Report of the 2014 Academic Audit of the University of Canterbury – Te Whare Wānanga o Waitaha

Cycle 5 academic audit undertaken by the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities

February 2015

Te Pokapū Kounga Mātauranga mō ngā Whare Wānanga o Aotearoa

AQA | Academic **Quality**Agency
For New Zealand Universities

Report of the 2014 Academic Audit of the University of Canterbury – Te Whare Wānanga o Waitaha

Cycle 5 academic audit undertaken by the
Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities

February 2015

Foreword

The 2014 audit of the University of Canterbury is the fifth academic audit of the University carried out by the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA). The University was last audited in 2010, as part of the Cycle 4 audit of New Zealand universities, by a Panel of auditors from the (then) New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit[1].

The methodology adopted for the 2014 audit of the University of Canterbury is that used for all New Zealand universities in this cycle of audits. The focus of Cycle 5 audits is on teaching and learning and student support, including postgraduate. The methodology is based on a framework of 40 Guideline Statements which are expressions of the qualities or standards that a contemporary university of good international standing might be expected to demonstrate. The Guideline Statements were developed after extensive discussion with New Zealand university staff and Vice-Chancellors and consultation with other stakeholders, including students and academic auditors. The Guideline Statements are informed by comparable frameworks in other jurisdictions, in particular the QAA (UK).

The Cycle 5 audit was carried out by a Panel of AQA auditors, including an international auditor, between August and December 2014. This report presents the Panel's findings, based on the evidence it has considered. The report is released under the authorisation of the AQA Board.

Dr Jan Cameron
Director
Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities

February 2015

---

[1] The New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit changed its name to the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities from 1 January 2013.

Executive Summary

The University of Canterbury was New Zealand's second university to be established, in 1873. Since 1975 it has been located at Ilam, from where almost all programmes are currently delivered. In 2007 the Christchurch College of Education was incorporated into the University and the University now also delivers teacher education courses outside Christchurch at centres in Nelson, New Plymouth and Rotorua. The University has no overseas campuses.

The University was audited by the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA) in 2014. The AQA audit methodology incorporates a framework of 40 Guideline Statements which articulate the qualities or standards which a contemporary university of good standing internationally might be expected to demonstrate. Prior to the 2014 audit, the University of Canterbury was most recently audited by AQA (as the then New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit) in 2010. In 2014 the University provided an update against the findings of the 2010 audit and the Panel is satisfied that appropriate action has been taken to address most of the 2010 recommendations. The Panel has reiterated the views of the Cycle 4 Panel that the University should extend and systematise its institutional benchmarking activity; the Cycle 5 Panel identified a number of areas where it believes the University would benefit from accessing the experience of other similar institutions as it seeks to consolidate a reputation as an internationally-recognised university.

Since the last academic audit in 2010 the University has been severely affected by the two Christchurch earthquakes in September 2010 and February 2011 and the thousands of subsequent aftershocks. In addition to major impacts on infrastructure and the associated remediation cost, student enrolments and academic staff numbers have decreased. At the time of the audit the ongoing issues related to personal dislocation and the stress associated with domestic rebuilding, remediation and insurance continued to impact on a number of staff and students. The Panel was impressed by the resilience shown by staff and students, by the commitment and their determination to meet the challenges being experienced as the University recovers from the impact of the earthquakes. The Panel commends the University on developing, implementing and evaluating risk management and business continuity procedures; on the effectiveness of these in the circumstances resulting from the earthquakes; on the commitment and fortitude demonstrated by staff and students to pursuing their teaching, learning and research; and on the leadership regionally and nationally in sharing good practice and lessons learned from their experiences.

The University of Canterbury is strongly devolved with many responsibilities residing with its Colleges and their Pro-Vice-Chancellors and Heads of School. While the Panel considers that apparent reliance on trust is admirable, it also identified a number of instances where devolution as practised at Canterbury compromises the University's ability to assure itself of the quality of academic and related processes at an institutional level.

Alongside the activities arising from the University's Investment Plan framework the University is planning its work for the UC Futures recovery plan agreed to with government in 2012. The UC Futures project includes articulation of a University graduate profile which will apply to all undergraduates. The Panel considers the academic initiatives proposed within the University's UC Futures business case are ambitious, but achievable. Several of the Panel's recommendations are

intended to assist the University towards these goals by providing an external perspective on the activities proposed.

The Panel was impressed by the pervasive involvement of students in University activities and the commitment the University has to listening to the student voice. The University and the University of Canterbury Students' Association are commended on the wide-ranging and effective contribution made by students to the University's planning, reviews, academic activity and service and to the joint University and UCSA provision of services intended to enhance student well-being on campus.

The Panel considers that the University shows good commitment to student learning support and its resourcing. The work of the University's Pacific team, disability support services, the attention paid to personal safety on campus, and the University's approach to seeking postgraduate feedback are all areas where the Panel identified excellent practice.

The Panel has made several recommendations intended to assist the University to further develop good practice in teaching, curriculum development and assessment. In particular, it recommends that the University develops and implements its e-learning strategy, including benchmarking against relevant good practices in comparable universities in New Zealand and elsewhere. Other recommendations refer to assessment moderation, course and teaching surveys and evaluation of teaching quality. The Panel recognised the increasing emphasis placed on teaching, and considered the teaching qualifications, awards and the Teaching Week to be good initiatives, but it also identified a need to address institution-wide professional teaching development and opportunities for pedagogical research.

Overall, the Panel was satisfied that in almost all cases the expectations articulated in the Guideline Statements were met. Where audit recommendations suggest improvements are necessary or desirable, the Panel is also mindful that the University has faced major challenges over the last four years and that its current priority is to bridge the gap from the 2010 pre-earthquake learning and teaching achievements to those now befitting a university of 2015 and beyond. The Panel hopes that its recommendations might assist in providing some guidance towards this objective.

The Panel has made six commendations, five affirmations and fourteen recommendations. The University is expected to report on its response to the recommendations made by the Panel in twelve months' time (early in 2016) and again at the time of the next academic audit.

Contents

List of Key Terms and Acronyms

AQA	Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities
AR	Annual Report
AUSSE	Australasian Survey of Student Engagement
CEM	Centre for Evaluation and Monitoring
CUAP	Universities New Zealand Committee on University Academic Programmes
DVC(A&I)	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and International)
EFTS	Equivalent Full-Time Student(s) or may refer to Equivalent Full-Time Study
Fresher	"Fresher" is used by the University of Canterbury to refer to students who are undertaking their first year of degree-level study at any tertiary institution.
FTE	Full-time Equivalent (staff)
HR	Human Resources
IP	Investment Plan
ITS	Information and Technology Services
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
MyUC	The University of Canterbury's new online student portal and student management system.
NCEA	National Certificate of Educational Achievement
NZQF	New Zealand Qualifications Framework
NZSCED	New Zealand Standard Classification of Education
Panel	Unless otherwise specified, "the Panel" refers to the Academic Audit Panel engaged by AQA to conduct the 2014 audit of the University of Canterbury.
PD&R	Professional Development and Review
PVC	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Head of a College)
SD	Supporting document (forms part of the University's Self-review Portfolio)
SMT	Senior Management Team
SP	Self-review Portfolio
SR	Self-review Report
TEC	Tertiary Education Commission
UC	University of Canterbury
UC Futures	The University of Canterbury's programme of work for renewal, post-2012.
UCIC	UC International College (a partnership between the University and Navitas Limited)
UCPEQ	University of Canterbury Postgraduate Experience Questionnaire
UCSA	University of Canterbury Students' Association

Preface

The University of Canterbury was New Zealand's second university to be established, in 1873. Until 1962 it was a constituent college of the University of New Zealand.[2] For its first hundred years the University was located on a central city site. Since 1975 it has been located at Ilam, from where almost all programmes are currently delivered. In 2007 the Christchurch College of Education was incorporated into the University. Some teacher education courses are taught outside Christchurch at centres in Nelson, New Plymouth and Rotorua, hosted by Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology, Western Institute of Technology and Waiariki Institute of Technology respectively. The University has no overseas campuses.

In 2013, the University of Canterbury had a total enrolment of 14,872 students (12,180 EFTS) and 1,907 staff (FTE) of whom 740 (39%) were academic staff.[3] The University's academic offerings span a range of programmes from sub-degree to doctorate level. It has a relationship with global education provider Navitas Limited as an affiliated college on campus that recruits international students and prepares them for degree study.[4] The University has a formal benchmarking arrangement with the University of Adelaide. It aspires to have staff, students and graduates who are "people prepared to make a difference".[5] It wants to be known as a university "where research, teaching and learning take place in ways that are inspirational and innovative".[6]

Since the last academic audit in 2010 the University has been severely affected by the two Christchurch earthquakes in September 2010 and February 2011 and the thousands of subsequent aftershocks. In addition to major impacts on infrastructure and the associated remediation cost, between 2010 and 2013 student enrolments decreased by 21% EFTS (20% headcount) and FTE academic staff decreased by 11%.[7] At the time of the audit the ongoing issues related to personal dislocation and the stress associated with domestic rebuilding, remediation and insurance continued to impact on a number of staff and students.

AQA acknowledges the willingness of the University to prepare for and to participate in this academic audit less than five years since the previous audit, given the significant preoccupation the University has with its recovery planning and activity. The Panel for the Cycle 5 audit has endeavoured to approach its task with a spirit of understanding but also with a focus on what the University might need to pay attention to as it moves forward to the future it envisages for itself. The Panel is of the view that while the earthquake impact has severely constrained the University in some areas, the new start being experienced has also opened up opportunities in other areas. The Panel's conclusions are drawn with an objective of contributing to the University's re-emergence and revitalisation. It is for the University to consider how it prioritises its responses to the recommendations made in the light of its many other pressing activities.

---

[2] www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1961/0049/latest/DLM334448.html?src=qs accessed 10.12.14.
[3] Self-review Report (henceforth referred to as SR), p 83.
[4] www.comsdev.canterbury.ac.nz/rss/news/?feed=news&articleId=495 accessed 26.09.14.
[5] Annual Report 2013 (henceforth referred to as AR), p 9.
[6] UC Futures document, 2012, p 3.
[7] SR, calculated from p 83.

University Profile

The University of Canterbury is structured as a matrix of five Colleges (the administrative and management structure) and seven faculties (the academic structure).

In addition to the Vice-Chancellor, the senior management of the University comprises two Deputy Vice-Chancellors (Academic and International; Research), five college Pro-Vice-Chancellors, the AVC (Māori), Registrar, Chief Financial Officer and three Directors (Human Resources; Learning Resources; Student Services and Communications). Services pertaining to students and teaching and learning have reporting lines spread across four main portfolios:

- Academic and international, including academic services reporting to the DVC (Academic and International)
- The Postgraduate Office and Dean of Postgraduate Research report to the DVC (Research)
- Student Services and Pacific Development, reporting to the Director of Student Services and Communications
- Facilities Management, Library, Information and Technology Services reporting to the Director of Learning Resources.

In addition, Māori Development sits within the portfolio of the AVC (Māori). [8]

The University's academic committee structure flows from the Academic Board (a committee of Council) to a suite of academic committees, plus the Faculty Boards. Faculty Boards in turn have various academic subcommittees, including teaching and learning, postgraduate and research subcommittees.

Of the 12,180 EFTS in 2013, 82% (9,987 EFTS) were enrolled in undergraduate degree-level programmes, 742 EFTS (6%) in doctoral programmes and 1,231 EFTS (10%) in other postgraduate programmes. The majority of students (83%) studied full-time. The majority (93%) of University of Canterbury students were domestic; 794 students identified as Māori and 283 as of Pacific ethnicity. [9]

Vision, Mission and Strategic Objectives

The University's Vision is: *People prepared to make a difference – tangata tū, tangata ora.* [10]

Its Mission is to *contribute to society through knowledge in chosen areas of endeavour by promoting a world-class learning environment known for attracting people with the greatest potential to make a difference.*

---

[8] www.canterbury.ac.nz/theuni/documents/uc_function_chart.pdf accessed 26.09.14.
[9] SR, p 84.
[10] AR, p 9.

The University wishes to be known as *a university where knowledge is created, critiqued, disseminated and protected and where research, teaching and learning take place in ways that are inspirational and innovative.*

The University summarises the "primary components" of its strategy to realise its vision and mission as being to *challenge, concentrate and connect.* The strategic objectives related to these components are

- *Objective 2: Challenge. Improving educational performance of priority learner groups.*
- *Objective 3: Concentrate. Enhancing the quality and impact of research outputs.*
- *Objective 4: Connect. Maintaining strong, collaborative and mutually beneficial relationships with stakeholders.[11]*

Alongside the activities arising from the Investment Plan framework the University is planning its work for the UC Futures recovery plan agreed to with government in 2012. Much of the activity explored by the audit Panel and discussed in this audit report relates to UC Futures. In particular, the UC Futures project includes articulation of a University graduate profile which will apply to all undergraduates. Until now the University has required graduate profiles for all its awards, but has not had an institutional graduate profile. Strategic documents preceding UC Futures state that in addition to producing graduates prepared to make a difference, the University intends to produce graduates who *are culturally confident and competent in a bi-cultural New Zealand and on a multi-cultural world stage.[12]* The University also recognises that, in the Canterbury context in particular, higher education should contribute to the region's stability and prosperity. The new Graduate Profile which forms part of UC Futures includes attributes which support these earlier statements.

The 2014 Academic Audit

The current audit follows the methodology used for all New Zealand universities in the fifth cycle of academic audits. It focuses on teaching and learning and student support, including postgraduate.

AQA academic audits draw on the University's self-review and the supporting documentation it provides, including intranet access, publicly accessible pages of the University's website and interviews with staff, students, Council members and external stakeholders. These various sources enable Panel members to triangulate claims made by the University and to ensure the Panel's own conclusions do not rely on a single source of evidence.

The University submitted its Self-review Portfolio, including a report and key supporting documentation in both print and electronic form, at the beginning of August 2014. The Self-review Report included hyperlinks to documents on the University's public website and also links to documents organised by the University on a Learn (Moodle) site for the purpose of the audit. These processes ensured the audit Panel had a large amount of information available to it. Further

---

[11] Investment Plan 2013-2015 (hereafter referred to as IP), pp 20-25.
[12] IP, p 16.

documents were provided on request as needed. In addition, the University provided some update reports a short time before and at the site visit.

As part of the audit process an invitation was extended to the University of Canterbury Students' Association, UCSA, to comment on the Guideline Statements as they saw fit. In the absence of a submission the Panel interviewed the President of UCSA on behalf of the Association.

The Chair of the audit Panel and the AQA Director visited the University for a pre-audit planning meeting in October 2014. In addition to reviewing the logistics of the site visit, the planning visit provided an opportunity for the Chair of the Panel to meet with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and International) and other staff and also to address straight-forward queries raised by the Panel.

The full Panel of five auditors came together in Christchurch on 24 November for the site visit to the Ilam Campus on 25-27 November 2014. In total, during the site visit the Panel spoke to 85 staff and 20 students, as well as some members of the University Council.

At the time of the site visit some senior staff were not able to be present for interview. However the Panel considered that its interviews with other staff, and its examination of relevant documentation, enabled it to form its overall conclusions despite the absence of a few individuals. Given the University's current circumstances in which priority must be given to ongoing recovery activity and associated business negotiations, these constraints are understandable.

1.   Leadership and Management of Teaching and Learning

1.1   Delegations

Universities should have clear delegations for decision-making related to teaching and learning quality and research supervision, and for accountability for quality assurance of programmes and courses.

The University of Canterbury is structured as a matrix comprised of an academic structure of seven faculties which are responsible for the awards of the University (each faculty headed by an Academic Dean), and an administrative and management structure of five Colleges (each headed by a Pro-Vice-Chancellor). Colleges are comprised of departments, schools and centres. Where a faculty aligns directly with a College, the Dean and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor might be the same individual. The University comments that the relationship between PVCs and Deans is a matter of ongoing discussion.[13] The Panel explored this with a number of staff who, in almost all cases, indicated that the structure worked and it was clear to them what responsibilities lay with each dimension. The occasions reported of when the matrix proved challenging were limited to a small number of areas that spanned more than one faculty, either because of inclusion in a range of programmes or because of double-degree structures. The Panel heard that a scheduled review of the structure had been deferred.[14] It gained no evidence that a review of the structure *per se* needs to be a matter of urgency but it does have some concerns regarding activities which are devolved as a consequence of the current structure (see section 1.2 and elsewhere in this report).

The University has clear formal delegations schedules. These are updated annually.

The Schedules of Delegations from Council to the Vice-Chancellor, and from Council to the Academic Board and others stem from Council's responsibilities and the responsibilities of the Vice-Chancellor articulated in the Education Act. Academic delegations to the Academic Board may be exercised, in some cases, by the DVC (Academic and International)[15] as chair of the Academic Administration Committee. In other instances the schedule requires that there is consultation with the Academic Administration Committee. The academic delegations arising from Council refer to decisions related to academic statutes for which Council has responsibility.

The Schedule of Delegations from the Vice-Chancellor to members of the Senior Management Team includes academic delegations related to such administrative processes as admission of students, student support etc.

The University's Academic Delegations Schedule advises that, in principle, authority should rest with an individual role, not a committee. Academic policies (including policies related to teaching and learning) which are the responsibility of Academic Board are given effect by the authorisation of the DVC(A&I) for institution-wide policies; by Faculty Deans for those that relate to the awards of their

---

[13] SR, p 6.
[14] Scheduled in 2007 when the new structure was introduced.
[15] Henceforth referred to as DVC(A&I).

faculties and by the Dean of Postgraduate Research for policies related to PhD study and institution-wide postgraduate policies. Academic (i.e. Faculty) Deans are responsible for ensuring the quality assurance of the awards of the Faculty. The responsibilities of Faculties are summarised in the Calendar, which is available in both hard copy and on the website.[16]

Academic Board has three main academic subcommittees: the Academic Administration Committee; the Learning and Teaching Committee; the Postgraduate Committee. Faculties are also Boards of Academic Board.

Delegations schedules are available on relevant websites.[17] The University states that delegated authority responsibilities are communicated to staff as the need arises. The Self-review Report indicates that a project is in train to develop overarching documentation to support and provide a context for the various delegations schedules.

The Panel heard that senior staff are clear about their delegated responsibilities and authorities; in a number of cases these are defined in role descriptions. Staff at lower levels, however, appeared less clear about where specific delegations lay. This is a concern if it impacts on their areas of responsibility and it might be prudent for senior staff to remind staff of authority specifications as it pertains to their work areas.

1.2   Strategic and operational planning
Universities should have appropriate strategic and operational planning documents which include objectives related to student achievement and teaching quality, with key performance indicators which inform academic quality assurance processes.

The University of Canterbury's Statement of Strategic Intent, adopted in 2009 and reviewed in 2012, is a single-page document which sets out the Vision, Mission and summarised Strategy.[18] It is given effect in the Investment Plan 2013-2015, which summarises activity and performance under four Objectives which align with the priorities of the government's Tertiary Education Strategy. The KPIs presented in the Investment Plan appear to be appropriate to the expectations of the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC).

Apart from those related to the performance of priority learner groups (as defined by TEC), the objectives, proposed activities and KPIs in the Investment Plan do not extend significantly into the areas alluded to in the Statement of Strategic Intent, namely the development of people "prepared to make a difference". The Investment Plan does, however, make it clear that this is the University's vision. The text refers, for instance, to a vision of a "world-class learning environment connected to local institutions and the world", to graduates who "are culturally confident and competent in a bi-

---

[16] 2014 Calendar, pp 12-13. www.canterbury.ac.nz/aqua/calendar.shtml accessed 10.12.14.
[17] www.canterbury.ac.nz/theuni/council/delegations.shtml accessed 29.09.14.
[18] www.canterbury.ac.nz/theuni/plans/annualreport.shtml accessed 29.09.14. (The Investment Plan states this was adopted by Council in 2010 but the 2013 Annual Report states 2009.)

cultural New Zealand", and to the "passion and rigour" brought to teaching and research.[19] The Investment Plan incorporates an Outcomes Framework which refers to "high quality, relevant courses and qualifications"; "support students"; "select prospective students most likely to succeed and make a difference".[20] The Plan also lists 11 "major transformational projects", some of which the University expects to have significant impacts on teaching and learning, student experience and the graduate outcomes. There is reference, too, to "a bold new graduate profile". This part of the Investment Plan document is clearly aspirational. It was not clear from this document where, or how, the aspirations are to be built.

The Panel understands that at least some of the objectives of the Investment Plan have been overtaken by the exigencies of the University's 2014 business case for remediation and government support which is a component of UC Futures. UC Futures is a significant document which will clearly drive the University's Statement of Strategic Intent and Investment Plan for the immediate future. While the business case includes detail of infrastructure development, it also includes reference to academic aspects to which the University has committed with government, as part of its intended transformation. These are referred to in this audit in relation to discussion of the Graduate Profile (sections 3.2 and 3.3).

For internal and public reference, the University provides a short high-level summary UC Futures document which refers to "transformational outcomes" of a university "where research, teaching and learning take place in ways that are inspirational and innovative".[21] This document reiterates the attributes the University will aim for in its graduates. Fundamentally, this document sets out how the University of Canterbury intends to respond to the legacy of the earthquakes, both for itself and for its region. Many of the staff who were interviewed said they saw the University's need to respond to the earthquake aftermath as a positive opportunity.

The University refers to the above three documents (UC Futures business case; the Investment Plan; the Statement of Strategic Intent) as providing the framework for its core activities.[22] The planning documents which are provided to demonstrate how this framework will produce the intended outcomes are three second-tier plans plus the new Graduate Profile:

> The Learning and Teaching Plan 2013-2017
> The UC Research Plan 2013-2017
> The Rautaki Whakawhanake Kaupapa Māori 2012: Strategy for Māori Development.

While both the Research Plan and the Strategy for Māori Development have sets of actions listed under each Objective, neither has timelines, targets or KPIs and only the Research Plan lists designated responsibilities. It is difficult to see, therefore, how the University is planning towards meeting its objectives and how it will measure progress, other than by the statement that (for the research plan) the plan will be reviewed regularly by the University's Research Committee and

---

[19] IP, p 16.
[20] IP, p 8.
[21] UC Futures summary document, p3. All references to the UC Futures document in this audit report are to the summary document as the Business case itself is confidential to the University.
[22] SR, p 7.

progress will be monitored.[23] The Learning and Teaching Plan is reasonably advanced in its development. KPIs and output achievements are listed and some use is made of quantitative and time series data.

In addition to the above three key plans, the University has a suite of other strategies and plans, including a Pasifika strategy 2014-2018 and an Internationalisation Strategy (under review). Again, these two strategies lack the detail which might be expected if one is to gain assurance that the objectives in the strategies are able to be monitored and are likely to be achieved. The Panel had an additional concern that Council did not appear to receive progress reports or KPIs which would be meaningful to its members in assessing the University's status and progress related to teaching quality. The University states that use of KPIs is a relatively new process and that monitoring of plans is a work in progress.[24]

The above issues permeate to lower levels of the University, where the Panel gained the impression that central monitoring of academic processes was patchy. The Panel is of the view that in an institution where many academic activities are managed at College or faculty level without systematic central oversight, some form of central monitoring is necessary. Examples of gaps in oversight will be referred to later in this report. Risks might be exacerbated by the University's apparent reliance on a limited number of systems or processes to deliver significant outcomes, in particular reliance on the Postgraduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching to provide professional development for teachers (see section 6.4), on the PD&R process to monitor teaching quality (see section 6.3) and on scheduled programme reviews to identify, develop and deliver the proposed Graduate Profile (see section 3.2). Increased levels of central monitoring would assure the University of quality and alert it to areas of risk, but need not compromise the devolved operational approach if activities and processes are well managed.

The Panel was told that planning regarding management and operational matters was largely "top-down" whereas planning for academic matters was largely "bottom-up". The Panel did not see any easy way of resolving the potential for tension at the interface which might result given the processes reside primarily in different domains (i.e. management and operations in the administrative and management structures, and academic matters in the faculty structure). The University has noted a need for improved communication between SMT and other staff and between service units, as indicated in recent staff surveys.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University review the delegation and implementation of core academic processes and processes related to the assurance of teaching quality in order to identify where central monitoring, including reporting and analysis, is necessary to provide the University with institutional assurance of the quality of these processes and their outcomes.

The review referred to in the above recommendation should include, but not necessarily be limited to, matters addressed elsewhere in this report, such as:

---

[23] SR, p7.
[24] SR, p7.

- the processes adopted for academic advising (see pp 20-21);
- oversight of induction processes both for new staff and for new Heads (see pp 44-46);
- oversight of staff workload management practices (see pp 46-47);
- oversight of performance development and review practices (pp 48-49);
- provision of resources for thesis students (both PhD and Master's) (p 55).

1.3   Student input
Universities should facilitate student input to planning, policy development and monitoring of key academic activities.

The terms of reference of Council, Academic Board, faculties and all key committees include student representation. The guidelines on programme approvals and programme reviews indicate an expectation of consultation with students. The University advised of a proposal to include a student member on review panels (in addition to requiring consultation with students).[25]

The University states that it normally consults with UCSA when policies are being reviewed and that students are actively involved in a range of other activities, such as planning for Teaching Week (see Chapter 6), development of the Learning and Teaching Plan and decisions about University teaching awards.

Staff and students confirmed that opportunity for student input is extensive. They provided examples of ways in which student involvement had affected the outcomes, on occasion in quite significant ways. It was obvious to the Panel that the University genuinely values its students' contribution, both as a student voice and for the services and initiatives the students offer. The Panel observed that student participation in UCSA elections was higher than is common elsewhere (35% of the UC student body voted in the most recent election). A caveat on the Panel's findings is that UCSA as the umbrella organisation might not ensure an equivalent voice is heard for international, Māori or postgraduate students, though there is no structural reason why this should be the case as these students do have their own associations. Also the inevitable transience of UCSA leadership means the University cannot assume the current impressive interaction between the University and UCSA will automatically be ongoing. The relationship will need continued work if it is to be sustained at its current level.

> The Panel **commends** the University and UCSA on the wide-ranging and effective contribution made by students to the University's planning, reviews, academic activity and services.

---

[25] SR, p 9.

> **1.4   Infrastructure**
> Universities should have strategies and/or use processes for ensuring that their teaching and learning spaces and facilities are appropriate for their teaching and learning needs.

The University of Canterbury has, understandably, been closely focused on the development of infrastructure to remediate losses due to the earthquakes, as well as endeavouring to address its aspiration to provide a "world class learning environment". The planning documentation related to buildings and facilities is comprehensive. This section of the University's Self-review Report reflects the attention to detail which has been necessary in developing its post-earthquake plans. Key documents reviewed by the audit Panel included the Capital Prioritisation Framework 2012-2014 of the Campus Master Plan and the Technology Investment Roadmap 2012-2017.

The University provided examples of new developments or refurbishments which align with some of the principles in its Campus Master Plan. In particular it notes those which reflect a growing closeness with Ngāi Tuahuriri.[26] The University also refers to facilities such as its field stations, the NZi3 ICT Innovation Centre and the augmented reality laboratory which add to the University's distinctiveness. The new Engineering and Science facilities to be built over the next five years are expected to be "cutting-edge".[27] Student-learning hubs which are planned are intended to meet contemporary needs in facilitating access to the services, spaces and resources students need to aid their learning.

In listing the various kinds of spaces and facilities which the University has, or plans to have, the Self-review Report notes that spaces must be responsive to pedagogies, but the Panel was not provided with any examples to illustrate how this can be ensured. The Self-review Report comments that the processes which go into planning also include identifying key education drivers and linking spatial responses to educational drivers. In the list of aspects which the Campus Master Planning process must consider, teaching and pedagogical philosophy is absent – though the list includes student learning and learning outcomes and refers to being responsive to the needs of academics.[28] Although the Panel gained little evidence of what educational drivers are identified or responded to, the University argues that its processes ensure consideration of a clear pedagogical vision. The processes explained to the Panel during the site visit were extensive, complex and appeared robust. The Panel heard that a subcommittee of the Learning and Teaching Committee provides input and that there is major consultation for any significant development, whether new buildings or refurbishment, with staff, students, specific user groups, other organisations which might share the spaces (e.g. sporting organisations) and Ngāi Tahu. Experiential visits to an Australian university to explore innovative kinds of spaces are a good initiative. In the Panel's opinion, specific consultation with respect to pedagogical developments would be enhanced and possibly expedited if the University had the benefit of the knowledge and expertise which normally resides in a research-informed academic development unit.

---

[26] Ngāi Tuahuriri is a runanga of Ngāi Tahu, centred on the district of Tuahiwi which extends from the Hurunui to the Hakatere river and inland to the Main Divide. http://ngaitahu.iwi.nz/te-runanga-o-ngai-tahu/papatipu-runanga/ accessed 10.12.14.
[27] SR, pp 11-12.
[28] SR, pp 10; 11.

The University's response to constraints imposed by the earthquakes has indicated imagination, initiative and efficiency. The Panel was pleased to hear that the University engages in a post-implementation review process, led by a business analyst external to the service unit responsible for the development. The Panel also considered the steps being taken by the University to ensure flexibility of space use, including addressing timetabling, were very positive.

The Technology Investment Roadmap refers to all institutional IT requirements. The first objective listed for the University's investment in technology is "supporting learning and teaching with integrated tools and spaces that enhance the effectiveness of … learners and teachers".[29] The objectives also refer to supporting staff in carrying out the business of the University and giving staff and students information which is relevant to their role. Yet the membership of the group which developed the Roadmap appears to include no academic representation. The document states that the University is under-investing in technology which supports learning and teaching spaces, and advises that the needs and priorities for investing in improving learning and teaching technology must come from Colleges, academics and students.[30] The Panel was told of various ways in which IT staff become aware of staff needs; mostly information technology planning is a bottom-up process. A range of activities is provided for staff to assist their use of IT, and the University has three flexible learning advisers. In the Panel's view this *ad hoc* approach did not appear to be well-informed by pedagogical needs in any strategic or systematic way. Some benchmarking activity with other New Zealand and Australian universities was reported, and was seen by the Panel as sound practice, but it was not clear how this interfaced with bottom-up communication of staff need. (See also section 6.4)

University staff are aware of areas where some upgrading is desirable (for example, in wireless capability). On the other hand, they said that benchmarked information indicates technical desktop support is good when compared to other Australasian universities. (See section 1.5 below).

1.5   Information resources
Universities should use processes for ensuring that their information resources are appropriate and sufficient for research-informed teaching and learning.

The University has four library sites across campus. The Macmillan Brown collection includes the Ngāi Tahu archive and offers specialist Māori resource librarians. Over recent years the University has invested significantly in the improvement of library spaces, some, but not all of this as a consequence of the earthquakes. Students indicated there remained pressure on space availability for study. The Panel learned that the Learning Environment Sub-Committee of the Learning and Teaching Committee is investigating the development of formal and informal learning spaces across campus.[31] The earthquake experience has expedited a move to a "just in time" service for library resource provision, where the focus is on access to material rather than ownership. E-books are

---

[29] Technology Investment Roadmap 2012-2017, p 4.
[30] Technology Investment Roadmap, p 10.
[31] SR p 12.

available via a rental model, with automatic purchase after a designated number of uses. Subsequently, the size of the physical print collection is decreasing.

A roaming service of support is provided within the Central Library. A virtual support service is also available, providing real-time responses to enquiries from both on and off campus. Library Liaison Officers work with academics and postgraduate students in departments and schools to review and identify resource requirements. Library staff also have input to proposals for new programmes or courses, to ensure new requirements are identified and determine if they can be funded.

The Library seeks feedback from users via occasional surveys, a suggestions website, noticeboards, online chats, meetings with UCSA and with committees. From its reading and interviews the Panel concluded that the University is managing to provide appropriate library services notwithstanding the constrained fiscal environment and the recent challenges to physical infrastructure.

The University uses a Moodle learning management system (called Learn). The Self-review Report comments that the resilience of the system was tested and performed well during the major earthquake periods (see also section 1.6). Furthermore, the increased reliance on the system prompted many staff to be more proactive in their use of e-learning technologies in their teaching. The University recognises its reliance on a single MySQL database is a significant single point of potential failure. The Panel was concerned about the risk this imposes, and also that the University currently had no specialist MySQL database administrator. The Panel was advised that other recommendations including a need to benchmark e-learning practices against international good practice and to improve effective e-learning support are being attended to:

- the Learning and Teaching Plan includes objectives related to e-learning;
- the University has changed the ways in which its Flexible Learning Advisers work (being re-assigned from departments to colleges and improving access through regular drop-in sessions and tailored staff training);
- the e-learning support team has been relocated to be part of the Library Research and Information Services co-located with the Library Liaison team.

A number of the initiatives in the Learning and Teaching Plan require development of details to translate objectives to outputs. For example, to "support and strategically promote the development of flexible learning and distance education options *to increase recruitment and/or retention*" implies more specific actions than the proposed output of "establishment of an e-learning advisory group" and "increased provision of blended learning".[32] From what it heard the Panel concluded that currently development of e-learning capability for academic staff relies on a variety of *ad hoc* mechanisms, some provided proactively by E-Learning Support staff and some initiated at the request of academic staff. Those support services whose access relies on individual staff initiative, risk missing those staff who are unaware of the potential tools and approaches which the University has available. Like the Library, ITS and learning technology staff have been working within a challenging fiscal environment and are aware that without more resources their services are necessarily constrained. A key focus is on how to make best use of the current technologies and staff.

---

[32] Learning and Teaching Plan 2013 (henceforth referred to as L&T) p 9 (emph. added).

The Panel was told that E-Learning Support staff had recently conducted an audit of 80 courses in one college, finding areas for improvement in online delivery in a quarter of these. The Panel was pleased to hear that students are surveyed regarding their satisfaction with information technologies, and that student feedback has been responded to. Otherwise there did not appear to be any systematic evaluation or quality assurance of e-learning provision at an institutional level.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University urgently address its reliance on a single MySQL database and the lack of a specialist MySQL administrator to ensure adequate protection against the risk of failure of the system.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University develops and implements its e-learning strategy, including benchmarking against relevant good practices in resourcing and back-up in comparable universities in New Zealand and elsewhere.

1.6   Risk management
Universities should have recovery plans and procedures which are designed to facilitate continuity of teaching and learning in instances of infrastructure system failure.

The University of Canterbury has had a dedicated Emergency Operations Centre and a detailed emergency plan since 2008. The Centre for Risk, Resilience and Renewal has been established since the 2011 earthquakes to use the University's experience to provide leadership in the development and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery. The University's emergency management activities are authorised by the UC Emergency Management Statute and guided by the UC Emergency Management Policy. Within the Christchurch area the University holds a formal status within the Civil Defence organisation, effectively meaning that in the event of a city-wide emergency the University must be prepared to look after itself.

The UC Emergency Management Statute and the UC Emergency Management Policy are accessible to all staff and students from the UC Policy Library.[33] The University also has a dedicated Emergency Management webpage.[34] In addition to the main plans the University is preparing companion plans which refer to field stations and outreach facilities (for example, the Kaikoura Field station could be vulnerable to tsunami).

The University's approach to overall emergency management identifies six phases: risk identification; reduction; readiness; response; recovery; review. The 2014 Emergency Management Plan focuses mainly on response. It is a finely detailed compendium of numerous aspects of emergency management. Contents include:

- Programme Administration (e.g. financial delegations and prioritisation of payments; secondment of facilities; notification levels)
- Laws and Authorities (relevant New Zealand Acts; UC statutes)
- Regional Hazardscape (e.g. earthquake; storm; transport; criminal activity; public health etc.)

---

[33] www.canterbury.ac.nz/ucpolicy/?SearchBy=Letter&Value=E accessed 01.10.14.
[34] www.canterbury.ac.nz/emergency/ accessed 01.10.14.

- Hazard Mitigation and Response (including, animal welfare; fire watch; medical waste)
- Event Planning (e.g. for infrastructure failure; pandemic; bomb threat)
- Prevention and Security
- Planning Process
- Incident Management
- Resource Management and Logistics
- Mutual Aid (e.g. regional; with suppliers; with other tertiary institutions)
- Mass Communication and Warning
- Incident Action Planning
- Facilities
- Training and Exercises
- Community Education and Information (including personal emergency kits; disability support).

The University's Centre for Risk, Resilience and Renewal is responsible for developing and delivering training programmes. These include a wide range of scenarios used for training. The multi-year strategic training plan is updated annually.[35]

The effectiveness of the University of Canterbury's emergency response was highlighted by the Director of the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management, who was national controller for the 2011 earthquake response in Christchurch. In his foreword to the University's 2014 Emergency Response Plan the Director applauded the University's response effort, its planning, training and readiness, and the leadership demonstrated within and by the University. "The University of Canterbury has been tested like few others in New Zealand", he said, and "has come through with flying colours". [36]

In its prioritising of action in an emergency situation the University lists "return to business as usual" as its fifth priority.[37]

In 2012 the University's report "Resilience Tested" documented an evaluation of the University's response to the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes.[38] The major 2011 earthquake occurred on the second day of the first semester of the academic year. An early decision to get teaching back on track, deliver a full academic year in 2011 and to start semester 2 on time were considered critical to the recovery. Among the academic responses to facilitate business continuity were such initiatives as shortening the subsequent teaching semester, condensing the subsequent examination period enabling the second semester to start on time despite the serious June 2011 aftershock. The advantage of having some in-course independent assessment (to facilitate aegrotat evaluation) is noted. The University received and approved 4,500 aegrotat applications for this examination period.[39]

---

[35] UC Emergency Response Plan, June 2014, p 108.
[36] UC Emergency Response Plan, June 2014, p ii.
[37] UC Emergency Response Plan, June 2014, p 6.
[38] www.canterbury.ac.nz/emergency/documents/resiliencetested.pdf accessed 01.10.14.
[39] Resilience Tested, p 16.

The University of Canterbury acknowledges the ideas it gained from California State University Northridge in installing temporary teaching facilities (in tents). On-line learning is highlighted as a feature of the UC response, as is off-site teaching in halls, hotels, company offices and conference venues, and retiming field trips. It is noted that many academics had to redesign their courses as their offices were inaccessible. Live-streamed videos increased to 2,500 hours per week and staff who previously had not made significant use of e-learning needed to become much more adept at a time when many were also under stress. Some staff and students missed months of research time; thesis students were assisted to find ways of making progress with their work, including the relocation of the research, sometimes overseas. All postgraduate students were granted an automatic two month extension, with the ability to apply for longer if needed, as well as fee waivers and scholarship extensions. The issues outlined in the Resilience Tested report indicate that while infrastructure recovery is fundamental to business continuity, a number of the challenges rely on the flexibility and initiative of staff (and students) to overcome these.[40] The University has been willing to share what it has learnt from its experiences with other universities and in a range of other fora.

> The Panel **commends** the University on developing, implementing and evaluating risk management and business continuity procedures; on the effectiveness of these in the circumstances resulting from the 2010 and 2011 Christchurch earthquakes; on the commitment and fortitude demonstrated by staff and students to pursuing their teaching, learning and research; and on the leadership shown by the University both regionally and nationally in sharing good practice and lessons learned from their experiences.

---

[40] Resilience Tested, pp 41-47.

2.   Student Profile: Access, Transition and Admission Processes

The University of Canterbury's student profile in 2013 was[41]:

	All students	%
Total students (Headcount)		
Domestic students	13,867	93
International students	1,013	7
Total Headcount	**14,872**	
Total EFTS	**12,180**	
Pākehā/European (EFTS)	8,616	71
Māori students	794	7
Pasifika students	283	2
Asian students	1,569	13
Indian students	207	2
Other	551	5
Full-time students (EFTS)	10,131	83
Part-time	2,049	17
Sub-degree (EFTS)	219	2
Undergraduate	9,987	82
Postgraduate	1,973	16
[includes doctoral students	*742*	*6]*

2.1   Admission and selection
Universities' admission and selection policies and practices should be clear and publicly available to students.

The University's admission criteria are detailed in the Calendar and on the University website, both of which are publicly available. The website has a searchable format. For example a prospective undergraduate student can search for admission requirements according to whether they are a New Zealander or international student, and then by entrance preparation (NCEA; other tertiary background; no formal qualifications; English language preparation needed, etc.).[42] Information is also reproduced in plain language in various brochures, e.g. the Guide to Enrolment (also available online). The University details the internal processes for identifying and selecting students and states that these systems are robust.[43]

---

[41] SR, pp 83-85. Because individual students might occupy more than one category, totals of the table might not equal the sum of the components.
[42] www.canterbury.ac.nz/admissions/ accessed 03.12.14.
[43] SR, p 18.

The University has not identified any particular preferred student profile in its Self-review Report. It bases its selection policies on a strategic objective of favouring high-achieving students who have the greatest potential to make a difference.[44] The most pressing objective is for the University to rebuild its student numbers to recover the attrition which followed the earthquakes.

Preferential admission is provided for a range of student groups, defined in the Admissions regulations. The manner of calculating NCEA scores, where these apply, is set out clearly.[45] Students not meeting the requirements for preferential entry are offered places subject to priority and availability. The admission decision for nearly all students claiming eligibility through NCEA is automated.

Selection and monitoring of students transitioning from the foundation programme delivered by the UC International College (UCIC, a partnership between the University and Navitas Limited)[46] are appropriate and give reasonable assurance of consistency with other admission routes. The University suggests an enhancement initiative to analyse subsequent academic achievement by admission reason, particularly for students with international qualifications, to ensure that its admission standards are set at an appropriate level, particularly against NCEA. The Panel neither read nor heard of any issue which lay behind this proposal, but in general supports ongoing analysis of such data.

The admission regulations include an appeal provision. However this was not easily located via the website.[47] The academic appeals and grievances policy which is available on the website does not make reference to appeals against admission decisions.[48] (See also section 3.1).

Admission requirements for the PhD and DMA are available on the University website (DMA regulations; PhD policies, regulations and guidelines).[49]

2.2 Access and Transition
Universities should use policies and/or procedures which are designed to assist the access and transition of equity groups or other priority groups.

The University does not appear to have any admission or access policies specific to equity groups or other priority groups, neither does the Strategic Plan refer to targeted recruitment of any specific equity groups or other groups (except international students). The Panel understands that the

---

[44] Draft Strategic Plan 2013-2017 (hereafter referred to as SP), p 2.

[45] www.canterbury.ac.nz/regulations/general/admission_regs_preferential_entry.shtml accessed 03.12.14.

[46] www.canterbury.ac.nz/international/study/ucic.shtml accessed 10.12.14.

[47] 2014 Calendar, Admission regulations A 8, p 15.

[48] The Academic Appeals and Grievances Policy refers to appeals against decisions from "General Course and Examination Regulations, the Limitation of Entry Regulations, the Course Regulations or any other academic decision where an appeal right is not provided within the University regulations." Admission appeals do not fit within any of these specific categories identified.

[49] www.canterbury.ac.nz/regulations/award/dma_regs.shtml; www.canterbury.ac.nz/postgrad/phd_students/policies.shtml accessed 03.12.14.

2015 Recruitment Strategy will, however, include specific initiatives designed to attract Māori and Pasifika students to Canterbury.

There is heavy reliance on the work of the Liaison team and on outreach programmes to communicate with underrepresented groups. Through these services additional support is directed towards international students, Māori, Pasifika, and students from low decile schools. The University states that its Equal Education Opportunities Policy identifies five low-decile schools in the Canterbury region for receiving support (including campus tours, visiting speakers and scholarships) to encourage students to embark on tertiary study.[50] A Māori outreach programme run in conjunction with CPIT and Lincoln University targets year 10, 11 and 12 students who are interested in tertiary study and the University of Canterbury College of Science runs a programme, in partnership with Taumutu Marae, for Māori students from three Canterbury secondary schools. For potential Pasifika students, in-school tutoring is aimed at improving academic standards to meet the University's focus on excellence. Year 11 students are given an on-campus experience. The Pacific Development team is clearly committed to extending its reach into Canterbury schools; its proposed extension of recruitment activity into the Auckland area will tap into a large Pacific population and could assist with increasing numbers of Pasifika students at UC.

The quality of the outreach activities appears to be high. However, while these activities can make a valuable contribution to increasing access, the Panel believes it is unlikely that on their own they will be sufficient to achieve significant growth. More imaginative and evidence-based initiatives might be needed for the Canterbury region.

The Strategy for Māori Development, Rautaki Whakawhanake Kaupapa Māori, articulates as an "area for development" the development of initiatives "that ensure Māori student recruitment, retention and achievement".[51] The Strategy does not indicate whether "ensure" means any particular target number. The initiatives indicated in the strategy are mostly developmental, reflecting activities which are common to New Zealand universities.

In its Self-review Report the University recognises that further work needs to be done to increase Māori and Pasifika student numbers, notwithstanding a recent growth in first-in-family Māori students enrolling at UC.[52] The Panel suggests the University considers whether its current admission policies and strategic emphasis on potentially high-achieving students might be perceived as a barrier for and by students from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds who might achieve the minimum admission threshold but not identify themselves as potential high-achievers.

Once at the University, Māori and Pasifika students have available to them a range of personalised support activities intended to aid transition to tertiary study. The Māori Development Team contact pre-enrolled students new to UC who self-identify as Māori, advising them of services available. At enrolment such students are put in contact with a Māori liaison officer who may offer extra help and

---

[50] For the objectives of this programme see
www.canterbury.ac.nz/theuni/documents/annualreport2003/ann_report_03_equalemploymentopportunity.pdf. Accessed 23.12.14. The Panel was unable to find the policy referred to above on the University website.
[51] Strategy for Māori Development, Rautaki Whakawhanake Kaupapa Māori 2012, pp 4-5.
[52] SR, p 21.

support. At this time the University involves the wider whānau in discussions relating to whānau support of students undertaking study. Accredited departmental tutors run workshops for Māori and Pasifika students in some departments. The Panel sees the proposal to contact Māori students regularly by telephone to ensure they are receiving appropriate pastoral support as a good initiative.

Pasifika students are offered support similar to that outlined above for Māori. All first year Pasifika students are assigned a senior Pasifika student mentor when they enrol. Over one-third of Pasifika students access free tutoring through the Pacific Academic Solutions and Success (PASS) programme and NZAid students from the Pacific have the opportunity to have their needs assessed and addressed by the Academic Skills Centre.[53] A refresh programme is offered to students who did not do well the previous year. The targeted financial assistance for support of Pasifika students provided by alumni donors is appreciated by staff. In future this alumni assistance is to also be extended to Māori students. Other activities which are available to all Pasifika and Māori students are mentioned in Chapter 4.

The University appears to have good working relationships with both the local iwi and with the local Pacific community. These relationships should assist the University in addressing access and transition challenges.

In its self-review the University did not identify international students as a priority group for access and transition. While the University's Strategic Plan and Investment Plan limit "priority groups" to those identified in the Tertiary Education Strategy (*viz.* Māori, Pacific and <25 year olds), the omission of international students from the self-evaluation is surprising given the University's growth objectives, and given its focus on global connectedness (see section 3.2). During interviews the Panel heard of a number of plans or activities to enhance "internationalisation" at the University by promoting both in-bound and out-bound student movement. Although the Panel understands the University might be shifting its emphasis from full-degree places to short-term places for international students, such students nevertheless have a need for transition support in a new university environment. Apart from the first year international student welcome and the work of UCIC, the Panel could find almost no targeted support for international students. The International Student webpage simply links students through to the home page for student support generally; designated central international student support appears to be limited to English language support.[54] Colleges run orientation activities for international students and the University commented that one College which receives a large number of international students does devote additional resources to ensuring international students have appropriate programmes of study, are monitored closely and are given additional support such as tutorials when necessary.[55] The Panel deduced from the comment that support for international students is seen as mainly a College responsibility, as is consistent with devolution of responsibilities.

---

[53] SR, pp 20-21.
[54] www.canterbury.ac.nz/international/ accessed 03.12.14.
[55] SR, p 22. Access to information about College support for international students is via college webpages (not centrally), e.g., www.bsec.canterbury.ac.nz/for/international/orientation.shtml.

The Panel **recommends** that the University gives consideration to the development of strategies and, where appropriate, KPIs and the provision of appropriate resources to enhance its recruitment of Māori, Pasifika and other under-represented groups.

2.3   Academic advice

Universities should use processes for providing academic advice and course information to both new and continuing students.

Provision of academic advice for prospective and new students is primarily the responsibility of the Liaison Team. Advising might be done in person, by email, telephone or via online course planning.

Academic advice for continuing students is the responsibility of the College in whose programme(s) the student is enrolled. College Student Advisors might also provide advice to new students when they are exploring complex or specialised programmes of study. Academic advice is treated as a confidential matter but a copy of the advice given is recorded in the student management system.

The Academic Advice Principles and Guidelines provide a framework for quality assuring advice on academic matters. It defines "advice" as implying a recommendation of how a student should act, noting that advice provides information, but information on its own is not necessarily advice. In particular, the policy implies the limits on delegated authority and states that:

- The location and identification of the appropriate staff for providing different types of academic advice must be well publicised, to students and to staff.
- Advice should be given only by those with "expert knowledge" about the issue; advice should be limited to the area of expertise of the adviser.

The policy also states that:

- Advice should be given directly to the student, not through an intermediary. Advice given to or through a third party is not official University advice.

The guidelines include notes on good practice in advising, comments on student responsibilities, and advice about appeal provisions. The Self-review Report notes that the University also has procedures in place to ensure that students needing specific kinds of support (e.g. learning skills) are referred to the appropriate central or college service.

Course information is provided to students in course outlines and on Learn (the University's Moodle learning management system).[56] Students are expected to check their University email addresses at least once a week. The University cites the low number of grievances related to major assessment and examination times as evidence of effectiveness of these forms of communication.[57] However the Panel heard that in one college there is variability in the content of course outlines and the learning objectives within them. The Panel endorses the University's plans to address these weaknesses where they occur.

---

[56] http://learn.canterbury.ac.nz/.

[57] SR, p 22.

The Panel heard from staff and students that the college-based system of advising poses a challenge for some students who are embarked or embarking on programmes which span Colleges. The Panel is also mindful that although the umbrella policy and guidelines for provision of academic advice are clear, the possibility of central quality assurance oversight is limited by the devolution of personnel doing the advising. The University has identified poor academic advice as an issue to be addressed.[58] It notes that currently many student files are kept by college offices in independent databases. A new student management system, MyUC, will provide the functionality to refine this system when introduced. A semi-automated system to enable advisers and/or students to generate and check degree plans is also being considered, as is a mechanism for contacting students who do not seek advice but might need it.[59]

The Panel supports these initiatives. It is of the view that a number of the issues it has read and heard about evolve from the freedom of Colleges to develop individualised processes in the absence of an institution-wide system. The Panel recognises that the specialist knowledge required to give timely and accurate advice resides in the Colleges. However, the Panel believes that centralised systems for oversight or monitoring of activities which are as fundamental to student success as is academic advice are necessary. They need not limit the freedom of Colleges to undertake the actual advising tasks in ways which are appropriate to their programmes and staff structures. The Academic Advice Principles and Guidelines set out the parameters for advising clearly. They need to be supported by appropriate systems. A system such as MyUC might possibly facilitate the centralised quality assurance referred to above.

> The Panel **affirms** the introduction of a new student management system and encourages the University to consider the issues related to student advice when designing the new system.

---

[58] Proposed enhancement, SR p 23.
[59] SR, p 23.

3.   Curriculum and Assessment

3.1   Programme approval

The University should have consistent and robust internal course and programme approval processes which meet any national and professional expectations and which include opportunity for input from stakeholders where appropriate.

The University provided detailed information about its processes for course and programme approval. The institutional requirements are available in the "Blue Book" which is available to staff on the intranet.[60] This intranet site includes links to templates and supporting instructions, as well as documentation for a wide range of matters associated with the development and approval of new courses or programmes, such as:

- University of Canterbury Statement of Strategic Intent
- NZQF Levels and Descriptors
- New Zealand Qualifications Framework November 2013
- Example of a framework for a Graduate Profile (CUAP)
- NZSCED Code Sets
- Funding Categories and 1-39 Classification Prescription
- Qualification definitions
- Discontinuing a major or subject
- Limitation of Entry
- Cancellation of Courses - low enrolments
- NZQF Offshore Delivery Rules.

Processes for approval of major developments pass through routine academic scrutiny of faculties, Academic Board (or Academic Administration Committee) and Council. A financial viability process, managed by accountants in the College office, must be undertaken in parallel with the academic approval process; proposals cannot be submitted to the Academic Board for academic approval until the financial viability has been assessed. The University has a minor course change system for such amendments as: mode or site of delivery; title changes; pre-requisite changes; EFTS weighting (less than 25% change). Approval of such minor changes is delegated to Colleges for approval. This process appears to bypass faculties.

The University provided the Panel with its archive of CUAP proposals which have been approved for the last nine years (2005-2013). The Panel understands that all Canterbury proposals submitted to CUAP over this period were approved.

The Panel was satisfied that the University's processes for course and programme approval are robust and meet national requirements.

---

[60] https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/bluebook/ accessed 04.12.14.

> **3.2   Graduate attributes**
> Universities should have clearly-defined intended graduate outcomes (graduate attributes) which are publically available and are accessible to students and staff.

The Investment Plan 2013-2015 states that the University will develop a "bold new graduate profile" of "new UC graduates who are work-ready, entrepreneurial, with a social conscience, equipped for New Zealand/Aotearoa's bi-cultural communities and global careers."[61] With this intention the University is building on the earthquake-related experience gained by many students who undertook some form of community/volunteer work. The Investment Plan notes that already over 30% of undergraduate students have some form of work experience as a component of their study requirements.

The University promotes graduate profiles for its individual degrees. These are varied and do not incorporate the attributes referred to in the Investment Plan consistently. At the time of the audit the University had just concluded a period of consultation to articulate a new undergraduate University Graduate Profile (see section 1.2). Staff and students who were interviewed indicated only limited understanding about the new Profile and attributes. The Panel was told variously that the new Profile has four attributes, or has five attributes. This degree of confusion indicates that more information needs to be disseminated to facilitate common knowledge and understanding. On the basis of Council minutes, the Panel concluded that the profile most recently agreed to has the following five attributes, *viz* that University of Canterbury graduates will be:

- critically competent in a core academic discipline of their degree
- employable, innovative and enterprising
- biculturally competent and confident
- engaged with the community
- globally aware.[62]

While the University recognises that the individual graduate attributes are not unique to the University of Canterbury, it argues that the overall package is unique as a graduate profile. The Panel was told by both staff and students that the Graduate Profile was supported by student representatives who had been involved in the consultation and discussion within committees.

As the Profile had only just been approved, the University has yet to develop the mechanisms whereby the attributes will be mapped onto the curriculum. The Panel was told that the scheduled cycle of five-yearly programme reviews will be the vehicle whereby revisions take place and that four staff would be seconded from within the University, on a part-time basis, to assist academic staff in incorporating the non-discipline-related attributes into their programmes across all Colleges in the University. The Panel heard that staff exchanges might be used more strategically to assist with the project. However the Panel believes the overall reliance on (a) programme reviews and (b) a very small group of advisory staff, is neither adequate nor sufficient to achieve the outcome intended for such a large and ambitious undertaking. If programme reviews are to be one of the

---

[61] IP, p 15.
[62] University of Canterbury Council Minutes, 29 October 2014.

mechanisms for ensuring graduate attributes are embedded then current review processes will not suffice; new terms of reference will need to be scoped and tested. The curriculum mapping which will be necessary involves the review and possibly redevelopment of assessment and delivery as well as programme content. To meet the proposed timeline it might be necessary to bring forward the current schedule of programme reviews. This will have workload implications.

The Panel discussed the introduction of the new Graduate Profile with a wide range of staff. From these discussions, the Panel gained the impression that operationalisation of the Graduate Profile is to become primarily the responsibility of those delivering the programmes and that there appeared to be little centralised accountability (apart from the four staff secondments referred to above) for assisting with this process and limited resources available to assist academic staff. This was particularly apparent when the Panel considered how the Graduate Profile is to be achieved by students (see section 3.3 below). Academic staff had varied ideas, in some cases quite vague, as to how the University expected institutional graduate attributes and programme learning outcomes might be aligned or meshed. In the Panel's view the University needs dedicated academic leadership for this project if it is to be realised within the period agreed to with government in the UC Futures Plan.

The Panel acknowledges that confirmation of the Graduate Profile is very recent, though consultation has been in train for some time. It would be premature to expect the University to have made huge progress in implementation. The Panel also recognises that many University of Canterbury staff continue to experience additional responsibilities and distractions in the earthquake aftermath. Nevertheless, the time frame that has been set for achievement of the Graduate Profile is ambitious and urgency is needed for it to be met. The Panel's recommendations are intended to assist the University as it proceeds with the project (see section 3.3 below).

3.3   Graduate outcomes
Universities should have processes for ensuring students have the opportunity to meet the intended graduate outcomes (graduate attributes) during their period of study.

From its reviews of courses and programmes the Panel observed that the relationship between learning outcomes and graduate attributes, while variable across programmes, seemed generally well understood. The outcomes were most clearly defined in the professional programmes. It was less clear to the Panel how the University assures itself that students have the opportunity to meet non-curriculum outcomes. This is an issue which will become critical for the new Graduate Profile.

University staff cited existing programmes which have work-related activity as a part of graduating requirements as evidence of the achievability of the graduate attribute related to work-readiness and employability. Similarly the number of student exchanges was cited as evidence of opportunity for global connectedness. The Panel also heard that there is not an expectation that *all* students will necessarily acquire *all* attributes in the Profile. These views raised concerns for the Panel.
The Panel is concerned that experiencing work-related activity does not, in itself, imply employability of the graduate. It sees a risk that the University might thereby not deliver on this graduate attribute

for all students. If "employability" is retained as an attribute then the Panel suggests that quite clear and unambiguous parameters and/or disclaimers are needed. Secondly, the intention to provide opportunity for students to acquire this attribute requires involvement with a large number of external stakeholders to ensure placements for students. Central oversight is likely to become essential to avoid issues related to overuse, replication, stakeholder disengagement, appropriate ethical and health and safety provisions, oversight of any external assessment tasks, and so on. The Panel is aware that the University has identified staff who might assist with this but was not convinced that the level of resourcing indicated will be adequate to meet the scale of the task.

Internationalisation was discussed with staff as a consequence of the Cycle 4 recommendation on this topic. While the graduate attribute of global connectedness might be considered part of a strategy of internationalisation, the purpose of this attribute might extend beyond the benefits that students and staff gain from the cultural and study experiences that can flow from international mobility. These benefits, and the ways in which students might acquire them, need to be explored quite thoroughly before the University commits to any particular types of international opportunities. As with the opportunities for work-experience, the opportunities for global-connectedness need some form of institutional oversight to ensure opportunities offered to students are appropriate, are acceptable to the University in terms of its own strategic relationships, are achievable both in terms of finance and time, and result in academic experiences which fit within the expectations underlying the Graduate Profile. The University also needs to consider how appropriate opportunities to acquire the benefits of global-connectedness might be provided for students who are unable to avail themselves of international exposure (whether through outgoing study or involvement with incoming staff and students). For example, what strategies might the University develop to enhance the interaction on campus of students from different nationalities and/or cultural backgrounds? From its interviews the Panel deduced that currently such interaction is unstructured. The task for the University in achieving this graduate attribute clearly extends beyond programme deliverables and implies a need for institution-level oversight and risk management.

The development of bicultural competence and confidence as attributes has posed a particular challenge for the University. The Panel heard, for instance, that a view that a university is a multicultural institution had to be reconciled with an obligation for a New Zealand university to address biculturalism. In support of a bicultural focus, however, the Panel was told that for students from overseas the *principles* of biculturalism might be relevant within their own societies, and that there was support for this graduate attribute from current and potential overseas partners. The Panel also heard of the very positive relationships the University of Canterbury has with Ngāi Tahu and with Ngāi Tuahuriri, relationships which the Strategy for Māori Development aims to enhance.[63] One challenge for the University will be the development of ways in which it can gain from its relationships to provide relevant bicultural perspectives and experiences within programmes.

The above three areas (i.e. employability; global connectedness; biculturalism) all prompted the Panel view that the processes put in place to develop and deliver the Graduate Profile need high-level academic oversight and institution-wide approaches to identifying, facilitating and supporting

---

[63] Rautaki Whakawhanake Kaupapa Māori 2012: Strategy for Māori Development, p 5.

opportunities for staff and students to experience and/or acquire the attributes. In the Panel's view, leaving these essential components to academic staff to embed into their curriculum and assessment, individually, poses a high risk of under-achievement for the University. Some attributes might be within the curriculum, but they also extend beyond the curriculum.

Mechanisms for assessing and recording acquisition of non-curriculum attributes will need to be developed and tested for equivalence across programmes. The introduction of a co-curricular transcript, signalled by the University, is a good initiative. The Self-review Report comments that e-portfolios are used in some disciplines.[64] The Panel suggests that e-portfolios might be encouraged more widely for students to record, evaluate and retain relevant non-curriculum experiences.

The task the University has set itself is ambitious and sizeable. In the Panel's view the project needs:

- designated central academic leadership for the project, with appropriate accountability and authority to direct reviews and developments;
- development of a clear, achievable timeline within a project management framework;
- identification of resource need and availability, including expertise beyond the positions currently identified;
- provision of professional development assistance to academic staff for curriculum mapping processes, including reviews and (if required) revision of assessment and modes of delivery;
- identification by the University centrally of the resources (experiential, external community and staff) needed to provide opportunities for students to acquire the non-discipline-specific attributes;
- determination of methods for assessing acquisition of non-curriculum attributes and professional development support of staff to develop expertise in these methods;
- implementation of the proposed co-curricular transcript.

The Panel suggests the University might seek as process benchmarks the experiences of other institutions which have engaged in institution-wide curriculum reviews or reviews of graduate profiles.

> The Panel **recommends** that in order to achieve institution-wide integration of the new Graduate Profile in all programmes, and to enable future students to achieve the graduate attributes, the University considers the areas where the Panel has expressed concern and urgently gives attention to the planning, resourcing and high-level oversight for the project.

---

[64] SR, p 28.

> **3.4 Programme review**
> Universities should have regular reviews of programmes and courses, including external accreditation reviews, which include input from students and other stakeholders and which are used to ensure curriculum quality.

The University has a routine schedule and process for programme reviews, based on the Academic Review Policy and Guidelines. Where possible, accreditation and programme reviews are run in parallel, with the accreditation review panel addressing any additional requirements or terms of reference needed for a University of Canterbury programme review.

Programme reviews are intended to assure the University of the quality of a programme, by assessing whether the programme meets expected standards at the University of Canterbury, nationally and internationally, and to determine ways in which the programme might be improved. Additional objectives may be included which are specific to the programme. The University states that this process facilitates programme benchmarking.[65] The Academic Reviews Policy and Guidelines provide detailed processes and expectations.

The Panel read recent review reports and some follow-up reports. Given the reliance on programme reviews to introduce the new Graduate Profile, the Panel explored how the University ensures review processes are fit for purpose. It was advised that the focus of reviews must be on whether the programme is meeting its graduate outcomes. Review reports are scrutinised by several committees, including the Academic Administration Committee and the Learning and Teaching Committee. The Panel was also told of the importance of the one-year-on follow-up reports which are reviewed by faculties and by the Academic Administration Committee. The follow-up report is referred to other committees for information.

The Panel was satisfied that current programme review processes are robust, currently are fit for purpose and that reviews are carried out routinely as scheduled. The main concern of the Panel was the extent to which responses to recommendations were monitored for implementation and what authority the DVC(A&I) has, as the person responsible for overall academic quality assurance, to impose requirements on a faculty or programme convenor. The Panel suggests some consideration of this step might be advisable as part of the preparation for use of programme reviews in the Graduate Profile project. The Panel also urges the University to consider bringing forward the next schedule of programme reviews in order to meet the timeline of introduction of the new graduate attributes.

> **3.5 Benchmarking programmes**
> Universities should use processes for benchmarking curriculum and assessment standards to ensure they are internationally appropriate. (See also 7.4 re thesis assessment)

A range of benchmarking examples is cited in the Self-review Report, for example staff exchanges and the use of overseas staff for teaching and on review panels; external accreditation of

---

[65] www.canterbury.ac.nz/aqua/programme%20reviews.shtml accessed 04.12.14.

professional programmes; participation in international ranking assessments; joint teaching of programmes. [66]

The University itself assessed that benchmarking is an area needing some attention.[67] In its interviews the Panel heard from staff that benchmarking of curriculum and assessment is "patchy". Few of the examples listed appeared to be initiated as deliberate benchmarking activities. The Panel heard little about benchmarking activity which was grounded in a philosophy or methodology of benchmarking practice.

The Panel noted the University's benchmarking relationship with an Australian university. While this appeared to serve some aspects of benchmarking, the Panel was not convinced that it occurred in any systematic or strategic way. Reliance on a single benchmarking partner might also limit the effectiveness for both parties; it could serve to reinforce complacency rather than provide an aspirational focus.

In the Panel's opinion the University has not addressed the issues raised in the Cycle 4 audit, *viz,* to broaden the range of benchmarking partners and to monitor information gained to ensure it leads to enhancement of, *inter alia,* teaching performance and student learning. No overview strategy or purpose was available to the Cycle 5 Panel, nor did there appear to be any systematic approaches to identifying good practice, risks and challenges or to monitoring the information gained from the activities mentioned in the Self-review Report as benchmarking. On a number of topics canvassed as part of the Cycle 5 audit framework the Panel gained the impression that the University was acting in relative isolation and did not appear to have sought or taken opportunities to explore practices in other institutions which had grappled with similar academic issues – such as major curriculum and assessment review and the development of opportunities for non-curriculum outcomes. While it understands the University's present need to focus on its internal demands and priorities, the Panel nevertheless saw the University's apparent isolation as a potential risk to meeting contemporary standards and its own objectives.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University articulates a statement of purpose or philosophy of benchmarking for curriculum and assessment; develops a strategy for implementation of benchmarking which includes guidelines as to how the University might make good use of both quantitative and qualitative benchmarked data to reinforce good practice; and explores additional benchmarking partners which might be useful comparators for the strategic initiatives on which the University is embarking.

3.6   Assessment
Universities should use documented procedures for monitoring and moderating assessment processes and standards. (See also 7.4 re thesis assessment)

The Assessment Policy, Principles and Guidelines define the University's expectations for assessment. The Guidelines state that assessment at the University is guided by validity and

---

[66] SR, p 30.
[67] SR, p 29.

reliability, manageability and fairness as core principles. It is expected that staff use these principles when planning, implementing and reviewing assessment tasks and processes.

The Guidelines cover such matters as assessment design, professional assistance available from the Academic Development Group, timing and feedback to students, student workload, management of disruption to assessment and academic integrity. In the Guidelines, moderation is introduced as good practice.[68] Monitoring and moderation are not mandatory and appear to vary widely across the University.

The Academic Development Group undertakes grade analysis which is used by the University for institutional quality assurance. The Panel heard that faculty Deans are alerted to courses with grade outliers, are expected to investigate the reasons for these and, if necessary, require adjustments to grading practice.

The Panel read that the University has a common grading scale. This is defined in the Calendar and also on the University website.[69] It appears that the common grading scale is for the translation of numerical marks to letter grades. It was not apparent to the Panel whether or how the University assured itself of grade parity across the University, or for particular programmes (outside those subject to professional accreditation) between universities.

The Panel did not identify any particular problem that arose because of gaps in moderation and monitoring. However in the interests of establishing good practice it suggests the University encourages moderation to occur where it is currently absent or irregular.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University develops a policy on moderation expectations and establishes agreed guidelines to apply across the institution.

3.7   Equivalence of learning outcomes
Universities should have formal mechanisms to ensure that learning outcomes of students in programmes taught on other campuses and/or with partner institutions, including those which are in other countries, meet the standards expected by the University on its home campus.

The only programmes identified as being taught away from the Christchurch campus are taught as part of on-site programmes in Education and have very small numbers of students involved. The Panel was advised that teaching and assessment are as part of the on-site courses. Given that these are teacher education courses they are also subject to the scrutiny of the professional body (New Zealand Teachers' Council). The Panel therefore did not explore equivalence further.

---

[68] The Assessment Policy, Principles and Guidelines , p 30-31.
[69] www.canterbury.ac.nz/aqua/grading.shtml accessed 04.12.14.

> **3.8   Academic misconduct**
> Universities should use procedures for addressing academic misconduct, including plagiarism and other forms of cheating.

The University has well-developed procedures for the promotion of academic integrity and the management of academic dishonesty. Student responsibility is emphasised, communicated to students via course outlines, School handbooks, assessment cover sheets, in the Student Code of Conduct and in institutional policy (Academic Integrity – Guidance for Staff and Students). Staff responsibilities are also mentioned in the Assessment Guidelines, including a reminder that staff should advise students that assessments may be scrutinised for academic integrity through the use of appropriate software applications such as Turnitin. The Panel heard that closer guidance on the use of Turnitin might be appreciated by staff.

The processes to be followed in the event of suspected plagiarism or cheating are laid out clearly.[70] The University considers its processes for detection of dishonesty to be effective but notes these rely on the vigilance of academic staff.[71] From the interviews the Panel concluded that the definitions, processes, and penalties were well understood, as was the distinction between deliberate dishonesty and poor academic practice and how these might be addressed by staff.

Students who were interviewed were also well aware of the definition, detection mechanisms and penalties involved with respect to dishonesty. There is an appeal procedure and the UCSA provides an advocacy and support service for students appealing a dishonesty decision.

The University provides workshops for students through the Academic Skills Centre, information on the Learn website and information is provided by the Library on how to avoid plagiarism.[72] These all depend on students choosing to access the resources. The University has no institution-wide academic integrity educational activity of the kind which is being increasingly considered as good practice elsewhere. The Panel did not, however, identify any specific need for this to be a priority at Canterbury.

> **3.9   Assessment in te reo Māori**
> Universities should have and, where appropriate, use procedures to facilitate assessment in te reo Māori.

The University's "Assessed Work in Māori" Policy states that a student may submit work in te reo Māori except where another language (including English) is specified. The Policy provides appropriate guidelines regarding notice of intention to submit in te reo Māori, arrangements regarding appointment of translators and guidelines for translation, and the right to appeal.

---

[70] Academic Integrity – Guidance for Staff and Students. Also
www.canterbury.ac.nz/regulations/general/other_regs_discipline.shtml;
www.canterbury.ac.nz/regulations/general/general_regs_dishonest_practice.shtml accessed 04.12.14.
[71] SR, p 34.
[72] www.library.canterbury.ac.nz/services/ref/plagiarism.shtmlm accessed 04.12.14.

The PhD Guidelines advise that a thesis may be submitted in te reo Māori and that candidates wishing to submit and defend a thesis in te reo Māori must seek approval at the time of enrolment. A recommendation is made by the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori) or nominee as to the candidate's fluency and literacy in te reo Māori in the thesis subject-area and the likelihood of being able to find appropriately qualified examiners for the thesis.

The University comments that in the last two years only two pieces of assessment and no theses have been submitted in te reo Māori.

The Panel saw no issues with the University's policies and documented processes.

4.   Student Engagement and Achievement

The University of Canterbury's Vision is of *people prepared to make a difference – tangata tū, tangata ora.* Among the 2013-2017 goals intended to achieve the Vision the University lists creation and maintenance of an outstanding teaching and learning environment, including "a wide range of innovative initiatives to support student learning".[73] The most recent 2014-2015 goals highlight enhancement of the student experience (Goal 1), referring *inter alia* to a number of objectives canvassed in this audit, for example Māori and Pacific student achievement, quality assured teaching, progress on the graduate profile and an e-learning strategy. The University aims to "define and develop a student centred culture".[74] These goals all relate to student engagement. UC's graduates are intended to be people "whose learning takes place well beyond libraries, lecture theatres and laboratories". [75]

4.1   Student engagement
Universities should use processes for monitoring and enhancing students' engagement with their study and learning.

The Self-review Report states that student engagement has been a "strong focus" for the University and that many processes are in place to monitor and enhance student engagement. The Panel is aware of the significant contribution of students during the immediate aftermath of the earthquakes, and is mindful that such an achievement is likely to have reinforced engagement with the University as well as with the community. However the Panel did not receive evidence that this engagement continued to flow over into students' engagement with their study and learning. It was of interest to hear from several interviewees that the student profile at the University of Canterbury had shifted, with a combination of students from outside the region who chose Canterbury in full knowledge of the challenges it faces and the opportunities such challenges might provide, alongside students who have endured disruption to study and personal lives for four years, in some cases through much of their secondary school careers. If this student profile is common across the University the Panel suggests it probably has implications for student engagement which differ from those at most other universities.

Non-academic staff discussed student engagement in ways which were meaningful and referred to research underway to gain an improved understanding of student experience and facilitators of engagement. The Learning and Teaching Plan 2013-2017 identifies a variety of activities which should support student engagement. It is not clear whether the different initiatives described in the Self-review Report are a direct consequence of the Learning and Teaching Plan, and are thus strategic initiatives, or have been introduced independently of it. The Report refers to orientation, blogs and e-news for students, mentoring programmes (see sections 2.2 and 4.2), personal academic advisers in one faculty, college-initiated social activities for students, as well as seminars and workshops. The Panel was pleased to read that the University established a "Halls Without Walls"

---

[73] SP 2013-2017, pp 1; 4.
[74] SP 2014, p 2.
[75] SP 2014, p 2.

programme in 2013 to cater for students living outside university accommodation, providing sporting and social activities and academic support. [76]

Emphasis was placed on technological tools which are in place or proposed to assist staff to monitor student engagement at an individual level or within groups. LearnTrak learning management software enables staff to monitor in real time students' online behaviour in a course with respect to access to resources and activities. The data which are available in LearnTrak are drawn from the previous night's logs. The facility enables staff to view patterns and changes in student online behaviour.[77] The University is also investigating the use of the Course Signals tool which will enable students to compare their own performance with that of a previous cohort.[78] The Panel supports the introduction of such a tool which allows students themselves to take responsibility for monitoring their progress. Introduction of a co-curricular transcript, being trialed in 2014, will also serve as a verified record of student engagement in co-curricular or non-academic activities (see section 3.3). The intention is that students will nominate the primary skill gained from an experience and identify the graduate attribute against which they wish the experience to be recorded. Such involvement is likely to enhance student engagement.

The Learning and Teaching Plan refers to use of AUSSE and other data to monitor and identify areas for enhancement. The Panel discussed monitoring with staff. It understands that while the University has relied on the AUSSE since 2008 it is currently considering alternatives in light of the withdrawal of some participating universities from the programme, and hence reduced value of the data for benchmarking. The University has in-house survey research capability within the Academic Development Group, and this has been used to monitor (in particular) postgraduate student experience (see section 7.5). The Panel supports the suggested introduction of a similar university experience survey to capture undergraduate experience. This could include aspects of the AUSSE and could potentially be a basis for benchmarking with other universities.

Other institutional research on retention, achievement and migration (from one programme to a different programme) provides rich data but it was not clear to the Panel whether or how these data are used to inform discussions about student engagement or to identify areas where there is a need for attention to student engagement.

> The Panel **affirms** the University's activities to enhance student engagement and, in particular, supports the introduction of a co-curricular transcript.

4.2   Retention and completion
Universities should use processes for assisting the retention, academic success and completion rates for particular groups, including Māori and international students.

As noted above, the University has appropriate institutional data on the retention, completion and achievement of target groups. For first year students, retention analysis includes retention proportions by achievement (i.e. NCEA score and university GPA), programme of study, ethnicity and

[76] SR, pp 36-37.
[77] http://learn.canterbury.ac.nz/course/view.php?id=26&section=14 accessed 05.12.14.
[78] SR, p 36.

part-time/full-time status. Selected programme data are benchmarked against institutional measures. The reports show that disaggregation is possible by College and by programme. The reports thereby provide data which might be useful in identifying groups at greatest risk of attrition.[79] The Panel read that such reports are discussed in different committees and also that analyses may be commissioned by departments, faculties and colleges as well as by the Senior Management Team. Written memos were shared with the Panel demonstrating attempts at ensuring wide dissemination of analyses. The Panel did not learn what action is taken as a result of these reports.

A proposed enhancement in the Self-review Report is to increase retention of the year 1 cohort into year 2 by 2017. The report does not indicate what strategies are in place or intended to achieve the retention objective: in the Learning and Teaching Plan the objective is the same as the output with responsibility delegated to College PVCs, Faculty Deans and the Student Success Manager.

The University provides a variety of resources to assist students with disabilities, including services for students with a temporary impairment.[80] Students who register with the service are assessed and a Learning Support Plan provided. The Plan is shared with departments in which the student is studying. The University reports that the number of students registering with the Disability Support Services in 2012 was a 36% increase on numbers in 2010.[81] The Panel heard that the service is well regarded by users.

The University refers to funds used to assist students for whom financial hardship might be an impediment to retention. With UCSA, the University offers scholarships, grants and recoverable loans.[82]

UC Pathways is a two-year programme that combines learning and life skills to help first year students to transition to University study and develop the essential skills needed to succeed. It includes a credit-bearing course which teaches critical thinking, academic reading, writing and research, as well as course planning and peer learning opportunities.[83] UC Pathways is intended to assist students from cohorts which have previously demonstrated high rates of attrition (the University identifies Māori, low-achieving school leavers and mature students).[84]

Most of the services outlined in Chapter 2 (section 2.2) to assist Māori and Pacific students with their transition to university study also serve them in their ongoing study, with the intention of assisting their retention and access. The Panel discussed the Cycle 4 recommendation that the University provides a "marae complex" on campus and accepted the reasoning behind a decision not to do so, including the Ngāi Tahu preference for the University to use community-based marae when this was necessary for ceremonial occasions or hui. The University does provide two dedicated study and

---

[79] Attrition Matters, 2013 report; Migration – Benefit or Barrier? 2014 report; Retention, migration and attrition of 2013 freshers report; retention of 2013 freshers into first semester 2014 report. Confidential reports.
[80] www.canterbury.ac.nz/disability/ accessed 05.12.14.
[81] SR, p 47.
[82] SR, p 39.
[83] www.canterbury.ac.nz/prospective/ucpathways/ accessed 05.12.14.
[84] SR, p 38.

social spaces for Māori students, Te Whare Ākonga o te Akatoki and Te Puna i Te Ora. The Panel appreciated the frank discussion it had with staff about the need for more support for Māori students. The Panel observes that considerable progress has been made since the Cycle 4 audit.

The Pacific Development Team is sensitive to the fact that the University of Canterbury is a university in the Pacific. The University has a Pasifika Students' House and other spaces for Pacific students to study and learn informally. The Panel was told of the desire by many Pasifika students to learn about their cultural heritage and history. It also heard that students who are successful at university can be expected to make a difference for their (Pacific) communities. The Panel was pleased to hear of research and critique on Pasifika needs and support, and also of the linkages the Pacific Teams has with other universities, both nationally and internationally, to share good practice and enable postgraduate students to share their research. The energy and commitment evident from this team was impressive.

The 2013 University report on attrition shows that the retention rate for Pasifika students from 2012 to 2013 approximated that for New Zealand Pākehā, but that for Māori students was much lower.[85] In 2014 the academic performance (GPA and pass rates) for Māori and Pasifika fresher students was below that for the total fresher group. However the retention of Māori students had improved quite markedly.[86]

> The Panel **commends** the University on the extensive range of support activities which is provided for pre-tertiary, undergraduate and postgraduate Pasifika students and on the dedication of the Pacific Development Team to the participation and success of Pasifika students.

4.3   Feedback to students
Universities should use processes for providing feedback to students on their academic progress (see also 7.3 re thesis students).

The Assessment Policy, Principles and Guidelines provide guidance for staff on giving feedback to students on their academic achievement at course level. The Calendar Regulations also specify a number of requirements in relation to feedback on student assessment, in particular a requirement that tests and other assessment must normally be returned to students within 4 weeks of the date of submission or assessment, "with sufficient oral or written information to allow students to form an accurate appraisal of their performance".[87] There was no indication that feedback in such cases did not meet the 4 week guideline in the regulations.

---

[85] Attrition matters – retention, migration and attrition of the 2012 fresher population. Confidential report, 2013, p 4.
[86] Retention, Performance and Composition of the 2013 Freshers. Confidential report, 2014. The term "fresher" is used to refer only to students who are undertaking the first year of degree-level study in any tertiary institution.
[87] www.canterbury.ac.nz/regulations/general/general_regs_course_work.shtml accessed 05.12.14.

The Self-review Report refers to other mechanisms for giving feedback, such as online quizzes and electronic submission (and return) of assessment.

Students reported dissatisfaction with timing of assessment which did not enable them to use it to inform subsequent study. This issue is common for courses of short duration; there is no simple solution which balances the time required for reasonable preparation and the time available subsequently for formative feedback and response. The issue should prompt some reflections on assessment practices for individual staff. Apart from occasional problems such as those reported above, the Panel did not identify any major problems regarding feedback to students on their academic progress. Some students reported that feedback commonly occurred more quickly than the guidelines required.

The University does not currently have electronic systems whereby students may monitor their overall progress in a programme themselves, but the Panel understands these are being investigated (see also section 4.1).

4.4   Under-achieving students
Universities should use processes for identifying and assisting students at risk of under-achieving.

Students who are at risk of under-achieving are identified via the cohort analyses referred to in section 4.2. The programmes and processes which the University states are designed to recognise, support and advance underachieving students include the LearnTrak tool (see section 4.1) and the UC Pathways programme (see section 4.2). Staff warned of the need for vigilance to ensure targeting for the UC Pathways programme does not translate into lower expectations for those students. A "Ghostbusters" programme which identifies and contacts students who had enrolled in a course but not attended or who are at risk of an academic progress review (see below) is a good initiative. Such students are offered support and in some cases are enrolled in "bespoke" courses of study.

Actual (as distinct from potentially) under-achieving students are defined in the Unsatisfactory Academic Progress Regulations in terms of low GPA, not meeting professional requirements, failure to pass more than half their courses or "they have otherwise failed to demonstrate any likelihood of success".[88] The procedures used by the University to review and address poor academic progress, and the avenues available to students to address any decision taken about their study, are available to students via the Academic Quality Assurance Unit website.[89] While exclusion is one possible outcome from an academic progress review, other options include restrictions on study load and provision of advice regarding assistance which is available.

In its Self-review Report the University did not specifically mention students who might not be failing but might still be under-achieving. However, it does refer to the Certificate in University Preparation and to the Science Headstart summer preparatory programme as ways in which students might be assisted to achieve, either by enhancing their English language skills or by providing bridging

---

[88] www.canterbury.ac.nz/regulations/general/general_regs_academic_progress.shtml accessed 05.12.14.
[89] www.canterbury.ac.nz/aqua/academic%20progress.shtml accessed 05.12.14.

preparation in science subjects. Without such programmes these students are likely to be at risk of under-achieving relative to their ability. The inclusion of study skills in credit courses (see section 4.2) is another mechanism provided by the University whereby potentially under-achieving students might be helped to reach their potential.

4.5   High-achieving students
Universities should use processes for identifying and supporting high-achieving, and/or potentially high-achieving, students.

High-achieving students are identified for the award of prizes and scholarships, including scholarships for specific groups (e.g. for Pasifika) and ranging from new entrants (e.g. UC Emerging Leaders and Dux scholarships) to postgraduate. Eligibility for direct entry to professional study also recognises high-achieving school leavers in relevant disciplines.

Other initiatives are at the discretion of individual Colleges and departments/schools. In one College high-achieving undergraduates receive a contribution towards tuition fees as well as an academic mentor, participation in interdisciplinary masterclass events and dedicated study space. Faculty deans and department heads commonly send congratulatory and encouraging letters to students who have performed well; this consideration might include students who are not top students but have shown significant improvement.

The University proposes that Colleges should engage more systematically with high-achieving students and potentially high-achieving students to identify further opportunities to support and extend them.[90] The Panel supports this initiative and encourages the University to find ways of sharing the good practices that currently occur in Departments and Colleges.

---

[90] SR, p 43.

5.   Student Feedback and Support

> **5.1   Academic appeals and grievances**
> Universities must have policies and/or procedures which they use to address academic appeals and grievances.

University regulation "GCER O: Appeals and Grievances" outlines a student's right of appeal, and the steps and procedures for the resolution of appeals and grievances.[91] The Academic Appeals and Grievances Principles and Procedures document processes in more detail. Further information is publicly available on the website "How to raise a concern", including the steps a student may take towards resolution.[92]

Appeal procedures advise that an attempt at informal resolution should be the initial step. Academic appeals are addressed at various levels depending on their nature. A general principle is that appeals should be determined at the level above that where the decision being appealed was taken (i.e. if the appeal is against a decision made by a Head of Department/School then the appeal is decided by the Dean of the Faculty or (for a PhD matter) by the Dean of Postgraduate Research). If an appeal cannot be resolved at that point then it is referred to the next level of authority, which might ultimately be the Academic Appeals Committee chaired by the DVC(A&I) or, as a final step, the Council Appeals Committee. The Panel learned that the Academic Quality Assurance Unit provides regular workshops for staff on management of appeals, grievances and complaints.

The University provides a grievances coordinator as a point of contact and to oversee appeals and grievances processes. The Panel was told that information about how to appeal a grade is usually included in course outlines. College academic advisers and Health Centre staff might also advise students presenting to them with a grievance. Students may access support and advocacy from UCSA, which has useful guidance on its website.[93] This confidential service offers a student help with:

- navigating the correct University appeals and complaints processes;
- concern, complaint and appeal letter writing;
- locating and understanding the appropriate University regulations and policies;
- helping to understand all options and avenues for resolution;
- advising on what evidence may be required for an appeal or complaint;
- facilitating the communication between the student and the University;
- attending meetings as a support person or advocate and assisting with appeals.[94]

Formal appeals committees include a student member.

The Panel reviewed the 2013 annual report to Council on appeals, grievances and discipline matters. It was told that appointment of a central Grievances Coordinator and reviews of processes had led to improvements in recent years, including a reduction in the time taken for a resolution to be

---

[91] 2013 Calendar pp 54-55.
[92] www.canterbury.ac.nz/concerns/resolve/begin.shtml accessed 06.12.14.
[93] ucsa.org.nz/support/appeals/ accessed 06.12.14.
[94] www.canterbury.ac.nz/concerns/resolve/begin.shtml accessed 06.12.14.

reached.[95] The Panel was confident that the University's processes are robust, that particular care is taken to ensure students are treated fairly and that there is monitoring of outcomes at the highest level.

5.2   Learning support
Universities should provide opportunity for all students to access appropriate learning support services, including specialised learning support services for international students and others with particular needs. (See also 4.2 and 5.4)

The University has a wide range of support services to assist students to achieve. Students who were interviewed gave positive accounts of the learning support services which are available from the Academic Skills Centre, and of the mentoring programmes. These include workshops and seminars for students at all levels of study, a 10-minute drop-in service, and individual pre-booked consultations (see also section 7.2 re. resources for postgraduate students). The Panel heard that the Academic Skills Centre staff participate in orientation, teaching students on the spot with one aim being to demystify university study. Staff teach in the Halls of Residence. The Academic Skills Centre also has specialised learning advisers for students with disabilities and for Māori and Pasifika students.

Tutoring is provided across the University and in the Halls of Residence. Some of this is delivered through faculty-based students' societies. Māori and Pasifika students may access free tutoring through the Pacific Academic Solutions and Success (PASS) and Te Puna Matauraka programmes. These programmes focus on study skills, academic writing and language and discourse specific to particular disciplines in ways which take into account the effect of students' cultural practices.[96]

UC Skills is a web-based resource that involves the Learning Skills Centre, the Library and the Mathematics and Statistics Department. Resources can be accessed online.[97] In addition to access from the UC Skills page, students can access them with a single click from the Learn homepage. The statistics provided to the Panel indicate that the total number of students accessing the Academic Skills Centre doubled between 2011 and 2014, in part due to the increase in embedded teaching within UC courses (in 27 courses in 2011; 66 courses in 2014). The Panel was told that a third of all students use Academic Skills Centre services or resources.

Other learning support services available to students have been detailed in sections 2.2 and 4.2.

> The Panel **commends** the University on its learning and academic skills support services, their accessibility and acceptability to students and on the initiative taken by staff to ensure relevance and effectiveness.

---

[95] SR, p 44.
[96] SR, p 45.
[97] www.lps.canterbury.ac.nz/lsc/ accessed 05.12.14.

> **5.3   Personal support and safety**
> Universities must provide safe and inclusive campus environments and should provide
> opportunity for all students to access appropriate pastoral and social support services.

From its interviews, the Panel deduced that the University has put considerable effort into ensuring the campus is a safe environment and provides effective processes for ensuring the health and safety of staff, students and visitors. Consideration currently includes awareness of close to 1,000 remediation workers on campus with major construction work occurring. In its own assessment the University considered that it exceeds the Guideline expectation.[98] Students who were interviewed confirmed that they felt safe and that security staff are visible and helpful.

Among the evidence the University cites in support of its own assessment are a campus Urban Search and Rescue Team, the campus Safety Escort Service and a rapid response unit for medical emergencies on campus. All security staff are trained in first aid and use of a defibrillator. The University has a campus-wide network of "blue light" emergency call and mass communications posts where people can seek help and where information can be received and disseminated rapidly if necessary. The primary response for any security incident is UC Security who also provide tips for safety on campus (for example, recommended walking routes at night).[99]

A Student Critical Incident Group, chaired by the Student Success Manager and comprising staff from various student support services, the residential halls and the New Zealand Police, is charged with ensuring that any student "of concern" is identified, monitored and supported.[100] This group developed the Student Emergency Management Plan, which is a companion document to the University's Emergency Management Plan. It documents processes to be followed in responding to a student emergency, defined as "unplanned or unforeseen traumatic event affecting a student or students which has an impact upon UC, its staff, its students and the wider community."[101] Students are surveyed on their perspective of provisions for their safety.[102]

Personal support appears to be well provided for. Some of these services are provided by UCSA – advocacy; financial hardship grants; foodbank; childcare/early learning centres; an emergency dental scheme; cafes and social spaces. UCSA also owns a 50% share of the University Bookshop. In addition to the academic support services already mentioned, the University provides a health and counselling service; careers, internships and employment support and a student-focussed gym and recreation centre. Chaplaincy services are provided by the Canterbury Tertiary Education Chaplaincy Committee.[103] A Joint Operations Advisory Board which includes student representatives informs University decisions about service provision. The Panel was pleased to see the University's accountability in evidence through the documentation of services funded by the compulsory student

---

[98] SR, p 46.
[99] www.fm.canterbury.ac.nz/operational/security/security.shtml#tips accessed 06.12.14.
[100] UC Emergency Response Plan, June 2014, p 61.
[101] www.canterbury.ac.nz/emergency/plans.shtml accessed 01.10.14.
[102] http://cantmd.canterbury.ac.nz/limesurvey/index.php?sid=64&lang=en accessed 06.12.14.
[103] www.canterbury.ac.nz/chaplains/fit.shtml accessed 23.12.14.

services levy in the Annual Report.[104] The University has three proctors (academic staff) who deal with discipline matters.

From its discussions the Panel concluded that the relationship between UCSA and the University with respect to service provisions was harmonious and effective. There also seemed to be a good relationship between student support staff and health and counselling staff, with referrals being made in both directions. The Panel was told that there appeared to be a rising demand for counselling services and that support staff needed to be proactive in their follow-up of such cases.

> The Panel **commends** the University and UCSA on the extensive and effective provision of services and facilities which enhance safety, support and personal wellbeing on campus, and in particular the proactive role played by UC Security in providing a safe campus for all staff, students and visitors.

5.4   Support on other campuses

Universities should have formal mechanisms to ensure appropriate learning and pastoral support is provided for students in programmes taught on other campuses and/or with partner institutions, including those which are in other countries.

Given the small numbers of University staff and students on sites outside Christchurch the Panel did not explore this matter in any detail. It read that host campuses have memoranda of understanding with the University whereby students are provided with access to facilities and support services, including library and computer lab use, access to the study skills services and health facilities (if available). All regional distance students are also able to access the UC Support Services offered in Christchurch. Māori and Pasifika Development teams, Student Support, Disabilities Resource Service and Academic Skills Centre teams all personally visit the regions at the beginning of the year to introduce the students to the services. The Distance Learning Coordinator in the College of Education is the point of contact for these students.[105]

On the basis of what it read the Panel is satisfied that provisions made for these students are realistic.

5.5   Feedback from students

Universities should use processes for gaining feedback on student satisfaction with teaching, courses and student services and should be able to demonstrate that feedback is used to inform improvement initiatives. (See also 7.5 re thesis students)

The main means of gaining systematic feedback from students are the teaching and course surveys and other user surveys (e.g. the safety survey referred to in section 5.3), the UCSA-run class representative system, focus groups and through student representation on key committees. The

---

[104] AR, pp 82-83.
[105] SR, pp 48-49.

AUSSE has also served to provide feedback on some areas. The University provided evidence of initiatives undertaken as a result of student feedback through these avenues.

The Panel explored the use of teaching and course surveys in some detail. Currently course surveys are three-yearly and are administered electronically. The Panel was alerted to some concerns about the teaching and courses surveys. It was told by both staff and students that there is survey fatigue, that response rates are low and that, as a result, the electronic surveys are unpopular with a number of academic staff. Course and teaching surveys are administered by the Centre for Evaluation and Monitoring (CEM) within the College of Education. While it learned that since the Cycle 4 audit the University has explored different survey mechanisms for course and teaching surveys and different frequencies of surveying, the Panel also deduced that the current arrangements have led to some constraints on new initiatives. It notes that advice on the design, administration and analysis of other surveys is provided by the Academic Development Group.[106]

Results of course surveys are returned to the course co-ordinator. Students reported that they had little feedback as to how survey data are used. While staff observed that students do not always know what impact their survey responses have had, staff also indicated that for many courses surveyed the feedback loop was not closed and students were probably never told of the impacts.

The University is aware that it needs to resolve the current problems and has a relevant proposed enhancement.[107] Staff shared initial ideas of potential arrangements when the current contract for this service with CEM expires. The Self-review Report states that two working groups (one technical, one academic) were giving the matter priority in 2014. The Learning and Teaching Committee also has responsibilities in this area.[108] The cross-university Online Student Survey Reference Group which oversees survey quality and scheduling of campus-wide surveys is a good initiative and should be able to address some of the issues raised. The challenge of low response rates is one which other universities also experience. Opportunities for benchmarking good practice could be explored.

Issues related to teaching surveys are discussed in section 6.3.

The class representative system is run by UCSA. Its website includes a site for feedback by students to their class representatives.[109] UCSA also sets itself up as the first port of call for students with problems. The service operates within the University's Policy and Guidelines (see section 5.1). The Panel concluded that the class representative system is well used throughout the University. Although some students were vague about the role of class representatives, most students who were interviewed felt that for most courses they were effective and their voice was heard.

UCSA also runs workshops to get student feedback and shares results with senior management. The Panel read that actions are followed up by student support staff and/or senior management.

---

[106] SR, p 51.
[107] SR, p 51.
[108] SR, p 51.
[109] http://ucsa.org.nz/classreps/ accessed 29.09.14.

From the examples it examined, the Panel concluded that the University provides good opportunity for students to give feedback but that uptake is sometimes poor and feedback to students needs attention.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University expedite the reviews of cross-institutional course and teaching surveys, paying attention to the weaknesses and strengths of the current systems and to prevailing good practice and institutional developments in student surveying both nationally and internationally.

5.6   Feedback from graduates
Universities should use processes for gaining feedback from graduates regarding their satisfaction with their university experience and learning outcomes and should be able to demonstrate that this feedback is used.

The University has conducted two surveys of graduates and intends to continue these every second year unless there is a particular need to obtain data more frequently. The surveys are administered and analysed by the Academic Development Group in collaboration with the Careers, Internships and Employment team.[110] These Graduate Destination Surveys are focussed primarily on employment. They seek information on:

- the role of their qualification in assisting the graduate to gain employment;
- activities and experiences at University that might have assisted them in gaining employment;
- skills gained from study useful in their current employment;
- what the University did well to prepare them for employment;
- what the University could have done better to prepare them for employment.

Response rates have been relatively good (38% and 49%). Reports from the surveys were viewed by the Panel. Analyses include tabulations of industry group by academic qualification; income by qualification, field of study etc; and future intentions.[111] Subject-specific reports are produced on request. Reports are distributed widely across the University and to external stakeholders.[112]

The University should be mindful that with the introduction of the new Graduate Profile it will be sensible to include questions relating to specific graduate attributes in future surveys.

Graduate input is also sought for programme and accreditation reviews and for particular projects initiated by departments (see also section 3.4).

> The Panel **affirms** the University's Graduate Destination Survey and the use made of resultant analyses, and suggests the University extends the survey and analyses to include specific reference to attributes in the Graduate Profile from when the first cohort which should have acquired these attributes graduates.

---

[110] SR, p 52.
[111] University of Canterbury Graduate Destinations Survey 2013.
[112] SR, p 52.

6. Teaching Quality

Goal 4.1 in the University's 2013-2017 Draft Strategic Plan is to "attract and retain an appropriate number of high quality motivated, flexible, enthusiastic, resilient staff at all levels who demonstrate respect for one another and contribute to UC's vision and strategic direction".[113] The Goals of the 2014-2015 Plan refer to engagement and development of staff.[114] In both plans a target or indicator of progress towards these goals is a voluntary staff turnover of academic staff of less than 5%. The Panel was told this target is currently being met.

In 2013 the University reported a staff profile as (FTE):[115]

Academic	740
Professional service staff	1,167
Total staff	1,907

Academic staff numbers have fallen since the earthquakes, from 833 FTE in 2010 to 740 in 2013, but appeared to be stabilising.[116] The Panel was told that a rebuilding of staff numbers would need to follow student numbers. The Panel has some concerns about the need to also match the future academic staff profile to the University's academic objectives, and how this will be achieved. The Self-review Report notes that the University faces a number of challenges in recruiting appropriately qualified staff, not all of these unique to Canterbury, but states that the challenges are manageable and not considered to be a significant risk. [117] The Panel was pleased to read that since the earthquakes staff have demonstrated a level of enthusiasm, determination and resilience that exceeded expectations.[118] This was reinforced by the comments made by staff from across the University during interviews, who in a number of comments indicated and provided evidence of their commitment to the University.

The Panel's focus in this section of the audit is mainly on the processes the University uses to ensure academic staff are effective in their roles in ensuring good academic quality.

6.1 Staff recruitment and induction

Universities' processes for recruitment and induction should ensure that all teaching staff are appropriately qualified, according to the level(s) at which they will be teaching (i.e. degree level; postgraduate; sub-degree) and that all teaching staff receive assistance to become familiar with their university's academic expectations.

The University has comprehensive processes, including policies, templates and flow charts, to guide the processes of recruitment and induction. A web-based "filing cabinet", accessible to all staff

---

[113] SP 2013-2017, p 12.
[114] SP 2014/2015, p 2.
[115] Academic staff figures from Annual Report 2013, p 3; SR p 83.
[116] SR, p. 83.
[117] SR, p 55.
[118] SR, p 55.

through the intranet, provides a central resource for all HR processes.[119] The Panel heard that some HR staff find the processes over-complicated and that there is an intention to simplify them.

The University has a Qualification Verification and Validation Policy and is confident that staff are appropriately qualified for the positions to which they are appointed. The Panel examined staff qualifications records and verified the University's claim. Selection processes are expected to include work samples and demonstrations of competence by such activities as work samples, research seminars and/or mock lectures.[120] HR provide some support for academic heads with respect to the development of interviewing skills. While the central HR office keeps records of staff qualifications and establishes the recruitment and selection processes to be followed, these are actioned at College level by HR staff who do not report centrally but to College Pro-Vice-Chancellors. The Panel suggests this disjunction is an impediment to quality assurance since there appear to be few opportunities for central oversight or monitoring. The Panel's concern also pertains to other HR activities referred to below.

Once staff are appointed they are offered an induction programme developed by central HR and supported and run by different units within the University. It is expected that academic Heads will work with new recruits to guide them through the programme in a manner which is appropriate to their experience, need and availability. Activities include induction workshops for research, learning and teaching, Library, thesis supervision, and Tangata Tū, Tangata Ora as well as on administrative matters.[121] The "Starting at UC" part of the HR toolkit is available to assist Heads with the induction process.

The induction process for new academic recruits spans a five year period. The Panel heard that a Career Planning workshop, attended by staff from other institutions as well as from Canterbury, has had 137 attendees since 2007. In the second year of appointment the induction guidelines recommend staff new to academia participate in an Early Career Academic Mentoring Programme which has involved 116 pairings between 2008 and 2014. The feedback provided to the Panel was positive. Beyond this, the University suggests new staff be involved in professional development programmes provided by the Academic Development Group and by HR Learning and Development Unit, and the Postgraduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching (see section 6.4).

The Self-review Report comments that as the above five-year induction plan is still in its introductory period there is no outcome evaluation available. Feedback is elicited through surveys; performance reviews and promotion applications might also give an indication of induction effectiveness.[122]

Central HR provides the resources for induction but the Panel was told that apart from the workshops which it runs itself and occasional surveys it has no means of overall monitoring as to whether induction occurs, or how effective it is.

---

[119] https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/hr/toolkit/index.shtml accessed 07.12.14.
[120] SR, p 54.
[121] Academic Staff Induction and Development Programme, p 4.
[122] SR, p 55.

The University provides some induction and support for staff moving into academic head positions, but this is optional and was not familiar to a number of the staff interviewed who might have been expected to be aware of it. The documentation for Academic Head Induction states that briefing sessions are to be arranged by the Head's administrator in association with the PVC's PA and should ideally occur within the first month of appointment. As with new academic staff, the central HR office provides resources for Head induction but the initiative for this to occur resides in the College. HR also provides workshops and programmes for new and aspiring managers and team leaders.[123] From its interviews the Panel concluded that both formal and informal opportunities provided by PVCs to support Heads and the activities offered to assist Heads' induction were highly variable across and within Colleges. The Panel heard that the University had previously had a comprehensive central programme but that currently initiatives depend on prompting by a PVC or collegial support from academic peers. In the Panel's view this is not sufficient to ensure Heads are appropriately equipped and supported for their roles.

> The Panel **affirms** the induction processes for new academic staff and supports continued strengthening and evaluation to ensure fitness for purpose.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University reviews the range and usefulness of its formal activities to induct and support academic Heads, strengthening these where necessary and making them compulsory for staff new to the role.

6.2   Research-active staff
Universities' workload management processes should ensure that degree-level students are taught mainly by staff who are research-active.

The management of academic staff workload is guided by the Allocation of Academic Activities and Establishing Academic Staff Workload Policy, introduced in 2013. The purpose of the Policy is two-fold:

- to ensure that every employee of the University on an academic agreement has an equitable, reasonable and safe workload that is regularly reviewed in consultation with the employee;

- to ensure that the University has processes in place that lead to the responsible deployment of academic expertise, which is the University's key resource.

The Policy indicates expectations of the University, of departments/schools and of individuals for the identification, allocation and accounting of academic activities. It recognises that academic activities are variable and have distinctive characteristics that vary with time and context within the campus.

Each department/school is expected to develop processes to identify academic requirements and allocate activities to individual staff at least annually. The Head of Department/School or nominee responsible for allocating the workload is asked to ensure:

---

[123] https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/hr/toolkit/02_starting_uc/induct_head/index.shtml; https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/ld/ accessed 07.12.14.

- the staff member is given the time to research;
- the research is relevant to teaching (research informed teaching).

The Policy differentiates required and approved activity of a staff member. Required academic activities are those identified within each department/school (for example, core components of teaching programmes, maintenance of key research programmes, and essential administrative and representational activities). Approved activities are those initiated by individual staff to complement and extend departmental/school programmes, to develop new strengths, or to enhance personal capabilities. Individually initiated activities are approved through negotiation with an individual's Head of Department/School (HOD/S). The Policy states that academic work plans need to recognise both required and approved activities if they are to be realistic, fair and achievable. While some staff referred to a nominal 40/40/20 workload guideline, the University does not dictate a workload formula but comments that quantitative measures to allocate duties are only a partial approach to accounting for academic activities.

It was clear to the Panel that the staff it interviewed were well-qualified and committed to their research. However it was also apparent that since the earthquakes some staff have experienced less time available for research as this got squeezed out, or into personal time, as a consequence of higher teaching and administration loads. This undoubtedly reflects a prioritisation within departments and schools to keeping the University's core teaching sustainable in a period of unusual focus on recovery and a context of atypical constraints.

Workload practices were reported to be "mostly consistent" across the University. This is another aspect which is not monitored centrally by HR (the Panel was advised that it had become a responsibility within Finance). The HR department thus has no formal avenue for identifying unreasonable anomalies, or for assuring itself of the quality and appropriateness of practices, even though that department is responsible for the Workload Policy.[124] (See Recommendations p49).

6.3 Teaching quality
Universities should use processes for assessing teaching quality and for monitoring and enhancing individual teaching capability of all teaching staff. (See also 6.5, and 7.1 re thesis supervision).

The University cites teaching surveys, professional development and review, and peer review as its main means of assessing teaching quality. The Panel heard that neither peer review nor the teaching surveys is mandatory, except for promotions purposes. However the Teaching and Course Surveys Policy states that a Lecturer **must** seek systematic feedback over a three-year period on the full range of his/her significant teaching contributions (original emph.)

---

[124] Allocation of Academic Activities and Establishing Academic Staff Workload Policy.

The Teaching and Course Surveys Policy outlines policy, procedures and general guidelines for administering course and teaching surveys.[125] Summaries of teaching surveys are sent to the lecturer concerned along with the student responses. A copy of the summary is also sent to the lecturer's Head of Department/School.

Peer review is managed at school or departmental level and is linked to the mentoring programme run by HR (see section 6.1). Both peer reviews and teaching survey data are considered during the staff member's Performance Development and Review (PD&R), as well as during consideration for promotion. PD&R processes are part of the HR toolkit.[126] They are intended to be continuous throughout the year, rather than confined to a single evaluation session. However the Policy states that as a minimum, each staff member should have an annual discussion with his or her manager (or delegate). Managers have a responsibility to make sure this process takes place.[127]

The PD&R Policy states that the overall facilitation of the PD&R process is the responsibility of the Director of Human Resources. In conjunction with College HR staff, central HR maintains the systems; coordinates training and support for managers and staff involved; conducts periodic audits of the PD&R process; and develops and executes plans for on-going improvement. Central HR also provides reports on progress of PD&R activities across the University and provides a learning and development programme to address common development issues that may be raised in the PD&R process.

The formal PD&R processes have been in place for ten years. The policy was described to the Panel as "permissive", implemented at the local school or department level, and not mandatory. The Panel reviewed PD&R completion figures for the most recent year and noted that for academic staff they ranged from 41% to 93% across the five colleges. It learned that senior management wishes to increase PD&R participation, encouraging staff to see it as a right rather than an obligation. The Panel strongly supports this objective.

Although it heard very positive accounts of PD&R experiences from staff who had been through the process, the Panel nevertheless believes that the devolution of responsibility for PD&R processes to schools and departments is an area of risk for the University in assuring academic quality. Effectiveness of the process relies significantly on the commitment and skill of academic Heads, who currently appear to have oversight by College PVCs but are otherwise supported only if they voluntarily avail themselves of the expertise HR provide. While the application of PD&R might well reside within schools or departments, it is the Panel's view that responsibility for ensuring it actually occurs and is effective should lie with a central authority.

The University relies on teaching survey results to provide it with measurable evaluations of teaching quality. Since 2010 it has been reviewing its metrics but this project has been delayed by more urgent attention being placed on such matters as the provision of safe teaching and learning

---

[125] The Self-review Report states that the Policy was under review at the time of the audit. However the Policy itself states that it was reviewed in February 2014, with a subsequent review date of November 2014. This audit report thus refers to the February 2014 policy.
[126] https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/hr/pdr/ accessed 07.12.14.
[127] Professional Development and Review Policy.

spaces.[128] A recent discussion paper (October 2014) which was tabled during the site visit addressed some of the issues of reliance on survey scores as measures of teaching quality. The paper canvassed a variety of means of identifying teaching quality which might be explored within the University.[129] There are two issues of focus for the University: how to define and identify good teaching and how to measure this as might be required for promotion processes. These dual purposes underlie potential tensions between formative and summative measures, which would need to be managed. The Panel was provided with a 2001 document "Teaching and Learning at the University of Canterbury" which outlines the approaches used by effective teachers.[130] Some aspects of quality teaching are also articulated in the criteria for UC Teaching Awards. The ideas in the documents referred to above might inform an agreed institution-wide understanding of what constitutes good quality teaching. This would be a prerequisite for any metrics to be developed.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University reviews the adequacy of its current teaching surveys for evaluating and documenting teaching quality, explores development of a rubric which defines good teaching and considers how this might be translated into meaningful indicators or measures to enable it to monitor and, where needed, improve the quality of teaching across the University.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University considers whether and how peer review might be introduced, encouraged and supported across the University such that it is available for all teaching staff as part of their personal quality assurance regime.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University reviews the structures and mechanisms available at an institutional level for ensuring:
> - that recruitment and induction policies are followed and outcomes evaluated;
> - that there is central oversight of the fairness and strategic appropriateness of workload management practices;
> - that professional development and review practices are consistent across the University and that outcomes are recorded in ways which facilitate ongoing quality assurance of teaching capability.

6.4   Teaching development
Universities should provide opportunities for staff to develop their teaching practice, including application of contemporary pedagogical research, use of learning management systems and use of new technologies.

The University's documents state that the Learning and Teaching Committee is responsible for leading the learning and teaching strategy at the University and for taking a leadership position on quality assured teaching practice. The Committee is also expected to "provide advice on professional development for all teachers throughout their career".[131]

---

[128] SR, pp 56-57.

[129] Supplementary paper: Discussion paper on quality teaching monitoring at the University of Canterbury, and meeting minutes.

[130] http://www.teachlearn.canterbury.ac.nz/documents/teachlearn.pdf accessed 07.12.14.

[131] http://www.teachlearn.canterbury.ac.nz/tlc.shtml accessed 07.12.14.

The Panel was told frequently that there is a strong commitment in the University to support high quality teaching. It was also told on several occasions that the former teaching development unit had been disbanded and responsibility for teaching development devolved to a number of programmes and units. In the Self-review Report the Panel read of programmes offered within the Learning and Development Unit of HR, of the emphasis being placed on the Postgraduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching, of research conducted by the Academic Development Group and of opportunities provided by the annual Teaching Week and by Teaching Development Grants. Apart from the support provided by Flexible Learning Advisers (see section 1.4) and a single academic developer within the Academic Development Group[132], the Panel was unable to find evidence of coordinated professional academic development services at an institutional level.

The programmes cited as being related to teaching and research which are offered by the Learning and Development Unit within Human Resources were
- Research Induction
- Learning and Teaching Induction
- Career Planning for the Early Academic
- Early Career Academic – mentoring programme.[133]

In the Panel's view, these activities provided by HR, while valuable, do not substitute for effective support for the development of teaching practice.

The University is actively encouraging all academic staff to complete teaching qualifications, strongly promoting the Postgraduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching to all academic staff without formal tertiary-focussed teaching qualifications. The Learning and Teaching Plan aims to "introduce incentives for academics to undertake formal study in higher education" with a KPI being 15% of academic staff holding teaching qualifications by the end of 2017. The Panel heard very positive reports of the Postgraduate Certificate programme. However it notes that participation numbers, while encouraging, are very small (26 in 2014, an increase from an average of 5 annually prior to that).[134] Other caveats the Panel would place on reliance on the Postgraduate Certificate to lift teaching quality include the observation that even if it achieves its 2017 target the proportion of staff having had the experience of formal teaching education remains low. The Panel also concurs with a view expressed during interviews that completion of the certificate does not, in itself, imply effective teaching since the Certificate's focus is more on the scholarship of teaching and learning than on teaching practice. Encouragement of the Postgraduate Certificate is a good idea but, like the programmes offered by HR, it does not substitute for institutional teaching development. Furthermore, if a principle of continuing professional development is accepted, the certificate qualification is only one step in the process, albeit an important step for staff without such a qualification. The Panel was also told that the programme is delivered within the College of Education by just two staff.[135] If this is the case, this is a risk to the University, not just with respect to the ongoing ability of the College to maintain adequate staff levels, but also to ensure that the

---

[132] www.adg.canterbury.ac.nz/people/ accessed 10.12.14.
[133] SR, p 58.
[134] SR, p 58.
[135] The University has subsequently advised that in 2014 it had five staff delivering the certificate programme.

design of the programme addresses the University's needs appropriately. In the Panel's view such a small number of staff also poses a risk to overall academic quality assurance of the programme.

The other avenue cited as providing professional development opportunities is the Academic Development Group. The Panel was unable to interview staff from this unit. It understands that only one of these staff is an academic staff member who undertakes pedagogical research and provides teaching support; the other staff members are institutional researchers producing the analyses referred to elsewhere (see sections 2.2 and 4.2).

The University provides contestable Teaching Development Grants for projects aligned with the objectives of the University, College and department learning and teaching plans. A UC Teaching Week held in 2013 and 2014 is a good initiative, though participation to date has been modest. Those who had availed themselves of these opportunities reported positively on them. The Panel's concern is that such activities tend to "preach to the converted". There was no evidence otherwise at Canterbury.

In its interviews with staff the Panel paid close attention to how they gained professional help or learned of new ideas and good teaching practices. It learned that Heads and PVCs tend to be placing significant emphasis on the Postgraduate Certificate, with some stating that it will be mandatory for new appointees. Outside of this, support for teaching improvement tended to be informal and collegial, rather than professionally facilitated. The Panel heard that centralised professional development could prompt a perception of being non-collegial. On the other hand, the Panel heard from teaching staff that it was a widespread view that availability of professional staff to assist with the development of teaching was inadequate. The Panel believes this will become more critical as the new Graduate Profile is developed and introduced.

In sum, the Panel was impressed by the repeated comments, from staff at all levels, that teaching is valued much more at Canterbury than it has been previously. The Panel's concern is that the provision of opportunities for ongoing professional development of teaching, while individually good initiatives, are too narrowly focussed. This poses risks of under-delivery, lack of cross-institutional coordination and of not meeting the needs of staff most in need. The Panel is mindful of the University's existing financial constraints but it considers the risks attached to the current situation are sufficiently high with respect to the University's capacity to deliver on its UC Futures plans that the professional staffing needs must be addressed sooner rather than later.

> The Panel **affirms** the UC Teaching week and the increased support for staff to undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching and encourages the University to explore ways of ensuring wider participation by academic staff across all colleges.

> The Panel **recommends** that the University addresses institution-wide needs for ongoing professional teaching development, including reviewing the role and staffing capability of the Academic Development Group and ensuring that all academic staff have access to assistance with their curriculum development, teaching, assessment and, if necessary, pedagogical research and pedagogically-informed use of IT.

> **6.5   Teaching support on other campuses**
> Universities should have formal mechanisms to ensure appropriate teaching support is provided for staff in programmes taught on other campuses and/or with partner institutions, including those which are overseas.

This Guideline statement was not explored. Only four programmes are taught on other campuses and the Panel understands the small number of staff involved are provided for in Christchurch.

> **6.6   Teaching recognition**
> Universities' reward processes (promotion; special awards) should recognize teaching capability.

The University's main means of recognising and rewarding good teaching are through its promotion processes and teaching awards.

The Panel reviewed promotion criteria and processes. It learned that teaching survey scores are evaluated and that staff are required to submit an "evidence-based commentary" of teaching philosophy.[136] The Panel was also told that the DVC(A&I) had recently been appointed to the promotions committee, in part to ensure teaching was appropriately recognised. Promotion processes appeared appropriate. The Panel was not provided with any information on promotion monitoring but neither did it hear of any concerns from staff.

The University has a well-developed system of institutional teaching awards which has been in place since 2001. As well as six annual awards, a teaching medal is awarded from time to time in recognition of an outstanding and sustained contribution to teaching in the University.[137] The University also has a good record of staff achieving national teaching awards.[138] While the Panel was told that all colleges also have teaching awards, there appeared to be some unevenness in the provision of awards within colleges. The University should assure itself that this unevenness does not result in inequity for some staff.

The Panel heard from a number of sources that there had been significant improvement in the recognition of teaching recently. It supports the initiatives to enhance the recognition of teaching and suggests that closer attention to some of the matters raised in this chapter will assist this objective.

---

[136] SR, p 61.
[137] www.canterbury.ac.nz/aqua/awards/awards.shtml;
www.teachlearn.canterbury.ac.nz/Teaching%20Medal.shtml accessed 08.12.14.
[138] www.teachlearn.canterbury.ac.nz/teaching_other.shtml accessed 08.12.14.

7. Supervision of Research Students

This chapter focuses only on research students, i.e. master's thesis and doctoral students. Responses from taught master's and honours students who were interviewed have been incorporated into previous sections.

In 2013 the University of Canterbury recorded the following profile of postgraduate students:[139]

Taught postgraduate	943 EFTS
Research postgraduate	1,108 EFTS

Of research postgraduate students:

Master's	366 EFTS
Doctoral	742 EFTS

Institutional oversight of postgraduate research resides with the Dean of Postgraduate Research, assisted by two Associate Deans and a small Postgraduate Office. Advice is provided by the Postgraduate Committee, a committee of Academic Board. In addition to being responsible for the award of scholarships, the Postgraduate Committee oversees quality assurance of all thesis procedures and advises the Postgraduate Office on administrative procedures; considers proposals for new postgraduate degrees; makes recommendations for the award of higher doctorates; and assists in the development of the University of Canterbury postgraduate strategy.[140] The Committee is responsible for all doctoral programmes and for Master's thesis programmes. Most schools and departments have a postgraduate coordinator.[141] Faculties also have postgraduate committees, sometimes chaired by an Associate [faculty] Dean, Postgraduate. The University does not have an institution-wide Postgraduate School.

The PhD guidelines and regulations govern all stages of PhD study at the University of Canterbury, from enrolment to graduation.[142] The Postgraduate website is comprehensive, including policies, guidelines and templates related to all aspects of doctoral study.[143] The Masters Thesis Work Policy and Guidelines provide guidance on institutional expectations, while recognising that regulations for Master's programmes are within the respective faculty regulations. A website provides an introduction to master's thesis study with links to faculty websites.[144] The Research Work for a Masters or PhD Thesis Code of Practice sets out the responsibilities of Heads of Departments/Schools, staff and students.

---

[139] Breakdown provided at the Panel's request 09.12.14.
[140] https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/committee/postgrad/terms.shtml accessed 08.12.14.
[141] SR, p 63.
[142] www.canterbury.ac.nz/postgrad/phd_students/policies.shtml accessed 03.12.14.
[143] www.canterbury.ac.nz/postgrad/ accessed 08.12.14.
[144] www.canterbury.ac.nz/postgrad/ma_students/ accessed 08.12.14.

> **7.1 Qualification of supervisors**
>
> Universities should use documented processes for ensuring staff supervising research students are appropriately trained and experienced as supervisors, including processes to enable new or inexperienced staff to gain experience as supervisors.

The Doctoral Guidelines state that on approval of the student's research proposal, the Dean of Postgraduate Research shall appoint a senior supervisor. This is normally a member of the University's continuing academic staff, but the Dean may appoint a non-continuing academic staff member as senior supervisor if satisfied that the candidate will receive continuity of supervision for the whole term of the PhD. In addition to the senior supervisor, there shall be a co-supervisor and/or one or more associate supervisors and/or a Supervisory Committee to support the supervisor and candidate. Members of the supervisory team, other than the senior supervisor, may be from outside the department/school in which the candidate is registered, and may be from another university or from outside the university system. Members of the supervisory team are appointed by the Head of Department/School in consultation with the candidate and senior supervisor. There does not appear to be a formal requirement of staff qualifications. However from its examination of staffing records the Panel observed that almost all staff have a PhD or other doctoral qualification.

Before being appointed as senior (primary) supervisor for a PhD student, an academic must complete the thesis supervisor course.[145] The course provides the new Canterbury supervisor with:

- knowledge of the PhD regulations, guidelines and procedures at the University of Canterbury;
- information regarding the nature and importance of thesis supervision;
- participation in peer discussion on supervisory practices, processes, challenges and rewards;
- guided participation and feedback from an experienced supervisory mentor.

Experienced supervisors coming to Canterbury from elsewhere can apply to the Dean of Postgraduate Research for an exemption from some modules. Each staff member who enrols in the course is assigned a supervisory mentor with whom the academic works between the formal workshop sessions.[146] Staff who had been through the course spoke positively about it and about the mentoring available within departments.

For Master's students the most common practice is for a student to have a senior supervisor and one associate supervisor. It is expected that all supervisors will have a research interest and/or methodological expertise relevant to the student's proposed research.[147]

The Panel heard about processes employed both centrally and at department/school level to try and ensure supervision workloads are realistic while at the same time providing for best use of expertise relevant to thesis topics. Six-monthly reports are provided to senior management on staff supervision loads.

---

[145] https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/ld/dev_plan/thesis_supervision/index.shtml accessed 10.12.14.
[146] https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/ld/dev_plan/thesis_supervision/dia.shtml accessed 08.12.14.
[147] Masters Thesis Work Policy and Guidelines, p 4.

The Panel was satisfied that qualifications of supervisors are appropriate, that the University has good processes in place to ensure PhD supervisors become competent and knowledgeable of what is required of them and that supervisory capacity for PhD theses is being monitored.

> **7.2   Resourcing of research students**
>
> Universities should use documented processes for ensuring research students are appropriately resourced to do their research.

The University's Provision of Resources for PhD Students Policy sets out the minimum resources the University agrees to offer, *viz* desk and chair, space with 24 hour access if required, telephone, access to computing and printing, adequate storage space including secure space, and an environment that meets health and safety standards. Colleges are expected to provide additional minimum resources as appropriate to the student's field of study. The Policy states that the existence of minima should not prevent students accessing additional resources.

The Self-review Report acknowledges there are some inconsistencies across the University in the provision of resources, attributing this to the autonomy of colleges to allocate resources devolved to them as they see fit.[148] The observation about variable resources was reinforced by students who were interviewed, who indicated a range of satisfaction levels and perceived variability as inequity. Staff concurred that there are issues around resourcing for thesis students' research. This is a particularly serious issue if resources become unavailable after a student has commenced their research, as the Panel was told happens on occasion. The Resource Policy states clearly that "A student's ability to complete their research should not be compromised by lack of basic requirements through financial constraints".[149] However it would appear that such matters might come to the attention of the Dean of Postgraduate Research or the Postgraduate Office only when a progress report is due. The Panel notes that the PhD is a University degree, not a faculty or College degree, and it would expect the University, as a whole, to determine resourcing practice more directly. The Panel alerts the University to the risks involved in accepting students for studies which the University might not be able to sustain.

The Panel notes that the Resource Minima Policy applies only to PhD thesis students. The Panel encourages the University to explore development of a comparable policy for Master's students, or to accommodating Master's students within the current policy.

Other resources available to research students, such as study skills workshops and Library resources, have been referred to in previous sections. The Panel gained no evidence from either staff or students that these are either inadequate or exceptional. The Panel was pleased to note that the University makes its emergency kit bags available to postgraduate students.[150]

---

[148] SR, p 64.
[149] Provision of Resources for PhD Students Policy, p 2.
[150] UC Emergency Response Plan, June 2014, p 63.

The Panel **recommends** that the University reviews its devolution of responsibility for resources for postgraduate research to Colleges and develops a more detailed set of institutional guidelines to ensure thesis research is not compromised by inadequate initial resourcing or insecure resourcing over the longer term.

7.3   Research supervision
Universities should use documented processes for ensuring supervision of research students is effective and that student progress and support are appropriately monitored.

University of Canterbury PhD candidates undergo a probationary period prior to enrolment confirmation. Within six months of enrolment, a student-supervisor agreement form is submitted on which comment is made about the progress of the proposal. A formal PhD confirmation procedure, usually within twelve months of enrolment, includes submission of a written report and an oral presentation followed by questions.[151] The exact procedures and timing for the confirmation process differ between departments/schools, but candidates must be provided with clear and detailed information about this process.[152] The Panel considered this to be a rigorous process.

The PhD Guidelines set out expectations regarding supervision reports. Six months after the date of confirmation of PhD enrolment, and at intervals of six months thereafter, the supervisors and the student must complete a progress report form. This is submitted by the Head of Department/School to the Dean of Postgraduate Research. The candidate must see the form completed by the supervisors and sign it.

It is expected that the Head of Department/School will consult with the departmental/school Postgraduate Research Committee or coordinator of postgraduate research and comment on whether progress is, or is not, satisfactory before forwarding the report to the Dean of Postgraduate Research. It is the Head of Department/School's responsibility to ensure that reports are submitted to schedule.

Any concerns emerging about the quality or rate of progress of a PhD student are expected to be addressed by the Head of Department/School and or by the Dean of Postgraduate Research.[153]

Master's students are also expected to submit progress reports at six months or sooner. Reports on Master's theses are submitted by the Head of Department/School to the relevant Faculty Dean. If problems occur, whether with supervision or resources, a student may seek advice beyond the department/school from the Academic Manager in the College office, from UCSA's student advocate or from the Dean of Postgraduate Research.

---

[151] www.canterbury.ac.nz/postgrad/phd_students/phd_confirmation.shtml accessed 08.12.14.
[152] PhD Guidelines.
[153] SR, p 65.

Information provided to the Panel from the University's survey of postgraduate students indicated that student satisfaction with supervision is high overall (see section 7.5). The Panel gained no evidence of problems or difficulties with either the process or the outcomes. Students said that there is plenty of help available if required, though some commented that international students might be challenged in accessing this due to cultural reticence.

> **7.4   Thesis examination**
> Universities' thesis examination processes should ensure thesis standards are internationally benchmarked.

Documentation related to the examination of PhD theses is clear. Students are provided with a plain-language outline of the overall examination process.[154] Both PhD Theses and Master's theses have two examiners. Within seven days of notification of a PhD thesis being submitted the senior supervisor must submit a completed Supervisor's Certificate confirming the work as the student's own and documenting any assistance received, which is sent to examiners along with the thesis.

The Panel was told that quality assurance of the examination process was predicated on the assumption that peer review is a valid form of assessment and that monitoring was therefore via the process of appointing the examiners.

For the PhD, the senior supervisor is expected to discuss and agree on the most appropriate examiners with the candidate. Two examiners are then nominated to the Head of Department/School for recommendation to the Dean of Postgraduate Research. The candidate must indicate to the Postgraduate office that he or she accepts the nominated examiners, or can make a case for a particular person not to be an examiner. The examination process must be independent of the supervisors, although at least one of the supervisors is required to attend the oral examination as an observer. Once examiners have been nominated all communication must be through the Postgraduate Office or, where indicated, the Chair of the oral examination.

The University has clear generic criteria for the examination of PhD theses.[155]

For Master's theses, one of the examiners must be external to the University of Canterbury and the other is usually a University of Canterbury staff member external to the supervisory team. Neither examiner can have had any involvement with the student or his/her thesis research; regulations are clear that an examiner should not be a close collaborator, colleague or friend of the supervisors. If there is no suitable internal examiner then a second external examiner may be appointed.[156] The processes to be followed if there is a discrepancy in grades between the examiners are laid out in the Master's Thesis Work Policy and Guidelines.

The Panel assessed that the online information available for staff and students is clear and accessible.

---

[154] www.canterbury.ac.nz/postgrad/phd_students/submission.shtml accessed 08.12.14.
[155] SR, p 66.
[156] www.canterbury.ac.nz/postgrad/ma_students/submission.shtml accessed 09.12.14.

It concluded that the examination processes described look robust, that there is monitoring and reporting at a cohort level and that both PhD and Master's examination processes provide a means of national, and for PhDs international, benchmarking. While the postgraduate exit survey identified delays in examination times for Master's theses in some parts of the University, no major issues with respect to thesis examination processes were identified during interviews. The Panel notes a recommendation from a 2012 survey that greater involvement by the Postgraduate Office in the oversight of Master's degrees might facilitate greater consistency and alleviate administrative delays. This supports the Panel's view that the Postgraduate Office and/or Committee might have closer oversight of the administration of key points of Master's thesis experience (e.g. admission; examination) which for all other programmes are under institutional control. The Panel is aware that such a step poses additional workload for these staff.

7.5   Postgraduate student feedback
Universities should use processes for gaining feedback on student satisfaction with supervision and support for postgraduate students and be able to demonstrate that feedback is used to inform improvement initiatives.

The six-monthly reports for thesis students provide an avenue for gaining feedback from postgraduate students, in particular regarding supervision needs and experiences. The reports facilitate an opportunity for intervention (see section 7.3). While the Postgraduate Committee has responsibility for oversight of all thesis procedures it was not clear to the Panel whether or not this extended to systematic monitoring of issues arising from supervision reports that might be systemic. If not, the Panel suggests the University might explore ways of doing this without compromising the confidentiality of students' comments.

A biennial survey using the University's Postgraduate Experience Questionnaire (UCPEQ) has been conducted since 2004. The analyses reported by the Academic Development Group are available by College as well as in institutional summaries.[157] Where there are more than ten students responding in a particular programme a programme-specific report may be produced. Targeted reports, e.g. about international students, have also been produced. An overview analysis for the five years 2007-2012 enabled trends in satisfaction with learning resources to be identified. Students are advised of who receives the survey results. The Panel was told that the Dean of Postgraduate Research meets with Heads or programme co-ordinators to discuss strengths and issues identified from the analyses. The Panel learned of initiatives that were a result of student survey feedback; it also received an example of communication to students about outcomes of previous surveys.[158]

Parallel surveys of thesis supervisors have enabled the University to identify discrepancies in response between students and supervisors.

In 2012 the University also conducted its first postgraduate student exit survey. This survey completes the postgraduate lifecycle by exploring examination processes.

---

[157] https://intranet.canterbury.ac.nz/adg/pg_ucpeq.shtml accessed 09.12.14.
[158] SR, p 68; Letter from Dean of Postgraduate Research to students.

The Panel considered the UCPEQ and the Exit Survey to be comprehensive, providing the University with systematic analyses and evidence-based recommendations.

The above strategies are periodic and might not capture issues of immediate concern. Other avenues for postgraduate feedback include the University Postgraduate Committee and department postgraduate committees (which have student representatives) and the Postgraduate Students' Association. It was evident to the Panel that the Dean of Postgraduate Research is also very accessible to both students and supervisors.

> The Panel **commends** the University on its comprehensive suite of postgraduate surveys, on the extensive use of the data, responsiveness to the analyses and on the communication back to students of actions taken.

Conclusion

In the course of the site visit to the University of Canterbury the Panel met with 85 staff, 20 students and some members of the University Council. All those interviewed shared their experiences and views with the Panel in a frank and open manner. The Panel was impressed by their resilience and commitment and by their determination to meet the challenges being experienced as the University recovers from the impact of recent earthquakes. The Panel was also impressed by the pervasive involvement of students in University activities, including policy-setting and decision-making.

In working through the Cycle 5 Guideline Statements the Panel was satisfied that in almost all cases the expectations were met. Where it suggests improvements are necessary or desirable, the Panel is mindful that the University has also faced other pressing challenges over the last four years and that its current priority is to bridge the gap from the 2010 pre-earthquake learning and teaching achievements to those now befitting a university of 2015 and beyond. The Panel hopes that its recommendations might assist in providing some guidance towards this objective.

The University is strongly devolved with many responsibilities residing with its Colleges and their Pro-Vice-Chancellors and Heads of School. The Panel considers that in a number of instances devolution as practised at Canterbury compromises the University's ability to assure itself of the quality of academic and related processes at an institutional level. The Panel has also reiterated the views of the Cycle 4 Panel that the University should extend and systematise its institutional benchmarking activity; the Cycle 5 Panel identified a number of areas where it believes the University would benefit from accessing the experience of other similar institutions as it seeks to consolidate a reputation as an internationally-recognised university.

The Panel considers the academic initiatives proposed within the University's recovery business case UC Futures are ambitious, but achievable. Several of the Panel's recommendations are intended to assist the University towards these goals by providing an external perspective on the activities proposed.

The Panel has made six commendations, five affirmations and fourteen recommendations. The University is expected to report on its response to the recommendations made by the Panel in twelve months' time (early in 2016) and again at the time of the next academic audit.

Commendations

GS1.3   C1   The Panel **commends** the University and UCSA on the wide-ranging and effective contribution made by students to the University's planning, reviews, academic activity and services.

G1.6   C2   The Panel **commends** the University on developing, implementing and evaluating risk management and business continuity procedures; on the effectiveness of these in the circumstances resulting from the 2010 and 2011 Christchurch earthquakes; on the commitment and fortitude demonstrated by staff and students to pursuing their teaching, learning and research; and on the leadership shown by the

University both regionally and nationally in sharing good practice and lessons learned from their experiences.

GS4.2　C3　The Panel **commends** the University on the extensive range of support activities which is provided for pre-tertiary, undergraduate and postgraduate Pasifika students and on the dedication of the Pacific Development Team to the participation and success of Pasifika students.

GS5.2　C4　The Panel **commends** the University on its learning and academic skills support services, their accessibility and acceptability to students and on the initiative taken by staff to ensure relevance and effectiveness.

GS5.3　C5　The Panel **commends** the University and UCSA on the extensive and effective provision of services and facilities which enhance safety, support and personal wellbeing on campus, and in particular the proactive role played by UC Security in providing a safe campus for all staff, students and visitors.

GS7.5　C6　The Panel **commends** the University on its comprehensive suite of postgraduate surveys, on the extensive use of the data, responsiveness to the analyses and on the communication back to students of actions taken.

Affirmations

GS2.3　A1　The Panel **affirms** the introduction of a new student management system and encourages the University to consider the issues related to student advice when designing the new system.

GS4.1　A2　The Panel **affirms** the University's activities to enhance student engagement and, in particular, supports the introduction of a co-curricular transcript.

GS5.6　A3　The Panel **affirms** the University's Graduate Destination Survey and the use made of resultant analyses, and suggests the University extends the survey and analyses to include specific reference to attributes in the Graduate Profile from when the first cohort which should have acquired these attributes graduates.

GS6.1　A4　The Panel **affirms** the induction processes for new academic staff and supports continued strengthening and evaluation to ensure fitness for purpose.

GS6.4　A5　The Panel **affirms** the UC Teaching week and the increased support for staff to undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching and encourages the University to explore ways of ensuring wider participation by academic staff across all colleges.

Recommendations

GS1.2   R1   The Panel **recommends** that the University review the delegation and implementation of core academic processes and processes related to the assurance of teaching quality in order to identify where central monitoring, including reporting and analysis, is necessary to provide the University with institutional assurance of the quality of these processes and their outcomes.

GS1.5   R2   The Panel **recommends** that the University urgently address its reliance on a single MySQL database and the lack of a specialist MySQL administrator to ensure adequate protection against the risk of failure of the system.

GS1.5   R3   The Panel **recommends** that the University develops and implements its e-learning strategy, including benchmarking against relevant good practices in resourcing and back-up in comparable universities in New Zealand and elsewhere.

GS2.2   R4   The Panel **recommends** that the University gives consideration to the development of strategies and, where appropriate, KPIs and the provision of appropriate resources to enhance its recruitment of Māori, Pasifika and other under-represented groups.

GS3.3   R5   The Panel **recommends** that in order to achieve institution-wide integration of the new Graduate Profile in all programmes, and to enable future students to achieve the graduate attributes, the University considers the areas where the Panel has expressed concern and urgently gives attention to the planning, resourcing and high-level oversight for the project.

GS3.5   R6   The Panel **recommends** that the University articulates a statement of purpose or philosophy of benchmarking for curriculum and assessment; develops a strategy for implementation of benchmarking which includes guidelines as to how the University might make good use of both quantitative and qualitative benchmarked data to reinforce good practice; and explores additional benchmarking partners which might be useful comparators for the strategic initiatives on which the University is embarking.

GS3.6   R7   The Panel **recommends** that the University develops a policy on moderation expectations and establishes agreed guidelines to apply across the institution.

GS5.5   R8   The Panel **recommends** that the University expedite the reviews of cross-institutional course and teaching surveys, paying attention to the weaknesses and strengths of the current systems and to prevailing good practice and institutional developments in student surveying both nationally and internationally.

GS6.1   R9   The Panel **recommends** that the University reviews the range and usefulness of its formal activities to induct and support academic Heads, strengthening these where necessary and making them compulsory for staff new to the role.

GS6.3   R10   The Panel **recommends** that the University reviews the adequacy of its current teaching surveys for evaluating and documenting teaching quality, explores development of a rubric which defines good teaching and considers how this might be translated into meaningful indicators or measures to enable it to monitor and, where needed, improve the quality of teaching across the University.

GS6.3   R11   The Panel **recommends** that the University considers whether and how peer review might be introduced, encouraged and supported across the University such that it is available for all teaching staff as part of their personal quality assurance regime.

GS6.3   R12   The Panel **recommends** that the University reviews the structures and mechanisms available at an institutional level for ensuring:
- that recruitment and induction policies are followed and outcomes evaluated;
- that there is central oversight of the fairness and strategic appropriateness of workload management practices;
- that professional development and review practices are consistent across the University and that outcomes are recorded in ways which facilitate ongoing quality assurance of teaching capability.

GS6.4   R13   The Panel **recommends** that the University addresses institution-wide needs for ongoing professional teaching development, including reviewing the role and staffing capability of the Academic Development Group and ensuring that all academic staff have access to assistance with their curriculum development, teaching, assessment and, if necessary, pedagogical research and pedagogically-informed use of IT.

GS7.2   R14   The Panel **recommends** that the University reviews its devolution of responsibility for resources for postgraduate research to Colleges and develops a more detailed set of institutional guidelines to ensure thesis research is not compromised by inadequate initial resourcing or insecure resourcing over the longer term.

Acknowledgments

The Panel thanks in particular Dr Rod Carr, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Canterbury, for his warm welcome to the University. Appreciation is also extended to the University of Canterbury staff who hosted the Panel.

The preparation and submission of the University's Self-review Portfolio was managed by Mrs Eleri Nugent. AQA is grateful for her assistance throughout the audit process. The effort of all those who contributed to the University's self-assessment process, preparation of the Self-review Report and the organisation associated with the site visit is appreciated.

The Panel is most grateful for the open interaction and frank comments and observations of all those staff, students and Council members who gave their time to appear before it during the site visit. The Panel also appreciated the access the University provided to discussion papers which were at an early stage of development and, as such, were as yet confidential to the University.

Audit Panel

Professor Bruce Harris *Chair of the Panel*	University of Auckland
Emeritus Professor Penny Boumelha	formerly Victoria University of Wellington
Dr Anne Martin	Education Consultant, Australia
Dr Roy Nates	AUT University
Professor Helen Nicholson	University of Otago

Secretariat

Dr Jan Cameron	Director Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities
Heather Kirkwood	Deputy Director (Finance and Communications) Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities

The Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities

The Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA) was established by New Zealand universities in 1994, as the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit. It is an independent body whose purpose is to contribute to the advancement of university education by:

- Engaging as a leader and advocate in the development of academic quality;
- Applying quality assurance and quality enhancement processes that assist universities in improving student engagement, academic experience and learning outcomes.

The AQA helps support universities in achieving standards of excellence in research and teaching by conducting institutional audits of the processes in universities which underpin academic quality and by identifying and disseminating information on good practice in developing and maintaining quality in higher education. Activities include a quarterly newsletter and regular meetings on quality enhancement topics.

The AQA interacts with other educational bodies within New Zealand and with similar academic quality assurance agencies internationally. The Agency is a full member of the Asia-Pacific Quality Network (APQN), and of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE). AQA has been assessed as adhering to the INQAAHE Guidelines of Good Practice in Quality Assurance.

Further information is available from the AQA website: www.aqa.ac.nz.

Cycle 5 Academic Audit Process

Key principles underpinning academic audits carried out by AQA are:

- peer review
- evidence-based
- externally benchmarked
- enhancement-led.

Audits are carried out by panels of trained auditors who are selected from universities' senior academic staff and other professionals with knowledge of academic auditing and evaluation. Each panel includes at least one overseas external auditor. An audit begins with a process of self-review leading to an audit portfolio that the University uses to report on its progress towards achieving the goals and objectives related to the focus of the audit. The audit panel verifies the portfolio through documentary analysis, interviews and site visits.

Final audit reports of New Zealand universities are publicly available. Reports commend good practice and make recommendations intended to assist the University in its own programme of continuous improvement. For New Zealand universities, progress on the recommendations is

submitted to the AQA Board in a follow-up report 12 months later. A further report on progress in implementing the recommendations of the previous audit also forms part of the self-review process in the next audit round.

Cycle 5 Academic Audit Framework

The Cycle 5 academic audit is framed around academic activities related to teaching and learning and student support. The key **Academic Activity Themes** which have been identified and which form the framework for both the self-review and the academic audit are:

1. Leadership and Management of Teaching and Learning
2. Student Profile: Access, Transition and Admission Processes
3. Curriculum and Assessment
4. Student Engagement and Achievement
5. Student Feedback and Support
6. Teaching Quality
7. Supervision of Research Students.

The audit framework covers activities and quality assurance processes which might be expected as fundamental in a contemporary university of good standing. The framework articulates these expectations in a series of Guideline Statements.

For each academic activity theme, universities are expected to address not just whether they do undertake the activities or processes identified in the Guideline Statements, but also evaluate how well they do so, and on what evidence they base their own self-evaluation. From their own self-evaluation, areas and strategies for improvement might be identified. The Cycle 5 Academic Audit Handbook provides more information on the kinds of evidence and indicators which might be appropriate for each expectation referred to in the Guideline Statements.

Throughout the academic activity areas identified in the framework, attention should be paid to such features as different modes of delivery and acknowledgement of learner diversity (e.g., international students; on-campus/off-campus). Unless otherwise stated, all activities and processes relate to postgraduate as well as undergraduate study. Where appropriate, specific attention might be paid to special student groups (e.g., Māori students, international students) but unless otherwise stated it is assumed processes discussed apply to all students similarly.