictionary (NZSLD) and the Language in the Workplace Project (LWP), are of high international significance and are very important to the research profile of the School and University. We have long sought a stable basis for funding needed for 'business as usual' activities related to these corpora. These include physical and digital archiving as well as ongoing storage (paper, audio and video recordings, transcriptions, coding and analysis); occupancy costs for each research team and research assistants; costs for everyday operations such as database and output management, response to requests for information, website updating and maintenance; a contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No. | Recommendation | Response
--- | --- | ---
| | towards transcription to ensure the rich corpus is fit for research purposes. Preferably, this would be one dedicated staff member for each corpus (NZSLD and LWP) in addition to research costs. Staff involved with both corpora are active in seeking external funding to support building and maintenance of these corpora, including a multi-University CORE bid which has been shortlisted for funding in the 2020 round, and two Marsden applications this year (one each for NZSLD and LWP). However, preferably both corpora would have a stable basis for funding day-to-day activities and long-term archiving, including input from the University, e.g. through the Library and ITS. (Note that the programme review in 2012 also recommended support for the Language in the Workplace Project which has not happened to date). We note that there are other corpora in the School, including the New Zealand Dictionary Centre (NZDC) and New Zealand Spoken English Database (NZSED) for which input from the Library and ITS is needed so that these are stored on secure servers and made accessible to a wider range of researchers.
2. | Maintain and enhance reputation, including through the quality of facilities used for research and teaching, to match the high quality of teaching. | Accepted. We agree with the Panel’s assessment that teaching and learning spaces, and postgraduate student offices, often do not match reasonable expectations of being fit-for-purpose and of sufficient quality. This issue is also acute for the English Language Institute (ELI), who need dedicated teaching spaces given the intensive language instruction in their programmes involving non-standard teaching hours and terms. This affects the attractiveness of their programmes to external funders.

LALS is committed to providing the best teaching and learning spaces and postgraduate offices it can within the very limited University confines, and in the face of rising occupancy costs and pressures to reduce space usage. It is important for the cohesion of our School that the staff and postgraduate thesis students of LALS remain in close proximity to each other. Currently, this is achieved as much as possible through spaces on the same levels of Von Zedlitz as well as in the neighbouring buildings on Kelburn Parade.

LALS has regularly petitioned the SLT for better teaching spaces. The ELI has been requesting dedicated teaching spaces conducive to intensive language instruction since 2006, and has regularly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raised issues such as cold air making some classrooms unusable on Level 1, Kirk, and faulty computers in 24KP. In terms of research spaces, the University does not currently have extra spaces available for research centres to further enhance our research reputation. However, we make use of shared spaces (such as the LALS meeting rooms), and the continued access to shared spaces within LALS will be of essential importance to maintaining group research collaboration. We are currently planning an application for Capex funding for an eye-tracker (see further below).</td>
<td>3. Undertake planning to ensure that staffing matters, including any new hires and replacements of retiring staff, are aligned to a strategy and direction for the Programme(s) and School. Accepted. While we believe this is part of our current practice, we agree that this is something we need to plan carefully given upcoming retirements of several staff, and the highly constrained current financial situation and its impact on hiring. This issue is particularly pressing for the NZSL programme, as one of their two senior staff retired last year. While it is difficult to plan new hires in the current COVID-19 financial situation, NZSL Studies will require replacement hire for the programme to remain viable and sustainable. Ability to recruit and retain replacement Deaf staff is dependent on implementation of recommendation 10c (ii) below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan opportunities for course and content review, including full participation of those involved, which includes tutors, senior staff, junior or new staff, as well as students. Accepted. In our view, these are activities we should always be doing, and believe we are doing, so we have no problem accepting this. In all programmes, student feedback is sought regularly on all courses, and courses are reviewed annually by all staff. There are student representatives on the School's Teaching, Learning and Equity Committee. The Panel praised the practice in Linguistics of rotating courses on a 2-year cycle at 300- and 400-level to allow all staff to offer higher level courses in their specialist area. This is also the practice for selected courses in the MA ALIN/TESOL programme. We will continue these practices, and the use of special topics, to allow for staff to teach to their specializations, where such specializations can be accommodated and are relevant to ensuring the overall learning outcomes of each programme are met.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide opportunities for professional staff to learn University systems that academics are required to use, in order for them to then efficiently support academic Accepted. The professional staff team supports academic staff with multiple systems around administration of courses, including Banner/Blackboard/Cognos/Course Outlines/My Allocator/Room Bookings/Student Records/Squiz/Talis/Elements and others. The team are</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff in their use of those systems.</td>
<td>willing and capable of learning/training in other systems if academic staff need assistance and it helps to reduce their administrative burden. Ongoing training needs are managed by the School Manager and as part of the PDCP process. We will look to improve academic staff awareness of which systems professional staff have training in, and to ensure that academic staff know they can request that professional staff be trained in systems if that would be useful for their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The School takes action to help its staff understand and be aware of the situation within and beyond the School. This includes, for example, how the School is placed regarding budgeting, workload, how the School compares to others, and the strategic direction of LALS.</td>
<td>Accepted. The School prides itself on its open and collegial culture, which was commented on by the Panel. Therefore, we are happy to take further steps to ensure that all staff understand and are involved in School strategic planning and budgeting to the extent possible. The Head of School will work with staff across the School to find ways to ensure all staff can be involved in strategic planning and budgeting, including informal avenues such as the daily School morning teas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Introduce a transparent and workable mechanism for measuring workload, including postgraduate supervision, and ensure that it is shared within the School.</td>
<td>Accepted. There was previously a workload calculator in the School, which has not been used for some years. Staff are broadly supportive of reintroducing a more transparent mechanism for measuring and allocating workload, while recognising that it is a complex task to ensure that this adequately accounts for the varied modes of teaching and research supervision across the School. We will work to develop a workload calculation mechanism, drawing on existing models including those used in other Schools. We recognise that this needs to account for (at least) different teaching modes (on-campus and by distance), course student numbers, time to introduce new courses or substantially revised courses, different roles of tutors and course coordinators in different courses, and research supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>That the University looks for how it can appropriately incentivise its strategic directions, such as high proportions of international students, for Schools to follow.</td>
<td>Accepted. This recommendation is directed to the University, and is related to issues that the School has been raising with Faculty management and the SLT for some time. The School has long performed very well in relation to two of the University’s strategic goals of increasing the number of research and taught postgraduate students, and international students, particularly from the Asia-Pacific region. We have a large and strong PhD programme, and taught postgraduate programmes, which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consistently attract quality international applicants. Moreover, the English Language Institute is an integral part of the School, with its longstanding international reputation for high quality research-led English language teaching.

However, there are several financial disincentives to continuing to grow student numbers: occupancy costs continue to rise, including for PhD office space; many funding allocations are done on a staff:student ratio basis, which penalises higher PhD loads for staff; the University scholarship scheme is not increasing funding at the same rate as PhD applications are rising, meaning very high quality applicants sometimes do not get scholarships. The recent decision for Wellington University International to apply a 5% fee to cover agent fees affects Schools with higher numbers of international students more, such as ours, and further overlooks the very significant role that staff within our School play in recruiting these students.

9. Incentivise activities related to the University’s strategic goals in a transparent and consistent manner across the Faculty.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | Accepted. Disincentives to growing international students were discussed in the response to recommendation 8. The School is also successful in attracting commercial revenue for strategic projects, particularly through the ELI. However, we are disincentivised to grow this revenue as it is subject to the standard contribution rate even when the commercial centre has already ‘contributed’ centrally. The School has consistently raised with Faculty and SLT the unfairness of this.

   Given our success with our internationalisation endeavours, LALS, especially the ELI, has received a massive hit during COVID-19. While we are doing everything we can to minimise the effects, we are especially concerned at the moment and hope that LALS will not be penalised by our success with the University’s internationalisation strategy. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

10a. That the School and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences work to improve the new Communication qualifications by including more Linguistics and Applied Linguistics courses within them.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | Accepted. Applied Linguistics/TESOL and Linguistics staff have already been in discussions with the Associate Dean (Academic Programmes) and Communication staff about TESOL and Linguistics courses which may be suitable for inclusion in the Bachelor of Communication (BC) degree. We will continue these discussions, to try to identify ways of including these courses which will strengthen the BC, while maintaining the integrity of the current TESOL and Linguistics majors.

   We note that it is not possible, given University regulations, for the Linguistics major to be different inside the BC and BA, and that we have limited capacity to offer courses exclusively for the BC. We |
| 10b. | Engage with students in ALIN/TESOL to understand their interests and academic needs. In particular, ensure that the relationship of theory to practice is clarified for postgraduates in the TESOL programme. | also note this recommendation needs to be enacted in cooperation with the Communication programme. |
| 10c. | Support the flagship New Zealand Sign Language programme through dedicated support for the programme’s resources and for NZSL staff to access professional development activities and to engage with the University more broadly. | Accepted. This recommendation is related to the MA ALIN/TESOL programmes. As the Panel notes, the balance between theory and practice is noted to be difficult to find in many international ALIN/TESOL programmes. Our approach is explained in all our courses. We will survey students to further understand their needs, and work to make clearer connections between theory and practice. |
| 10d. | Investigate opportunities for creating a dedicated student support position in the Writing programme potentially with a Māori or Pasifika focus. | Accepted. This recommendation addresses two distinct aims: (i) improving IT support for the online learning and research platforms managed by DSRU (which entails either improved VUW infrastructure capacity in support of digital learning, or securing funding to contract external support, which is an ongoing, largely successful, pursuit for DSRU; see response to Recommendation 1); (ii) accessibility provisions which support equal employment opportunities for Deaf staff members. This should align with University-wide employment policy. |
| 10e. | Continue to maintain and explore new connections between Writing and other programmes in the University, including a closer link to student support services to ensure that students receive the right support from the right place. | Accepted. We will pursue the possibility of securing a suitable applicant for this role, preferably Māori or Pasifika, within two years. We will consult with Āwhina and Pasifika Student Success about this role. |

*Accepted.*
Implementation details

Recommendation 1: Corpora

**Responsibility:** School Research Director (Prof Paul Warren), Programme Director NZSL (A/Prof Rachel McKee) and Director of the LWP (Prof Meredith Marra)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Research funding applications to support ongoing development, maintenance and interrogation of NZSL and LWP corpora are in progress, including a multi-University CORE bid and two Marsden applications.</td>
<td>Applications in progress. Results November 2020</td>
<td>Not in LALS’ control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) We will continue to request input from the University centre, including the Library and ITS for support with digital archiving and maintenance of NZSL, LWP and other corpora held in the School, and funding for basic costs. The LWP met with the Vice Provost (Research) in late 2019, who indicated such support aligns with the University’s new research funding strategy. While we recognise that such commitments may be difficult in the current circumstances, we look forward to some long-awaited investment by the University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 2: Facilities

**Responsibility:** HoS (A/Prof Peter Gu), ELI Director (Dr Angela Joe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The School will continue to request improvements to teaching and learning spaces, and better quality spaces for postgraduate students. We recognise that such capital expenditure projects are likely to be very constrained in the current environment, but we hope that such essential improvement projects are still given priority when possible.</td>
<td>Not in LALS’ control</td>
<td>July 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The School is planning to submit a capital expenditure bid for a dedicated eye-tracking facility. Eye-tracking is an extremely useful method in psycholinguistic and applied linguistic studies, and has become a standard technique. This would be beneficial for the research of a range of staff members, and is regularly asked for in PhD student applications (including students who choose not to come to Victoria because we do not have this equipment). We had hoped to put this proposal in this year, but recognise this may not now be possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 3: Staffing

**Responsibility:** HoS (A/Prof Peter Gu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
(1) Review of staffing requirements for NZSL Studies and application via the usual VUW workplace planning processes for a replacement hire of an NZSL Studies lecturer.
(2) HoS to meet with Programme Directors of all programmes to discuss strategy and direction in relation to staffing needs given known upcoming retirements, and develop a staffing plan, to be followed by applications as required via the usual VUW workplace planning processes.

**Recommendation 4: Course review**

**Responsibility:** Programme Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) Involving all staff in course and content review, and getting student input, as part of current practice and as happens annually in all programmes.  
(2) Examples of use of Special Topic slots used to cater for staff interests (including recent hires) at 300 level and at MA level are:  
   i. TSOL303 (Language and Creativity);  
   ii. LALS516 (English for Academic Purposes);  
   iii. LALS518 (Formulaic Language: Acquisition, Processing and Use).  
(3) In Linguistics, in conjunction with CAD, we will undertake 'exit surveys' of some of the first cohorts of students completing the redesigned undergraduate major, by the end of 2021. | Ongoing | Completed |
| | | October 2021 |

**Recommendation 5: Professional staff development**

**Responsibility:** School Manager (Bernie Hambleton), Learning, Teaching and Equity Director (Dr Corinne Seals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The School Manager will work with the Learning, Teaching and Equity Director to establish a procedure, such as a directory, to make academic staff better aware of University systems professional staff have training in.</td>
<td>November 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 6: School position awareness**

**Responsibility:** HoS (A/Prof Peter Gu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The HoS has re-established a School ‘Advisory Panel’ which meets regularly to support the HoS in strategic and budgetary planning for the School. This consists of the HoS, DHoS, the Professors in the School and the ELI Director.</td>
<td>Completed-ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7-8
Recently, the current and former HoSs have dedicated more time in the monthly School meetings, attended by all permanent staff, to discussion of the School budget and strategic planning matters.

Recommendation 7: Workload measurement mechanism

Responsibility: HoS (A/Prof Peter Gu), DHoS (Dr Sasha Calhoun)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The HoS and DHoS will establish a working group including members from the different programmes in the School, to develop a workload calculation mechanism, which will be discussed and refined with the whole School before being implemented. The working group will consult with the Faculty on models used in other Schools.</td>
<td>Working group report by November 2020. Implementation of model in 2021.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 8: Incentivisation-international students

Responsibility: HoS (to raise with WUI/SLT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This recommendation is directed to the University. We will continue to raise these issues with Faculty and University management, although we recognise that the situation in relation to international students is uncertain in the current environment.</td>
<td>Not in LALS’ control.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 9: Incentivisation-University strategic goals

Responsibility: HoS (to raise with SLT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This recommendation is directed to the University. We will continue to raise these issues with Faculty and University management.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 10a: Inclusion in Communication programme

Responsibility: TESOL Programme Director (Dr Jean Parkinson), Linguistics Programme Director (Dr Sasha Calhoun).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date</th>
<th>Actual completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have identified courses in Linguistics and TESOL which may be suitable for inclusion in the BC including LING 101 (Language and Communication), TSOL 203 (Text and cultural context), and TSOL 303 (Language and creativity). We will continue discussion with Communications programme</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
directors about whether and how these could be included in the BC programme. A further course currently under design in conjunction with the Programme director for Intercultural Communication is ICOM202 (Intercultural Communication in Global Contexts). We will consult further with the Programme director for Intercultural Communication about this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 10b: ALIN/TESOL student need analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility:</strong> MA ALIN/TESOL Programme Director (A/Prof Jonathan Newton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will carry out a survey of MA students’ needs and interests. We will survey past students and use an exit survey with completing students, as well as consulting with a focus group of volunteer students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 10c: NZSL support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility:</strong> Programme Director NZSL (A/Prof Rachel McKee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NZSL Programme Director will continue to work with University management, including the VP (Academic) to discuss equal employment opportunities issues for deaf staff, including through the University’s new Equity, Diversity and Inclusion framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 10d: WRIT student support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility:</strong> Writing Programme Director (Dr Derek Wallace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will pursue the possibility of securing a suitable applicant for this role, preferably Māori or Pasifika, within two years (although we recognise this may be delayed due to the current financial situation). We will consult with Awhina and Pasifika Student Success about this role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 10e: WRIT programme connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility:</strong> Writing Programme Director (Dr Derek Wallace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Subject to gaining the necessary wider institutional support, we will propose the establishment of a 300-level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
course in Advanced Academic Writing suitable for potential post-graduate students in all Faculties across the University. We will meet with Student Learning to clarify our relationship and respective roles.

| December 2020 |
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>
Welcome to new members

The apologies received were taken as read; no further apologies were given. Professor Guilford said farewell to Professor Ian Ball noting his last day is 31 July. Taylah Shuker and Max Salmond were welcomed from VUWSA. Taylah as acting VUWSA President and Max, VUWSA’s Education Officer, will be attending Academic Board in the space of Academic Vice President. Taylah Shuker said she was thankful for the opportunity to contribute and was looking forward to working with Academic Board members.

Part B of the agenda

Item 9, the minutes of the 23 June meeting, were moved from Part B to Part A of the agenda. When the item was addressed the member withdrew the request as the issues were with the Part C minutes that were on Part C agenda already to discuss.

Part C of the agenda

It was resolved that non-members be excluded from this meeting for consideration of item AB20/29 and Part C minutes.

Oral report from the Vice-Chancellor

Professor Guilford noted the following points:

- **Trimester Two:** Staff were thanked for their efforts in offering Trimester Two courses in dual mode, both in face to face and online course delivery. It was recognised that this has been a great deal of work but has resulted in large numbers of students returning to campus.

- **Enrolments:** Trimester Two domestic enrolments are strong with a 43% increase from this time last year, bringing numbers close to 2019-year end figures. Enrolments are still short of the budget as they don’t meet the forecasted growth. International enrolments are lower compared to this point last year and look likely to remain that way as the borders are still closed. Indications from the Government are that international student access will be restricted until Trimester One 2021 so there will be pipeline effects. There is a proposal, supported by local government, currently at the Minister’s office suggesting Victoria University of Wellington lead a pilot to charter and quarantine international students. Visa changes will also impact international students as work rights will not be the same.

- **Financial impact:** Forecasting for the year end budget is underway, all faculties and CSU’s met targets to reduce budgets resulting in the deficit dropping from an initial $30-40 million to approximately $19 million. Whilst lower than last year the international student numbers have been better than originally forecast at the start of
COVID-19 as many remained studying online. Similarly, accommodation has seen better utilization than was forecast in the worst-case scenario.

In response to a question regarding the breakdown of students studying at Undergraduate or Postgraduate level, Professor Guilford explained that the student cohort average is slightly older and is partly driven by returning New Zealanders. A large proportion of the students are interested in postgraduate study and upskilling.

43.20 Oral report from the Provost

Professor Larner provided an update noting the following points:

- **Promotion Applications**: the request from members for a further extension of the promotion application date was considered; however, the initial date will remain as any further extension would have flow on effects.
- **Non-degree teaching entity**: a case is going to Council next week for a stand-alone entity. The requirement for this initiative is further supported by the demand for upskilling discussed above.
- **Academic Pathways**: there is a steering group meeting tomorrow to discuss the next tranche of documentation. This has involved developing Q and A's from the feedback provided to date.

A question was raised asking whether next year’s promotion round would consider impacts of the extra work required to offer dual delivery courses and the effects of supporting calls to take leave. In response Professor Larner noted that she hadn’t considered next year’s round at this point. The impacts of COVID-19 were national and not institutional and presented different challenges within a variety of spaces. The impacts on research and education are uneven, and a big determiner was access to childcare. The University will be looking at these questions.

Professor Guilford explained that the University was still trying to evaluate the financial impacts of COVID-19 and there was a chance that there may not be a promotion round in 2021. Costs would need to be considered as student numbers for 2021 were unknown.

In response, a member asked whether that meant that financial options would be presented again, and if new ideas could be considered such as the sale of art. Professor Guilford acknowledged that all financial options would be revisited; noting that there was a modest uptake of voluntary measures; for instance, only 30 staff took up staff giving. He said the situation was fluid and dynamic and would depend on border openings and that measures taken to date had not resolved the situation.

44.20 Oral report from Tumu Ahurei (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Māori)

Professor Higgins began her report by wishing members a happy Matariki, noting that Matariki is a time to reflect on the past and look forward to the future.

Professor Higgins stated that further progress towards the Māori Strategic Outcomes framework (Mai I te Iho kit e pae) has been achieved this month and includes the following:

- **Enrolments**: Despite the COVID-19 pandemic, as at 17 July, Māori student enrolment numbers were at 1796 EFTS, which is up 44 EFTS since the last Academic Board meeting and 20 EFTS ahead in comparison to this time last year. We are just below our 2020 Māori student cohort target of 11.5% which is positive.
• **Māori Academic Staff:** have all settled into Trimester Two teaching. A development here includes the opportunity for design students to focus on the Living Pā in one of the design courses.

• **Nga Pae o Te Māramatanga:** next week Professor Higgins will be part of a team making a pitch to maintain Ngā Pae o Te Māramatanga as one of the country’s Centres of Research Excellence. Ngā Pae is the only Māori focused CoRE and our University and staff have been actively involved in its development. Professor Higgins currently sits on the Board, Te Kawa a Māui’s Head of School, Ocean Mercier, leads one of their research programmes and AVC (Mātauranga Māori) Meegan Hall leads their professional excellence programme. Together, they will be working to ensure that Māori research continues to be valued, supported and funded in the next round.

• **Scholarships:** since June Academic Board, we have invested $114,000 in the Taihonoa scholarships programme, which was match funded by our Taihonoa iwi and other Māori partners.

• **Living Pā:** a successful fundraising function was held last week. Timed to coincide with the arrival of Matariki, and presented by the Prime Minister’s Science Communicator of the Year and Alumnus Professor Rangi Matamua launching our augmented reality version of the Pā and videos of our Living Pā ambassadors.

• **Te Herenga Waka Resilience Programme:** there will be an article in the upcoming University News to update and acknowledge staff. To date 60% of deliverables have been achieved; acknowledgement was given to all staff that had contributed to this effort. The Futures Workstream 7 is currently holding staff sessions on wind-tunnelling themes and today’s Provost Forum topic will be focused on Workstream 2 - Research.

45.20 Oral report from the Vice-Provost (Academic)

Professor Brock noted the following points:

• **Dual mode courses:** Academic staff were thanked for their hard work in changing mode of delivery, assessment methods and services to students in Trimesters One and Two this year. The workload impacts have been enormous, and Professor Brock was grateful to both staff and students for the way this had been embraced and overall, the University did very well. Early analysis of Trimester One suggests that the changes to teaching methods were successful: students’ GPA was higher than Trimester One 2019 (5.6 v’s 4.9) and the pass rate was the same at 87% with less than 2% of grades still to come in.

• **CUAP:** all VUW programmes submitted to CUAP have been signed off by other universities and most have also been given final approval by the CUAP Chair. The only exceptions are the Master of Nursing Practice and Master/PGDip/PGCert Health Psychology and PGDip in Health Psychology Practice, which will be approved once accreditation by the relevant professional body has been confirmed.

• **Consultation:** proposed changes to Credit Transfer and RPL Policy to recognise micro-credentials and proposed change to Academic Programme Review Terms of Reference are currently out for consultation until 31 July. Comments should be forwarded to Ed Schofield in the Academic Office.

A member raised concern that students who undertook NCEA level 3 this year may be less prepared for University in 2021 and if so, how would the University prepare for this? Professor Brock commented that university entrance standards had changed in recognition of COVID-
and the University may well need to provide further enhanced support services. The Student Success Programme initiatives should be partly implemented by then which will help, but the University is focused on that issue.

There was a discussion about the tight turn-around time between the end of Trimesters One and Two and how the compacted marking time had impacted on workload, some staff working long days as there is limited budget to employ markers to assist. The question was asked whether there would be a delay in the end of year marking timeline. Professor Brock acknowledged the grade entry deadlines meant there were tight timeframes but the end of Trimester One dates had been extended as much as possible and further extensions would impact processes such as extensions, suspensions and aegrotats and the same considerations apply to Trimester Three. He said it would be optimal to think of academic provisions strategically over multiple trimesters and to consider other aspects as well as grade entry deadlines. When asked to elaborate specifically regarding the time between Trimesters Two and Three, considering there wasn’t as much of a requirement for prerequisites into Trimester Three courses, Professor Brock noted that there was no intention to extend the break between Trimester Two and Three as it is already short and students need that time, but he would reconsider if it was required.

46.20 Oral report from the Vice-Provost (Research)

Professor Hyland provided an update on the following points:

- **Faculty Strategic Research Funds:** we are transitioning from the University Research Funds to the Faculty Strategic Research Funds and then the University Strategic Research Fund. We have launched, or are launching, three rounds of the Faculty Strategic Research Funds: Wellington School of Business and Government have opened their round and it is closing on 7 August, Faculty of Education will open in August and close mid-September. The dates for the Faculty of Health are still to be finalised but are expected soon. Other Faculties are working on finalising processes and timing.

- **Open access repository:** this was made available from mid-April to address the challenge of research visibility and to make research publications available in an open domain. Since mid-April 411 items have been deposited into the repository and as of yesterday there were 29,858 views and 6,630 downloads. This is an excellent way to raise the visibility of research work as many of those views and downloads were international. It is easy to deposit the work via elements and there is support available, online and through the library. To support open access, we are developing a policy which will be going out for consultation.

- **Te Herenga Waka Carers Research Retreat:** funding has been approved for a pilot programme to run a research retreat for academics with significant carer responsibilities. The retreat will give these academics an opportunity to take time out from their every-day rhythm to focus on their research. This could include anything in the research stage including funding applications, project conceptualisation, background reading, and of course writing up research outputs. This will be run through the Research Office and the Centre for Academic Development (CAD). Contact Chris Dean in the Research Office for more information.

- **Returning Carers Research Grant:** This research scheme was launched earlier this year and is specifically for those staff who have had extended periods, or a number of smaller periods, of leave for caring responsibilities who may need some support to re-
ignite their research. There is more information available in the internal funding tab of the Research Funding page or talk to Hamish Clayton in the Research Office.

Professor Guilford noted at this point that the University will soon be in the resource consent process to demolish the Gordon Wilson flats and preserve the McLean flats. Consent has required consultation with neighbours and provision of a ten-year vision for the site. This will be a topic for public debate and building will not commence in the next few years.

47.20 Provost’s Forum: How can the University better support research activities into the future?

Professors Larner and Hyland introduced the forum noting that the demands on teaching and learning has meant that research may have taken a back seat. This topic is looking specifically at ways in which research was affected by COVID-19 and the ongoing global situation. Research Resilience is one of the strands of the Te Herenga Waka Resilience Programme. Overall the Research Resilience Workstream Two has three strands.

The first strand (a) is focusing on people: supporting and growing our postgraduate cohort, looking at the research career pathways and those particularly vulnerable as has been seen during COVID-19. The second strand (b), and the discussion today, looks at how research has been affected: the lack of international mobility, access to archives, not being able to network as usual, research dissemination and the like but also opportunities that have arisen due to COVID-19 from that. The third strand (c) is about resilient research processes and structures with an emphasis on streamlining and minimising time that academics spend on research administration. Matt Plummer, Susy Frankel, Dale Carnegie and Mirielle Consalvey run the second strand.

The aim of strand (b) of Workstream Two is to ensure that all research that has not been affected continues; acknowledging that some research has been disrupted and find ways to pivot or adapt to the challenges; and enable research by distance, trying to find new opportunities.

Matt Plummer and Mirielle Consalvey led the discussion explaining that this workstream is trying to capture the effects of COVID-19 and how we can support research activity into the future acknowledging that research will have to adapt to the new context.

Slides provided included a link to a two-minute survey for staff: bit.ly/vuwresearch.

Members were asked to contact the team with any thoughts.

External contracts: there are prolonged delays with Marsden funding and PhD scholarships that have been approved and offered to students who are unable to enter the country. A similar problem has arisen with international Master’s and PhD students and the consequential stall on projects, and delays with overseas grants in which the dates can be extend but not with additional funds. It was asked how the University treats unfunded extensions to grants over multiple years when the school budget runs for one year, and whether the University could put money aside to get teaching relief at the later date?

Professor Hyland said this may be a case of looking at what you can do differently now. Many agencies have been very flexible and open to changes in the research grant plans. Professor Guilford said he would prefer to know about these types of grants earlier and Professor Hyland
could collate the information on situations; particularly for PhD students or Postdoctoral researchers running out of stipend.

**Impact on sabbaticals**: the desire for certainty was expressed in regard to RSL next year and URF and what can academic staff bank on to help with planning. Also, there was a desire for the Research Office supporting academics with external organisation funding as some organisations, such as MBIE, are not supporting wages properly within the full cost funding model.

**Teaching workload**: budget cuts meant more teaching and marking for staff and less research; it is important this is acknowledged in the discussion. Additional comments included the inefficiencies of teaching over the period. Often the hardware wasn’t suitable and the reinvention of teaching, zoom meetings, drop in sessions with students and upskilling impacted on time.

Positive points included excellent international collaborations over zoom and efficiencies gained by zoom meetings rather than face to face.

A question was raised about the amount of research that has shifted to a remote format and whether that is by preference or necessity. In response, Professor Hyland said that data was not available. It is the inability to access international research facilities that remains a problem.

**Administrative burdens**: a member suggested that time could be saved if access to, and distribution of, research money was more streamlined and if staff had more freedom to use their funding to buy out more time; for instance, hiring postgraduate students for teaching. Other comments were made that processes are risk averse. Reducing the levels of approval would be beneficial as would be the reduction in reporting.

**Early career researchers**: various members felt that the impacts, and coping with the impacts, would have been more difficult for early career researchers who hadn’t built up networks. Opportunities overseas including prestigious invitations have had to be turned down and RSL stopped. Support and advice on the next steps and adaptation are important. Early career researchers would benefit from communications as soon as possible affirming they won’t be penalised for any delays in research and that the University understands and supports them if they haven’t met their research output goals. They will need extra time to redesign their goals and standards regarding promotion.

Professor Larner confirmed that she is trying to send out those exact messages and that Academic Board members could also assist to spread the word to early career colleagues that these aspects will certainly be considered in promotion rounds. Professor Guilford noted that *Your Voice* and the Futures work also highlight the need to de clog processes, structures and systems and that we will be continuing with this work in earnest later this year.

**Fieldwork**: staff in the Earth Sciences had found their fieldwork has been severely hampered. Considerations will have to be made for many staff wanting to continue their research in Trimester Three. It was noted that PhD research programmes have been delayed particularly in the sciences. They have been supported well by the Faculty of Graduate Research but some students have had to go home to see parents or may need to withdraw. Financial assistance will need to continue. Pam Thorburn stated that there were still funds in the Hardship fund.
available and there is opportunity there to look at initiatives. The University is looking at a tutor relief fund and there may be opportunities to support postgraduate researchers.

Reflecting on the comments regarding the two hardship funds, a member asked whether the normal hardship fund and the PhD hardship funds had different eligibility criteria. Professor Neil Dodgson explained that the PhD fund allows money to be paid towards fees and supports students on suspension who have no means of support or who can’t undertake research. Pam Thorburn added that application criteria has been relaxed and the grants are greater.

Humanities and Social Sciences staff have previously benefitted with the proximity to Archives and the National Library; however, there are cuts in reading room hours at Archives and disposal of tens of thousands of books by the National library which is impacting Postgraduate students and academics.

A member also suggested that a surprise benefit of this situation could be for the academic Academy, not just this institution, to look at the expectations of each other, and that this could be the time to influence how academics work.

48.20 Academic Programme Review

Head of School Janet Toland introduced the report and implementation plan for the academic programme review of the programmes in the School of Information Management. The review, undertaken in August, included both subject groups providing a synergy across the school. Professional, technical and academic staff were commended. All recommendations have been accepted except for two which are due to practicality. Opportunities for all undergraduate students to have an internship is not feasible and funding regarding the ICT graduate school is not under the control of the school. The school is working on ideas to extend Senior Tutors and contractors to assist teachers, strengthen research opportunities for staff, increasing flexibility in majors and minors and has completed a research plan. Grant thanked the school for a positive review.

There were no questions or comments.

49.20 General Academic Statute

Professor Brock introduced the proposal to establish a new General Academic Statute and re-organise other policy documents to align within the new policy framework. It was noted that there were new provisions including changes to the English language competence and provisional admission requirements, but mainly documents were relabelled. Professor Brock acknowledged the extensive work undertaken by Jenny Christie in the Academic Office and noted the proposal had been out for consultation for six months. Jenny explained that the proposal mainly included re-organisation of content and involved extensive consultation. It is hoped that this proposal will set up a framework to make it easier to manage ongoing changes to policy documents. There was one congratulatory comment from the floor, for the work done, and one member suggested inserting the word “serious” in the General Academic Statute s7.2.3 prior to “mistake”. The suggestion was noted for consideration.

The proposed General Academic Statute was endorsed for forwarding to Council for approval. The following new or relabelled policy documents were approved:
1. Admission and Enrolment Regulations
2. Credit Transfer and Recognition of Prior Learning Regulations
3. Academic Progress Regulations
4. Academic Dress Regulations
5. Graduation Procedures

The proposed repeal of the following documents was endorsed for forwarding to Council for approval:
1. Academic Dress Statute
2. Academic Quality Statute
3. Admission and Enrolment Statute
4. Graduation Statute
5. Qualifications Statute

The proposal to repeal the Fees Statute and replace it with a new Fees Policy approved by the Vice-Chancellor was noted.

50.20 CUAP Round Two Proposals

Three proposals were approved for submission to CUAP. The request for access to Student Allowances and the Student Loan Scheme for new programmes and associated double-degree programmes and the consequent amendments to the Qualifications Statute were approved.

1. MTchLrn-1 New Schedule of Courses for Master of Teaching and Learning including deletions. 
   Dobson/Guilford
2. BEd(Tchg)Ec-2 New Schedule of Courses for BEd (Teaching) ECE including deletions and removal of section in General requirements. 
   Dobson/Guilford
3. GradDipTch-1 New Schedule of Courses for GradDip (ECE, Primary and Secondary) including deletions and reduction of EFTS. 
   Dobson/Guilford

Professor Dobson introduced the following suite of qualifications, handing over to Associate Dean Andrea Milligan to provide detail. Andrea Milligan spoke to the proposals as a suite, explaining that they had been developed in response to new Teaching Council requirements. The proposals were a result of extensive co-design with students and the teaching community over the last 18 months. Pending approval, the programmes will be ready for implementation in 2021.

51.20 Part B of the agenda

No items having been brought forward —

1. Parts A and B of the minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 23 June 2020 (Nos. 26.20–35.20) were confirmed.
2. 2 non-CUAP proposals summarised in the Academic Committee report were approved; 
   AB20/27
3. the five proposals approved by the Academic Committee at its 30 June meeting were noted.
4. the other matters approved and discussed by the Committee at its 30 June meeting were noted.
5. the Graduate Nursing, Midwifery and Health programme implementation update report (completed) was received. AB20/ 28

G. Guilford

At 2.27pm, non-members left the meeting to allow members to discuss confidential items.

Part C

52.20 MEMBERS ONLY AB20/ 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute held due to reasons of confidentiality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Guilford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance
66 members attended; 10 non-members were in attendance; 20 apologies were received (refer to Appendix 1 for detailed record).

Signed: Professor Grant Guilford, Vice-Chancellor
Appendix 1: Academic Board attendance 21 July 2020

Members attending
Professor Grant Guilford, Convenor

66 Members present
Professor Siah Hwee Ang
Professor Richard Arnold
Professor Stuart Brock
Professor Gregor Coster
Associate Prof Urs Daellenbach
Professor Simon Davy
Professor Kevin Dew
Professor Stephen Dobson
Professor Neil Dodgson
Professor Douglas Easterly
Janet Fletcher
Associate Prof Nicholas Golledge
Associate Prof Peter Gu
Professor Grant Guilford
Professor Dave Harper
Professor Mark Hickford
Professor Rawinia Higgins
Dr Linda Hogg

Dr Michael Homer
Associate Prof Val Hooper
Professor Margaret Hyland
Professor Catherine Iorns
Laura Jackson
Professor Annemarie Jutel
Laura Kamau
Professor Simon Keller
Associate Prof Dean Knight
Professor Wendy Larner
Professor Antonio Lyons
Professor Simon Mackenzie
Dr Xavier Marquez
Professor Meredith Marra
Professor Lisa Marriott
Associate Prof Stephen Marshall
Dr Stuart Marshall
Professor Jim McAlloon
Professor Ehsan Mesbahi
Professor Miriam Meyerhoff

Professor Nicola Nelson
Elizabeth Olsen
Professor Emily Parker
Associate Prof Rebecca Priestley
Dr John Randal
Professor James Renwick
Kiana Ringrose Perez
Max Salmond
Professor Marc Aurel Schnabel
Taylah Shuker
Geoff Stahl
Ms Pam Thorburn
Dr Janet Toland
Professor John Townend
Marcus Tumaï
Professor Paul Warren
Professor Ian Williamson
Professor Marc Wilson
Professor Ulrich Zuelicke

Attending under s3.2 of the Standing Orders of the Academic Board: Advised Dugal McKinnon attending to represent Sally Jane Norman but sent in apology.

Attending under Academic Board Statute s4.1(xvii): Taylah Shuker acting VUWSA President and Max Salmond, VUWSA’s Education Officer attending as acting Academic Vice President.

Non-members in attendance
10 Non-members present
Sarah Boyd
Jenny Christie

Annemarie de Castro
Joseph Habgood
Cathy Powley
Edward Schofield
Claire Williams

Mireille Consalvey
Matt Plummer
Lynn Grindell

Apologies
20 Apologies
Professor Brigitte Bonisch-Brednich
Dr Anita Brady
Professor Daniel Brown
Professor Dale Carnegie
Dr John Haywood
Assoc Prof Flaviu Hodis

Professor Kate Hunter (lateness)
Professor Sarah Leggott
Professor John Macalister
Professor Charlotte MacDonald
Professor James Noble
Professor Sally Jane Norman
Professor David O’Donnell

Rebecca Priestley (early departure)
Professor Karen Smith
Dr Jan Smitheram
Professor Elizabeth Stanley
Assoc Prof Jeffrey Tatum
Professor Peter Whiteford
Professor Jennifer Windsor
AGENDA ITEM 8

Date 11 August 2020
Proposer Professor Stuart Brock, Vice-Provost (Academic)

DOCUMENT RECORD

Reference AB20/32
Title Report of the Academic Committee
Author (memorandum) Pam Green, Academic Programmes Coordinator
Date 11 August 2020

The Academic Board is asked:

To approve: the 8 non-CUAP proposals
To note: the one proposal approved by the Committee at its 4 August meeting; and
To note: note the other items discussed and/or approved by the Academic Committee at its 4 August meeting.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>Academic Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Pam Green, Academic Programmes Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>11 August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Report of the Academic Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report covers the 4 August 2020 meeting of the Academic Committee. This meeting was cancelled and proposals were approved/endorsed via online email consultation.

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

B. Academic proposals for Academic Board 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. BDI/41 – Change to major requirements
To change the major requirements for ANFX to include COMD 241 starting in 2021

2. BDI/39 - To make DSDN 183 permanent
To make Special Topic DSDN 183 Design Thinking for Sustainability permanent as DSDN 173 Design Thinking for Sustainability and to retain the special topic slot DSDN 183

3. BAS/44, BBSc/37 MArch(Prof)/17 - To make SARC 328 & 428 as permanent as SARC 302 & 402.
To introduce two new (co-taught) permanent courses –SARC 302, SARC 402 Prison Architecture: Buildings, Policy and Representation | Ngā Mahi Waihanga Whare Herehere and retain the Special Topic slots SARC 328 and SARC 428.

4. BSc(Hons)/9 - ESCI 408 Special Topic: Frontiers of Paleobiology conversion to new course
To make course ESCI 408 Special Topic: Frontiers of Paleobiology permanent as ESCI 454 Frontiers of Paleobiology in 2021, and to retain ESCI 408 as a Special Topic slot.

5. BSc(Hons)/2 - MATH 483 Special Topic: Operator Algebra conversion to new course MATH 443 Operator Algebra
To make the special topic MATH 483 Special Topic: Operator Algebra permanent as MATH 443 Operator Algebra in 2021 and retain the MATH 483 Special Topic slot.
6. BC/2, BA/11 - Introduce new course LCCM 172 and delete ENGL 172

To introduce a new course to the BC schedule: LCCM 172 *Reading and Writing Literary Texts*
To amend the major subject requirements for Literary and Creative Communication in the BC and to delete ENGL 172 *Reading and Writing Poetry*

7. BA/6 - Convert 5 Theatres courses to permanent offerings

To make two Theatre Special Topic courses permanent and amend the Major Subject Requirements for English Literature in the BA. To introduce two new courses to the Schedule for the BA(Hons) and amend the subject requirements for the Master of Fine Arts (Creative Practice) (MFA(CP))

8. BA/7, BA(Hons)/2, MSS/1 - Convert 5 courses from the School of History, Philosophy, Political Science and International Relations to permanent offerings

To make the following special topics permanent:
- INTP 304 *The Politics and Foreign Policy of Japan* (offered as INTP 301 ST)
- INTP 446 *War and its Aftermath* (offered as INTP 427 ST)
- POLS 210 *Contemporary Politics of the Middle East* (offered as POLS 211 ST)
- POLS 352 *Migration and Identity* (offered as POLS 378 ST)
- STRA 515 *New Zealand Foreign and Security Policy* (offered as STRA 534 ST)

and retain the Special Topic slots.

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

1. BSc(Hons)/6 - New 15-point research project in Mathematics

To introduce a new 15-point research project in Mathematics: MATH 487 *Research Project 1* in the BSc(Hons).

D. Other matters (endorsed to go to SLT seeking approval to release for consultation)

1. Special Topic & Directed Individual Study Memo

Changes to the Academic Approvals Handbook relating to Special Topics and Directed Individual Studies
MEMORANDUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>Academic Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Professor Stuart Brock, Vice-Provost Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>11 August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>Academic Programme Review – Geography Review Completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Summary

The Geography programme went through an academic programme review in September 2015 and are providing an update to the Academic Board that implementation of the recommendations has been completed. The Academic Board first received the implementation plan in June 2016, and most recently received an update to that plan in September 2018.

To receive: A programme review completion report for the Geography Programme
ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORT

Review of Geography

Date the Implementation Plan was approved by Academic Board: 7 July 2015
This progress report covers the period: 20 February 2016 to 24 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Recorded by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td>26/7/2020</td>
<td>Edward Schofield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVC/Dean</td>
<td>13/8/2020</td>
<td>Lynn Grindell</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Actions update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Not accepted (Amalgamation of ENSC &amp; ENVI)</td>
<td>With reference to the Progress Report dated 20/2/16, substantial progress has been made with the Environmental Science (ENSC) programme(s) including the appointment of two new lecturers and the development of a suite of ENSC Masters Programmes. One of the new ENSC appointments, also teaches on the Environmental Studies (ENVI) programme and is able to articulate explicit linkages and synergies of the two programmes to both cohorts of students. The annual ENVI Student Conference now (since 2018) includes all ENSC students, providing further linkages between the two programmes. The School will continue to explore ways to better link to and draw on the strengths and distinctiveness of both majors but for the purposes of reporting sees no further need to report progress. This completes the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>That (a) the Geography Programme seek school support for the geographical information science courses to be offered as either required or recommended options in both the Geography and Earth Science Programmes to address the central concern of providing a diverse range of opportunities for students to develop their skills and knowledge in geographical information science.</td>
<td>SGEES/VUW has withdrawn from the University of Canterbury-led MGIS and instead has developed a VUW MGIS, with additional resourcing via the appointment (2018) of Professor David O’Sullivan. This completes the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Actions update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>nature of geo-spatial data in the School’s teaching and learning strategies, and subsequent student career pathways; and (b) It is the Panel’s view that the School should consider the opportunities that arise from GI science and carefully consider whether additional resources are required in this area.</td>
<td>This process continues as a matter of course. For the purposes of reporting the School sees no further need to report progress. This completes the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>That, recognising capacity and workload constraints, the Geography Programme maintains and promotes its distinctive and successful Development Studies programme, building the University’s commitment to internationalisation through links to central government, NGOs and international communities.</td>
<td>This completes the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Not Accepted (formal workload model)</td>
<td>As per previous update; although this suggestion was not formally accepted, we continue to work to monitor staff workloads to keep them manageable and reasonably equitable. This completes the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>That the Programme reviews the courses offered at the 400-500 level and acts to clarify and consolidate the curriculum at this ‘taught’ postgraduate level to ensure students can clearly identify pathways</td>
<td>The comprehensive internal review of ENVI programmes referred to in the 2016 update has been completed with several new courses implemented with clearer pathways. The wider Geography programme has also benefitted from the following new postgraduate programmes with well-defined pathways: GIS, Environmental Science, Climate Change Science &amp; Policy. As is evident from the above, this is an ongoing process as a matter of course. This completes the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>That the points values of courses be reviewed and standardized, ideally to either 15 or 30 points. Upon deciding this, the School will need to ensure that all courses are reviewed with a particular focus on ensuring that it is in line with the assessment handbook, the student workload policy and that</td>
<td>As reported in the 2016 update, there has been significant effort put into reviewing and standardising course weightings and updating and clarifying relevant information for students. All new courses at postgraduate level are being standardized to either 15 or 30 points, while our second and third year offerings have been standardised at 20 points. The school has also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Actions update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Not Accepted</td>
<td>As per previous update.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. | That the Programme, School and Faculty addresses the various dimensions related to mātauranga Māori (as described further in this review document) specifically to ensure that these align with the new graduate attributes, the Treaty of Waitangi statute and the Tertiary Education Strategy. More specifically, the School should develop, in consultation with the Poukairangi Ako, Dr Meegan Hall, (and others) strategies to address the following areas that require attention:  
- staff development and capacity, particularly in relation to cultural competence  
- Māori student success  
- curriculum development that incorporates mātauranga Māori | As reported previously, this issue has high priority. Most staff have completed staff development courses in relation to cultural competence and many are including substantially more mātauranga Māori content in their teaching and research programmes. The appointment of Dr Rebecca Kiddle has helped substantially with this process and her many initiatives include developing a staff Waiata group, running workshops for mihimihi and tikanga, and welcoming meetings for new Māori students. We are seeing increases in Māori students at postgraduate level including scholarship recipients. Recently, the School has proposed the appointment of Mr Rawiri Smith of Ngati Kahungungu ki Wairarapa as an Adjunct Teaching Fellow in recognition of his wide-ranging contributions to our Geography programmes. We are awaiting SLT’s decision on this proposal.  
As is evident from the above, this is an ongoing process as a matter of course.  
This completes the implementation |
| 9. | That the school develops a plan to recruit, engage, retain and improve the success rate of Pasifika students. The plan should be in line with the Learning & Teaching and Equity & Diversity strategies and should include sustainable and inclusive practice for Pasifika students. | As reported in our 2016 Progress Report, the School has been working with the Awhina infrastructure (previously within the Science Faculty and now across the University) to address this recommendation point.  
Improving recruitment and retention of Pasifika students and improving their success rate is a school wide priority, including all the ESCI and GEOG programmes and is an ongoing process as a matter of course.  
This completes the implementation |
MEMORANDUM

TO       Academic Board
FROM     Professor Stuart Brock, Vice-Provost Academic
DATE     10 August 2020
SUBJECT  Academic programme review schedule for 2021

This item confirms the schedule for academic programme reviews for 2021. Due to Covid-19, all but one review scheduled for 2020 was deferred which creates a cumulative effect on the schedule over the next couple of years.

The Academic Office will be working alongside Faculties on the schedule for 2022 and beyond to ensure a more balanced workload for all concerned (there are currently 14 reviews scheduled for 2022 which is also the year of AQA’s audit of the university).

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the academic programme review schedule for 2021

ACADEMIC PROGRAMME REVIEW SCHEDULE 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Faculty of H&amp;SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science and International Relations</td>
<td>Faculty of H&amp;SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Practice and Software Development</td>
<td>Faculty of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography and Development Studies</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy and Management, e-Government</td>
<td>Business School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>