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Preface

Background

The New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit was established in 1993 to consider and review New Zealand universities' mechanisms for monitoring and enhancing the academic quality and standards which are necessary for achieving their stated aims and objectives, and to comment on the extent to which procedures in place are applied effectively and reflect good practice in maintaining quality.\(^1\)

Cycle 1 academic audits were full institutional audits of the then seven universities; they were conducted during the period 1995-1998. Cycle 2 academic audits focussed on research policy and management, the research-teaching nexus and the support of postgraduate students, as well as a theme specific to each university; they were conducted during the period 2000-2001. In 2001, a full institutional academic audit was conducted in the eighth New Zealand university - the newly-created Auckland University of Technology.

Cycle 3 academic audits, of which this audit of Massey University is the first, are focused on:

- teaching quality,
- programme delivery, and
- the achievement of learning outcomes,\(^2\)

and are being conducted over the period 2003-2006.

The process of audit

The process of audit requires a self-review which informs an audit portfolio (structured with respect to the Cycle 3 framework) in which the university evaluates its progress towards achieving its goals and objectives related to the focus of the audit, identifies areas for improvement, and details intended plans, strategies and enhancement activities with respect to those enhancement activities it considers to be of priority. After examining the portfolio, and seeking further information if necessary, the Audit Panel conducts interviews in an Audit Visit to the university to seek verification of materials read, and to inform an audit report which is structured in accordance with the framework for the conduct of Cycle 3 audits as set down in the Unit's 2002 *Academic audit manual*.\(^3\) The report commends good practice and makes recommendations intended to assist the university in its own programme of continuous improvement of quality and added value in the activities identified by the Unit as the focus of Cycle 3 audits.

Soon after the publication of the audit Report, the Unit will discuss with the university the way follow-up action to audit that is undertaken by the university might be monitored by the university and reported to the Unit.

Massey University academic audit

Massey University agreed to being the first university to be audited in Cycle 3. Massey University was also one of the last universities to be audited in Cycle 2, with the Audit Visit in March 2001, the release of the Unit's audit report in July 2001, and the submission by Massey University of its follow-up report to the Unit in April 2002. The agreed timetable for the present audit saw the submission of the self-review audit portfolio on 23 June 2003, only 14 months after the follow-up to Cycle 2.

---

\(^1\) See *Appendix 2* for the Unit's complete terms of reference, its vision and its objective with respect to academic audit.

\(^2\) See *Appendix 3* for the framework for Cycle 3 academic audits.

\(^3\) John M. Jennings (compiler), *Academic audit manual for use by the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit, December 2002*, Wellington, the Unit, 2002.
The Audit Panel appointed to carry out the academic audit of Massey University met in Wellington on 6 August 2003 for a Preliminary Meeting at which it evaluated the material it had received, and determined further materials required. The Chair of the Panel and the Director of the Unit undertook a Planning Visit to Massey University on 14 August 2003 to discuss the supply of the further materials requested as well as arrangements for the Audit Visit. The five-day Audit Visit took place from 22-26 September 2003, during which time the Panel interviewed nearly 200 members of staff and students during visits to all three campuses - two days at Massey University Palmerston North, one day each at Massey University Albany (Auckland) and Massey University Wellington before returning to Massey University Palmerston North to review the previous four days and to deliver a preliminary report to senior management.

The self-review portfolio submitted by Massey University included a copy of the University's *Academic quality assurance plan 2002-2004*, prepared in October 2001 and revised in February 2002. That plan includes strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats as identified at that time. The self-review undertaken in 2003 associated with this present academic audit updated that plan with respect to the themes of this audit, and the portfolio text presented 19 key improvements in the areas of 'teaching quality', 'programme delivery' and 'student learning'.

After reading the University’s audit portfolio, the audit Panel asked for information as to how pressing or urgent the need for self-improvement was, and some idea of priority of the listed improvements together with information as to responsibilities for improvements, resources available, timeframes and monitoring of enhancement activities. In its response, Massey University reported that it intended to advance the improvements during the next 18 months; many of the reviews identified had already been conducted and strategies for implementation was underway; in other areas, the University was in the early stages of planning strategies to achieve the identified improvements. Within its response, the University regrouped the 19 improvements under eight topics - 'Māori @ Massey', 'Teaching quality: evaluation, recognition and reward', 'Tertiary assessment', 'Enhancing student learning', 'Staff workloads', 'Qualifications reviews', 'Ongoing development and refinement of information systems', and 'E-learning'. The Panel has presumed that all key improvements were considered by the University to be of equal priority.

By the end of the audit process, the Panel was pleased to recognise that a number of the initiatives at the centre of this audit were independent of the specific requirements of this audit. Most of the initiatives - such as the Review of Academic Policy-Formation, the Fund for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching, the development and implementation of a strategy for flexible learning and teaching, the Equivalence Policy for papers taught in more than one mode or on more than one campus, the Online Learning Monitoring Group - predate the confirmation of the Cycle 3 focus in late 2001. Thus the University can be recognised as a learning institution which undertakes its own investigations of aspects of its operations when and as issues arise.

John M. Jennings

*Director*

*12 December 2003*
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Summary

General

• Massey University's academic programmes are delivered and quality assured by five Colleges operating on three campuses - at Palmerston North, Albany and Wellington - and through extramural education. Massey University stresses its 'one university' culture and given the geographical spread, the organisational structure requires careful, efficient and effective management.

• The Panel commends the recent review of academic policy-formation which involved extensive input and discussion by a wide cross-section of the University community. The principles and recommendations set out in that report must now be used to contribute to the realisation of Massey University's vision.

• Massey University is in the early stages of the implementation of its recently-approved qualifications review policy, which requires close monitoring to ensure effectiveness.

• The commitment of the University to its responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi and the development of focussed strategies are commended; the Panel noted that there are personal allegiances in place at present but recommends the development of stronger institutional structures for consultation with tangata whenua.

• A Student Programme Management Tool information system promises enhanced data collection and academic planning.

Teaching quality

• The Panel commends Massey University's commitment to addressing staff workloads and the University-wide approach to the systematic development and monitoring of workload models which began in June 2002. The Panel recommends the monitoring of the effects that might arise from the implementation of the Performance Based Research Fund and any impact on workload and time available for academic staff to enhance the quality of teaching.

• The Panel was impressed by the reports it received on the work of the Training and Development Unit, including the Unit's initiatives in research into areas of need. The Panel supports developing and implementing strategies so that courses reach staff across all campuses who would benefit from the Unit's services.

• Massey University's Fund for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and its Teaching Excellence Awards have, on the one hand, provided resources for staff to develop and implement innovative teaching practices, and on the other hand, have recognised teaching excellence. Staff promotions procedures identify teaching quality alongside research, and the Panel recommends a monitoring of the implementation of those procedures to evaluate their impact on enhancing the quality of teaching.

• Massey University relies heavily on the Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching process (SECAT) for the evaluation of teaching. The Panel recommends that Massey University develop and employ a variety of ways to collect evidence to complement SECAT, and that the University monitor the way evaluative information is being fed into systems to review current academic programmes and used in the enhancement of academic programmes and of the quality of teaching and learning.
Programme delivery

• The Panel commends Massey University for its commitment to a policy of flexible learning and teaching which enables students to select the mode or modes of instruction - classroom, electronic and extramural - best suited to their circumstances. The Panel heard of uneven workloads for students and staff and recommends that this be assessed. The Panel also recommends that changes consequent on the implementation of the flexible learning and teaching strategy be more effectively communicated throughout the University so that the strategy is better understood.

• Massey University's equivalence policy aims at ensuring that each offering of a paper, regardless of mode or location, provides reliable and valid opportunity for students to achieve equal learning outcomes, involving equivalent curriculum, assessment and academic support for the learning process. The Panel recommends that the University ensure that the implementation of this policy does not constrain local initiatives.

• The Panel commends Massey University for recognising the needs arising from the challenges posed by on-line learning.

• Massey University has been continuing its discussion on the interdependence of research and teaching following its investigations on the research-teaching nexus carried out in preparation for the Cycle 2 academic audit.

• Massey University has a comprehensive system of student support agencies in place. The Panel commends the level of support given to students generally, and appreciates that the University is aware of the uneveness in the quality of facilities that support student learning across the three campuses.

• Massey University's tradition and commendable emphasis on access is being balanced against a more recent objective to seek enrolment of higher calibre first-year students and to support them in reaching their potential. The growth in numbers of international students in particular has placed added pressure on facilities. The Panel supports the University in its intention to recognise excellence in learning and student achievement.

• The Panel commends Massey University for its efforts to address the problems arising from students with inadequate preparation for university-level study and problems with English-language instruction.

Achievement of learning outcomes

• The Panel notes the accreditation of a range of professional academic programmes and recommends that Massey University develops and implements appropriate external benchmarking of all processes and outcomes across the University in support of its declared aim of excellence in research, teaching and learning, and community service. The Panel also recommends benchmarking of the quality of teaching and learning in academic programmes not subject to accreditation by professional bodies.

• Massey University is commended for its initiative in examining the first-year experience at university.

• The Panel heard that staff worked hard to ensure equivalence in assessment in papers delivered across campuses but the Panel was unable to gauge the extent to which assessment is aligned with learning outcomes and recommends monitoring the effectiveness of assessment policies and practices and their impact on the alignment of assessment to learning outcomes.

• The Panel met with a selection of external stakeholders who complimented the University on its effective consultation, collaborative research and support for community groups. The Panel gained the impression that most links with stakeholders were personal, and recommends that Massey University ensures existing structures adequately facilitate consultation with appropriate community groups.
Commendations and recommendations

Key: C = Commendations  R = Recommendations

General

Massey University: one university, three campuses, five colleges

R 1  The Panel recommends that Massey University takes care over its management of processes for aligning University-wide plans at campus and College levels to ensure the necessary focus and action is brought to bear in implementing key priorities for quality enhancement on a consistent basis.

Academic policy formation at Massey University

C 1  The Panel commends Massey University for its initiative in ensuring detailed consideration of factors associated with academic policy formation in the University, and for the good practice model presented in the Review of academic policy-formation at Massey University: final report.

R 2  The Panel recommends that Massey University ensures and monitors the successful implementation of the recommendations contained in the Review of academic policy-formation at Massey University in ways that will effectively and efficiently facilitate meaningful consultation with all staff, and contribute to the realisation of Massey University’s vision to be an integrated multi-campus institution with a ‘one university’ culture.

Qualifications review policy and procedures

C 2  The Panel commends Massey University for its qualifications review policy.

R 3  The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors the outcomes of the qualifications reviews to ensure their effectiveness in the enhancement of teaching and learning.

Treaty of Waitangi

C 3  The Panel commends Massey University for its Māori @ Massey strategy and considers that the aims and platforms are appropriate such that they have the potential to contribute to a better quality of outcome for Māori students.

C 4  The Panel commends Massey University for the appointment of four Māori professors and for the development of Māori Research Centres in Colleges and the Maori Research Academy, which the Panel sees as providing opportunities to achieve and sustain excellence among Māori staff and students.

C 5  The Panel commends Massey University for its intention to establish kaiwawao on each campus that enables relationships with tangata whenua and mana whenua in all three locations.

R 4  The Panel recommends that Massey University develops processes to ensure the initiatives taken by the Māori academic leadership are implemented widely across Colleges and campuses.

R 5  The Panel recommends that Massey University develops appropriate institutional structures and support strategies which will enable Massey University to maintain consultation with tangata whenua to inform and assist decision making.

Information services

R 6  The Panel recommends that Massey University ensures an early completion and commissioning of the proposed administrative support databases and administrative systems.
Teaching quality

Assignment of staff

C 6 The Panel commends Massey University for its commitment to addressing staff workloads, for the work being undertaken in the development of workload models, and for the ongoing review of their implementation to ensure relevance and effectiveness.

R 7 The Panel recommends that Massey University, through its academic units, monitors pressures on Māori staff arising from their additional responsibilities and addresses any negative impact of such pressures on the quality of research and teaching.

R 8 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors pressures arising from the implementation of the Performance Based Research Fund environment and addresses any negative impact that might affect workload and the time available for academic staff to enhance the quality of their teaching.

Training and Development Unit

C 7 The Panel commends Massey University for the work of the Training and Development Unit in proactively initiating research into areas of need, in developing and presenting courses - especially in the areas associated with flexible learning and teaching - and in monitoring their effectiveness.

R 9 The Panel recommends that Massey University supports the Training and Development Unit in developing and implementing strategies consistently across all three campuses thereby reaching staff across the University who would benefit from their services.

Rewards for excellence in teaching

C 8 The Panel commends Massey University for its Fund for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and for the Teaching Excellence Awards scheme, and acknowledges the high calibre of those staff who have received support and recognition.

R 10 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors any revisions and refinements to its staff promotions procedures, and the impact of the implementation of those procedures, to ensure they contribute to the enhancement of teaching quality.

R 11 The Panel recommends that Massey University recognises quality-assured, peer-reviewed study guides as publications when academic staff are considered for promotion.

Evaluation of teaching and feedback

R 12 The Panel recommends that Massey University develops and employs a variety of ways to collect evidence of teaching quality that will complement the information captured by the Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching.

R 13 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors the manner in which Colleges and academic units make use of information gathered in the Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching and ensures that the information is used effectively to assist the review of current academic programmes, the development of new papers and programmes, and the enhancement of teaching quality.

R 14 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors the manner in which Colleges and academic units inform students about the results of student surveys and make effective use of information in the enhancement of academic programmes.
Programme delivery

Flexible learning and teaching

C 9 The Panel commends Massey University for its initiatives in the development and implementation of a flexible learning and teaching policy and associated strategies, and in the on-going monitoring of these initiatives.

R 15 The Panel recommends that Massey University reviews curriculum and assessment to identify and address uneven workloads for students and staff.

R 16 The Panel recommends that Massey University reviews the mix of different learning modes - face-to-face, on-line, extramural - in relation to staff workload, student preferences and pedagogy, and implements strategies by which changes consequent to the reviews of flexible learning and teaching are more effectively communicated throughout the University and better understood.

Equivalence policy

R 17 The Panel recommends that Massey University reviews its policy of course equivalence across all campuses to ensure that the implementation of that policy does not constrain local initiatives.

On-line learning

C 10 The Panel commends Massey University for recognising the diverse needs of staff and students arising from the challenges posed by on-line learning.

R 18 The Panel recommends that Massey University develops and implements an appropriate strategy for supporting staff in their use of e-learning, ensuring appropriate support and development across all campuses of the University.

Interdependence of research and teaching

R 19 The Panel recommends that Massey University supports the implementation of initiatives contained in Towards understanding the interdependence of research and teaching (2001) and Strengthening the interdependence of research and teaching (2003).

The support for student learning

C 11 The Panel commends Massey University for the level of support generally available to its students.

R 20 The Panel recommends that Massey University ensures its student learning facilities are of consistently high quality across all campuses.

Access versus excellence

C 12 The Panel commends Massey University for its intention to attract high-achieving first-year students, and for its policy of providing scholarships for students from low decile high schools.

R 21 The Panel recommends that Massey University progresses ways to recognise and reward excellence in learning and student achievement, and develops measures of success in the enrolment of high calibre students and their achievements.

Student preparation and English language skills

C 13 The Panel commends Massey University for its efforts to address the problems arising from students with inadequate preparation for university-level study and from students' problems with English-language academic instruction.
The achievement of learning outcomes

Moderation and benchmarking

R 22 The Panel recommends that Massey University identifies appropriate benchmarks and implements these as measures of key processes and outcomes across the University in support of its declared aim of excellence in research, teaching and learning, and community service.

R 23 The Panel recommends that Massey University identifies appropriate benchmarks and implements these as measures of the quality of teaching and learning for those academic programmes not subject to accreditation by professional bodies.

The first year experience

C 14 The Panel commends Massey University for its initiative in examining the first–year experience and notes the process for discussion and identification of strategies for improvement as outlined in the First Year Experience Taskforce Report.

Assessment

R 24 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors the effectiveness of any revisions and refinements to its assessment policies and practices and their impact on the alignment of assessment to learning outcomes.

External stakeholder involvement

C 15 The Panel commends Massey University for the strong personal relations of staff with external stakeholders and the way that the stakeholders are consulted and involved in programme design.

R 25 The Panel recommends that Massey University ensures the existing structures adequately facilitate consultation on policy development with appropriate community groups.

NOTE
The words ‘Massey University’ in each recommendation is intended to refer to the agency within Massey University that the University itself deems to be the one most appropriate to address and progress the recommendation.
1 General

1.1 Massey University: one university, three campuses, five colleges

Massey University carries out its research, teaching and learning on three campuses - at the Turitea, Hokowhitu and Ruawharo sites that make up the Palmerston North campus; at the Albany campus; and at the Wellington campus. As well, Massey University has a 'fourth campus' - the large extramural student enrolment from throughout New Zealand and overseas. The design, delivery and development of academic programmes is the responsibility of five Colleges - College of Business, College of Design, Fine Arts and Music, College of Education, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and College of Sciences.

This matrix of campuses and colleges is matched by an administrative structure headed by the Vice-Chancellor.

Each campus has a Deputy Vice-Chancellor who is responsible for localised strategic planning, infrastructure and co-ordination of services, and each Deputy Vice-Chancellor also carries an additional university-wide responsibility - Extramural Programmes (Palmerston North), International (Albany), and Strategic and External Relations (Wellington).

Each College is headed by a Pro Vice-Chancellor who is responsible for the strategic direction of the College, budgetary management, and the quality of academic teaching, research and community service activities related to the academic programmes delivered across the University. The range of College offerings varies from campus to campus, with many qualifications being offered at more than one campus as well as extramurally. Palmerston North offers the greatest range of qualifications in the College of Education, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the College of Sciences; Wellington (where the Pro Vice-Chancellor is situated) offers the majority of the teaching in the College of Design, Fine Arts and Music. The College of Business has a strong presence in all three campuses and the newly-appointed Pro Vice-Chancellor will be situated in Albany.

The office of the Vice-Chancellor includes three Assistant Vice-Chancellors who have responsibilities for university-wide policy development as well as the co-ordination, planning and monitoring of activities with respect to research, academic programmes and the Treaty of Waitangi.

The Panel read and heard evidence to suggest that Massey University is well aware of the issues arising from this matrix. The Panel notes that the extent and nature of quality objectives, key improvements and other goals signalled by management are such that different groups within the complex organisation may adopt different priorities in addressing these strategies. The Panel heard about the effect of the wide geographical spread of the three campuses and the difficulties staff face to developing a ‘Massey culture’. The Panel heard about some independence of approach on the Albany campus and, to a lesser extent, on the Wellington campus. The challenge for the University will be to manage the inevitable tension of forming a common culture while encouraging and respecting regional diversity. Students, for example, were heard to have loyalties to their 'home' campus and the fourth extramural campus, rather than to the University.
Recommendation

R 1 The Panel recommends that Massey University takes care over its management of processes for aligning University-wide plans at campus and College levels to ensure the necessary focus and action is brought to bear in implementing key priorities for quality enhancement on a consistent basis.

1.2 10 year plan and the University’s objectives

In late 2002, Massey University published a 10 Year Plan in which it determined goals and objectives designed to ensure the University's overall direction remains relevant in the changing social, political and economic contexts. The Plan was the outcome of a consultative process which included forums at all campuses. It contains goals and objectives in eight areas - research and creative work, teaching and learning, the Treaty of Waitangi, students, staff, the University in the wider community, internationalisation, organisation and management. The goals and objectives in this plan are reflected in the goals and objectives in the Statement of objectives/profile for 2003-2005 that have, in turn, informed the institutional objectives in the areas of this audit as set out in Massey University's self-review portfolio. The Statement of objectives/profile for 2003-2005 includes specific performance indicators and targets that are designed to enable meaningful reporting of progress internally and to stakeholders.

The Panel welcomed the opportunity to explore the governance role played by Council in the formulation of such objectives, as well as in the subsequent monitoring of progress towards their attainment. The Panel heard that policy formation occurs on a ‘from bottom up and from top down’ basis and that the University was paying particular attention to factors that might impact on its academic reputation as part of its risk management framework. The need to keep Council informed in a precise, timely and meaningful manner was clearly recognised, as were the potential dangers of information overload.

Massey University also recognises that there is some unevenness in the manner in which aspects of the University's activities are reported to Council. In large part this reflects the fact that certain information – financial information, for example – is inherently more able to be presented in an objective and condensed form. However, in areas that are the subject of this audit – teaching quality, programme delivery and the achievement of learning outcomes – providing information about quality presents more difficult challenges for the University if it is to enable Council to discharge its important governance role. The potential impact of the quality of teaching and learning on Massey University’s standing and reputation are clearly acknowledged by the University, and the Panel heard that the University intends to pay further attention to this area with the objective of ensuring ‘best practice’ procedures are followed.

1.3 Academic policy formation at Massey University

In November 2001, the University received the Review of academic policy-formation at Massey University: final report. That report was presented by a committee comprising four senior members of Massey University staff with one senior colleague independent of the University, who had been asked in April of that year to undertake an inclusive review of the University's structures and processes for academic policy-making at college, campus and university levels, to assess the extent of collegial participation in those bodies and processes and their effectiveness as forums for academic reflection, debate and decision making, and to evaluate the composition and effectiveness of the Academic Board and its relationship with its sub-committees.
The committee sought submissions from all staff and met with interested persons from each campus before preparing and distributing a discussion paper for comment. The report is in three parts. Part 1 contains a review of key international and Massey University documents. Part 2 presents a framework of seven principles (based on the values and objectives of the University) which could be used to determine how academic policy might be set in future. The principles concern collegial participation and responsibilities, academic policy, the Treaty of Waitangi, governance and management, collegial participation in governance responsibilities, collegial balance in times of change, and quality requirements for effective collegial participation. Part 3 contains 22 recommendations that give expression to the principles set out in Part 2, and are grouped around six themes - collegial responsibility in academic policy-formation; the Treaty of Waitangi; identification of key bodies in academic policy-formation; membership and processes of the Academic Board; College boards; and education and training. A brief note on the implementation of the recommendations is also included.

The Panel was impressed by the thoroughness of the report and by the inclusion, as appendices, of summaries of initial staff submissions and subsequent submissions on the discussion document. The Panel understands that all principles and all but one of the recommendations have been adopted by the Academic Board and Council.

Commendation

C 1 The Panel commends Massey University for its initiative in ensuring detailed consideration of factors associated with academic policy formation in the University, and for the good practice model presented in the Review of academic policy-formation at Massey University: final report.

Recommendation

R 2 The Panel recommends that Massey University ensures and monitors the successful implementation of the recommendations contained in the Review of academic policy-formation at Massey University in ways that will effectively and efficiently facilitate meaningful consultation with all staff, and contribute to the realisation of Massey University’s vision to be an integrated multi-campus institution with a ‘one university’ culture.

The Panel heard that academic policy development is driven by proposals from academic staff and senior management. The Academic Board is progressively assuming greater responsibility for academic issues. The Panel also heard of the University’s recognition of risk management as a key activity, and its commitment to implementing sound policies in that area. The risks identified include those involved with the progressive shift to on-line learning, over-exposure to enrolments from international students, failure to satisfy demand for relevant qualifications, and shifts in government policy.

1.4 Qualifications review policy and procedures

In August 2002, the University approved a Qualifications review policy which provides the operational framework for reviews of entire academic programmes and composite majors through the peer evaluation of objectives, structure and management, teaching, learning and assessment processes. To assist the process, it is intended to make available to review panels feedback gained from the analysis of information gathered from the Graduate Course Experience Questionnaires. An implementation plan for 2003-2006 proposes a schedule for qualification reviews which will see all qualifications reviewed by 2008.
Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified two key improvements relating to qualification reviews.

- Implement the Massey Qualifications Review Policy and Procedures.
- Present and distribute the data obtained from the Graduate Course Experience Questionnaire.

Commendation

C 2 The Panel commends Massey University for its qualifications review policy.

Recommendation

R 3 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors the outcomes of the qualifications reviews to ensure their effectiveness in the enhancement of teaching and learning.

1.5 Treaty of Waitangi

In March 2003, the recently-appointed Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori) presented a paper entitled Māori @ Massey which was endorsed by Academic Board and by Council. Māori @ Massey sets out strategies for developing and implementing the Treaty of Waitangi objectives listed in the University's 10 year plan. Six broad aims were identified - enhancement of Māori academic capacity; expansion of the Māori professional workforce; collaboration with Māori in the creation of new knowledge; informing cultural, social, economic and ecological policies and programmes; promotion of te reo Māori as a living language; and direct participation in ē iwī and Māori ventures linked to positive Māori development. The strategy is built on four 'platforms' - academic excellence, campus innovation, engagement with Māori, and effective policies - and ten projects have been selected for progression during 2003. Māori @ Massey presents a challenge to the University, especially the extent to which projects associated with the strategy can be integrated across Colleges and campuses.

The development of the Māori @ Massey strategy is comprehensive and the Panel noted progress on the projects. The relatively new Office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori) has strong academic and Māori leadership and capable staff, and has the potential to provide strong leadership to the implementation of the policy across the University. People interviewed by the Panel generally noted that this policy is likely to provide cohesion in the area of Māori development at Massey University and that it 'raises the bar' for all staff with respect to issues of quality and excellence for Māori students.

The Panel heard that the furtherance of Māori issues on campus can be largely left to interested individuals. For example, the Panel heard that the development of initiatives for and with Māori was uneven across the Colleges and campuses. In addition, the Māori learning support people on different campuses and across Colleges have initiated their own informal networks but some suggested to the Panel that they could be supported in a more structured way - such as face-to-face meetings - to share information and to learn from each other.

The development of campuses in Albany and Wellington, away from Massey University's traditional 'home' base, brings with it the need for new relationships to be established with Māori communities, especially tangata whenua in each region. The establishment of kaiwawao on each regional campus is an essential initiative for Massey University to establish itself at Albany and...
Wellington. The Panel is aware that the University is cognisant of the comprehensive approach required on each of its three campuses.

Massey University also needs to ensure all staff recognise that their Treaty of Waitangi obligations are ongoing despite the variable number of Māori students present on any one campus. The domination of international and other students on two of its campuses means the University needs to be particularly aware of addressing the Treaty on those sites.

The Panel heard of concerns regarding consistency of the implementation of the Treaty of Waitangi through current structures, and of examples where staff considered they had not received appropriate recognition or sufficient support in gaining an understanding of the implications arising from the Treaty. This leads the Panel to wonder if the University as a whole is fully cognisant and supportive of the layers of cultural complexity that are added when a University operates on several campuses. Further, the College structures across campuses also allow for extra 'gaps' to bridge when dealing with the needs of staff and students in this area.

### Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified two key improvements in the area of the Treaty of Waitangi.

- Continue to identify and deliver programmes and papers that support Māori development and contribute to Māori people and the Māori resource base.
- Implement the Māori @ Massey strategy as a means to support the wider incorporation of Māori in University teaching programmes.

### Commendations

**C 3** The Panel commends Massey University for its Māori @ Massey strategy and considers that the aims and platforms are appropriate such that they have the potential to contribute to a better quality of outcome for Māori students.

**C 4** The Panel commends Massey University for the appointment of four Māori professors and for the development of Māori Research Centres in Colleges and the Maori Research Academy, which the Panel sees as providing opportunities to achieve and sustain excellence among Māori staff and students.

**C 5** The Panel commends Massey University for its intention to establish kaiwawao on each campus that enables relationships with tangata whenua and mana whenua in all three locations.

### Recommendations

**R 4** The Panel recommends that Massey University develops processes to ensure the initiatives taken by the Māori academic leadership are implemented widely across Colleges and campuses.

**R 5** The Panel recommends that Massey University develops appropriate institutional structures and support strategies which will enable Massey University to maintain consultation with tangata whenua to inform and assist decision making.
1.6 Information services

Massey University Information Technology Services provide a range of information technology related services to staff and students. Of particular importance to the University at the moment is the maintenance and development of two packages - the Student Programme Management Tool which provides authorised staff across the University with student information, and the Integrated Product Database which captures critical academic data relevant to paper offerings and provides a mechanism for quality control in relation to the University’s academic portfolio. Development of these packages is a ‘work in progress’, and the University hopes that completion of the Student Programme Management Tool will greatly enhance the ability of University officers to determine student progression and eligibility to graduate as well as enabling staff to provide consistent advice on the relevance of particular papers to students' overall programmes of study.

Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified three key improvements in the area of ongoing development and refinement of information systems.

- Continue to develop and refine administrative support databases – in particular, implement the Student Programme Management Tool as a more efficient means to determine student progression and assist with student programme planning.
- Build on the administrative systems such as Integrated Product Database and the Qualifications Register to scope and establish a central database of qualification information including approval and review dates.
- Continue to monitor the administration of the Graduate Destination Survey and identify strategies to enhance data gathering and information management.

Recommendation

R 6 The Panel recommends that Massey University ensures an early completion and commissioning of the proposed administrative support databases and administrative systems.
2
Teaching quality

2.1 Objectives
Massey University has set itself the following objectives regarding teaching quality:

Training and development

• To provide development and support that enhances the effectiveness of staff with students from diverse cultural backgrounds and needs.

• To ensure staff continue to have access to high quality staff development programmes relevant to learning and teaching.

• Continue to develop and run staff development programmes in support of priority strategic areas, e.g., Flexible Learning and Teaching, WebCT training, extramural teaching, and the Treaty of Waitangi.

Reward and recognition

• Continue to recognise and nurture teaching excellence through award programmes and sharing best practice.

• To ensure the University has a culture that attracts and encourages staff, and appropriately values, recognises and rewards quality performance by staff.

2.2 Assignment of staff
A document prepared in early 2002 entitled University policies and procedures for the allocation of workloads sets out seven principles to be applied when determining staff workloads by departments throughout the University. Any workload allocation mechanism must be comprehensive and transparent; workload must be equitable; it must be reasonable; the total workload must be safe; workload must be assigned with the agreement of the staff member; changes to workload are made by mutual agreement; recognition must be given to staff from tangata whenua for the diverse obligations to iwi, hapu and whenua. Workload mechanisms must be reviewed from time to time.

In November 2002, a Report of the Workloads Implementation Group presented details of the development and implementation of workload models in departments during 2002. Issues identified from an examination of the workload models developed by departments and units included institutional issues of specialisation of staff, management of workload extremes, workload planning and resource implications, as well as departmental issues of allocation procedures, workload allocation formulae, teaching requirements, research, equity and workload benchmarks, the work of academic and general staff, and buy-out procedures and workload allowance. The report contains 12 recommendations for improvement.

Associated with Massey University’s concern over the workload of academic staff, a University-wide Academic Work Environment Survey was conducted in September 2002 as a pilot survey aimed at gathering valid, institution-wide baseline data on staff perceptions of the academic work environment. Results were aggregated by College and campus and a University aggregate was
generated as a point of comparison. It is intended that the results from the survey help establish priorities for improvement within Colleges and across the University.

The Panel acknowledges the University’s commitment to the development and implementation of workload models and the monitoring of their implementation. Heads of Department have an active role to play in determining the split of responsibilities for each staff member among research, teaching and administration/community service. The Panel heard from staff about differences of approach across the University, and the possible impact of the Performance Based Research Fund on staff research activities.

The Panel was pleased to hear that extra cultural and community responsibilities of Māori staff were taken into account in workload models. It concerned the Panel, however, to hear of Māori staff being overburdened in departments where there is no critical mass, and where Māori input expectations are being raised but there are too few Māori staff to deal with the demand. The achievement of a critical mass in numbers of higher qualified Māori staff is necessary to achieve the University's objectives with respect to its staff profile.

Departments need to be aware of, and monitor, the workload of Māori staff in these situations. The development of Māori perspectives in coursework and the inclusion of Māori staff in departments is supported by the Panel, but these developments cannot be at the expense of the individual - the often lone or few Māori staff members. The responsibility for these issues needs to be more widespread in the departments where this is the case.

The Panel also noted the links between the workload models and the staff Performance Review Process, and that this process allowed for ongoing discussion and planning. Some staff interviewed considered that workload associated with e-learning raises particular problems primarily because it is seen as more time-consuming that other modes.

### Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified two key improvements in the area of staff workloads.

- **Continue to monitor staff workloads and the implementation of the University Workloads Policy.**
- **Continue to implement the University Workloads Policy to spread teaching-related activity more equitably amongst academic staff thereby preserving time for research.**

### Commendation

**C 6** The Panel commends Massey University for its commitment to addressing staff workloads, for the work being undertaken in the development of workload models, and for the ongoing review of their implementation to ensure relevance and effectiveness.

### Recommendations

**R 7** The Panel recommends that Massey University, through its academic units, monitors pressures on Māori staff arising from their additional responsibilities and addresses any negative impact of such pressures on the quality of research and teaching.

**R 8** The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors pressures arising from the implementation of the Performance Based Research Fund environment and addresses
any negative impact that might affect workload and the time available for academic staff to enhance the quality of their teaching.

2.3 Development of teaching competence

2.3.1 Training and Development Unit

The Training and Development Unit co-ordinates staff training and development activities in support of Massey University’s commitment to providing a learning environment in which staff are well-qualified, culturally aware and sensitive, and provided with opportunities for personal and professional development. The Unit conducts needs analyses and training, advises on training and development policies and strategies to enable the University meet its obligations and objectives under its Charter and to implement University plans, and assists managers meet their responsibilities with regard to the professional development of staff. All new staff are required to attend an induction course administered by the Unit. All new academic staff eligible to supervise PhD candidates are required to complete a training session before taking up supervisory responsibilities. Staff employed to teach part time or for one year or less are required to complete a teaching skills programme, while the training of graduate assistants or other part-time assistants is the responsibility of departments or Colleges (as appropriate) with the support of the Unit.

The Panel heard how University staff appreciate the enthusiasm, strategic focus and determination of the staff of the Training and Development Unit. The courses offered were reported as being good and relevant.

The Panel found that courses on flexible learning were not offered as widely as staff would like to see, especially at Albany and Wellington, and that support for on-line learning was removed too soon or was not available for developmental progress. The Panel heard calls for more hands-on support for staff at Albany, more support for staff involved with WebCT, more training for tutors, and a more systematic coaching programme for staff associated with the departmental Performance Review and Planning exercise. The Panel believes that the needs of casual staff will become an important issue especially in a time of expansion.

The Panel was impressed by the programme of courses and by the attempts by the Unit to monitor the effectiveness of its work. However, the opportunities for ongoing staff development offered by the Unit, especially for ‘established’ staff, do not appear to be reaching all who might benefit from its services. The Panel understands that this is also of concern to the staff of the Training and Development Unit.

There is a need for further development and implementation of courses about the Treaty of Waitangi and/or te reo Māori for staff generally, and for international staff in particular. The Panel is pleased to note the initiatives being taken by the Unit and the planned strategies of the Office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori) which will provide support for the Unit.

Commendation

C 7 The Panel commends Massey University for the work of the Training and Development Unit in proactively initiating research into areas of need, in developing and presenting courses - especially in the areas associated with flexible learning and teaching - and in monitoring their effectiveness.
Recommendation

R 9 The Panel recommends that Massey University supports the Training and Development Unit in developing and implementing strategies consistently across all three campuses thereby reaching staff across the University who would benefit from their services.

2.3.2 Rewards for excellence in teaching

The *Fund for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching* was established in 1994 to recognise the importance of teaching within the University. It is aimed at encouraging excellence and in providing development funding for innovative teaching approaches, as a recognition that quality teaching is of fundamental importance to the University. This Fund is distinct from *Teaching Excellence Awards* which reward staff who are identified by students and staff for the quality of their teaching.

In 1998, a review was undertaken of the operation of the Fund for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching in its first three years (1994-1996). This resulted in the publication of ‘*There are hothouses of innovation going on . . .*: an evaluation of the first three years of Massey University’s University’s Fund for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching* (January 1999). The report found that funding for innovation had influenced the quality of teaching and that there was a need to capitalise further on the outcomes of the projects. The report made seven recommendations with respect to the continuation of the fund and to the improvement of the scheme in aspects such as greater attention being paid to the pedagogical basis for funded projects, more effective promotion of the fund, greater recognition of participants in projects, and the collection and dissemination of outputs and outcomes of projects.

The Fund was reviewed again in 2003 – to celebrate a decade of awards – with three recommendations being made with respect to funding allocation by the University to the Fund, enhancement of the Fund section of the Quality website, and expansion of responsibilities for the Fund Committee. The report noted that in the period 1994-2003, 152 projects had been funded in a variety of areas, such as computer assisted learning, teaching evaluation, and student learning.

During the four days of interviews, the Panel met with a number of academic staff and noted their enthusiasm for, and commitment to, high quality teaching. The Panel heard that the considerable documentation required for an application was a disincentive to staff who might otherwise apply, especially given the practical limits necessarily placed on the amount of money available which therefore make it impossible to fund all deserving applications. Some staff considered that time was better spent in teaching revision and preparation; other staff considered that time was better spent in research especially given the importance of research to academic promotion and the probable impact of the Performance Based Research Fund on departmental finances.

Another instrument for rewarding excellence in teaching is the annual *promotions exercise*. The promotions criteria state that the demonstration of excellence in teaching in promotion to Senior Lecturer is as important as excellence in research and scholarship and in contributions to the profession and administration; the place of excellence in teaching for promotion across the Senior Lecturer bar is not clearly identified but implies an importance equal to that of the other activities. Outstanding and widely recognised competence and service to teaching,
administration and the discipline may be accepted in lieu of an extensive publication record for promotion to Associate Professor.

The Panel also heard about the considerable amount of time spent by staff on the preparation of study guides for extramural courses, and the extent to which some study guides exemplify research and scholarship. The Panel believes that quality-assured, peer-reviewed study guides should be recognised by the University as publications and taken into account for promotion purposes.

### Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified three key improvements in the area of rewards for excellence in teaching and funding for projects.

- **Continue to review regularly staff appointments and promotions procedures to ensure that excellence in teaching is valued and recognised alongside excellence in research.**
- **Consider ways to value and reward improvement in teaching.**
- **Develop a system for ongoing publication of Fund for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching projects to ensure that the work of the Fund recipients is publicly recognised and valued.**

### Commendation

*C 8* The Panel commends Massey University for its Fund for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and for the Teaching Excellence Awards scheme, and acknowledges the high calibre of those staff who have received support and recognition.

### Recommendations

*R 10* The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors any revisions and refinements to its staff promotions procedures, and the impact of the implementation of those procedures, to ensure they contribute to the enhancement of teaching quality.

*R 11* The Panel recommends that Massey University recognises quality-assured, peer-reviewed study guides as publications when academic staff are considered for promotion.

### 2.4 Evaluation of teaching and feedback

Student feedback on teaching performance at individual, department, College, campus and University levels is captured by the *Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching* (SECAT). Introduced in 1996, the process involves the administration by an impartial colleague of a questionnaire containing six sets of questions – compulsory generic questions regarding the administration of the paper, and more specific questions about the teaching. The results of analyses of completed questionnaires are sent to the staff members concerned and to their academic managers with whom the results are discussed. The SECAT website contains the operational timetable and detailed information about the administration of the process.

The Panel noted that Massey University is aware of the limitations of SECAT and that there are local initiatives at College, campus and departmental levels that involve other approaches to collecting information about teaching quality, such as through peer observation. The reduction of an evaluation to a number is, at times, simplistic and can obscure the richness of feedback contained in students’ written comments. The Panel was unable to gain a feel for the ways
feedback is used to enhance teaching and learning. From discussions with students, it would appear that the quality of feedback to students is uneven.

Recommendations

R 12 The Panel recommends that Massey University develops and employs a variety of ways to collect evidence of teaching quality that will complement the information captured by the Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching.

R 13 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors the manner in which Colleges and academic units make use of information gathered in the Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching and ensures that the information is used effectively to assist the review of current academic programmes, the development of new papers and programmes, and the enhancement of teaching quality.

R 14 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors the manner in which Colleges and academic units inform students about the results of student surveys and make effective use of information in the enhancement of academic programmes.

Massey University has developed a Performance Review and Planning assessment process for staff. It involves a performance review for the past year and a performance plan for the coming year. The process is intended to assist staff plan future activities and align individual and organisational goals and career development. It is designed primarily to assist staff improve their performance and thereby assist in the enhancement of the University’s core activities of research, teaching, learning and community service. Massey University expects all staff to undergo annual review, although the University’s Annual Report 2002 acknowledges that this was not the case that year.


3

Programme delivery

3.1 Objectives

Massey University has set itself the following objectives regarding programme delivery:

**Academic programmes**

- To provide a range of academic programmes of excellence that are relevant to students, and accessible to different groups throughout New Zealand. Massey programmes should develop students as independent learners, and significantly enhance the employment opportunities available to graduates.
- Ensure that all courses, regardless of the campus or mode of delivery, provide students with access to excellent education of international standard, supported by effective quality systems and, where appropriate, with specific international accreditation.
- Conduct regular surveys of students, graduates and major employers of graduates and use the resulting information to improve the relevance and quality of academic programmes, learning support and services.
- Complete the qualification reviews which include academic and industry evaluations, student feedback, and sector comparisons.
- To develop and strengthen links with industry and the arts, professional and other sector groups, schools and other educational institutions, in a systematic manner and to mutual advantage.
- To increase the relevance of the University's teaching and research for the peoples of the Pacific region.

**Teaching and research**

- Reinforce strong commitment to research-led teaching and scholarship.
- To encourage staff to develop and maintain links within the University, and also regionally, nationally and internationally, to enhance teaching and research.

**Flexible delivery**

- Promote and develop the distinctive nature of Massey reflected in its extramural programme, and broaden this to a flexible learning and teaching focus that integrates new technologies into course delivery for both internal and extramural students.

**Māori**

- To ensure that the University has teaching programmes relevant to the aspirations of Māori in both content and delivery.

**International**

- To develop effective and appropriate international enrolment and programme delivery opportunities in order to enhance the reputation and strengthen the resources and capacity of the university.
Programme delivery

- To foster well-chosen international alliances, partnerships and joint ventures.

Facilities and support

- Provide student support services and a physical environment that will attract students and support greater academic success and retention.
- Ensure that international students at Massey University are well supported and that campus life is reflective of international cultures and values.
- Continue to collaborate with local communities to enhance off-campus facilities and support for students.
- Continue to develop learning support mechanisms and capability in the University with particular emphasis on Māori, under-represented groups and extramural students.
- Expand the number of prestigious scholarships and schemes that support high calibre students.
- Provide access for all students to high quality on-line educational services, support tools and pedagogy.
- Carry out the student satisfaction survey annually.

Study opportunities

- To increase the opportunities for the University's students to study overseas and to interact with students from other countries.
- Increase the number of students undertaking postgraduate research programmes and the level of scholarship and other support available to them.
- Continue to support the Vice-Chancellor's Bursary Awards Scheme to enhance access to University study for students from low-decile schools.

3.2 Design

3.2.1 Flexible learning and teaching

In 1998, the then Director of Extramural Studies prepared a paper entitled A strategy for flexible learning and teaching. The paper set out a vision in which teaching and learning would offer students a variety of learning pathways from which they could select, and would offer teaching staff a common set of teaching resources to draw upon. The vision would also give teaching staff access to the technologies to deliver and service the programme. The strategy proposed the use of technology in support of open and distance learning and the development of inter-campus programming and teaching; the technology would allow a more cost effective and flexible approach to campus-based teaching and learning. The strategy would see the historic distinction between internal and extramural teaching give way to a new model of ‘flexible teaching and learning’.

The flexible learning and teaching model has two critical components – development of a resource-based teaching strategy requiring well-planned and professionally-produced sets of study materials, and development of a variety of learning streams for interaction among students, between students and their tutors, and between students and the learning resources. Enhancements would be required in the area of management and administration (achieving a high level of integration among the various services and delivery streams and working
effectively in a multi-campus, collegiate environment), media (a set of courseware for every paper, teaching on the web, establishing the tele-classroom, modifications to campus-based delivery systems), learning (a variety of modes or streams from which students can choose), and service responsibilities (consideration of the appropriate services and their location within the organisational structure of the University).

It was clear to the Panel that this paper has influenced Massey University’s approach to programme delivery in recent years and that the substance of this paper has been absorbed into the teaching and learning sections of the University’s primary strategic planning documents. Massey University is now committed to a policy of flexible learning and teaching which enables students to select the mode or modes of instruction best suited to their circumstances at the time - classroom, electronic, extramural. This flexibility seems to be reasonably well-understood by the students. One student survey found that exclusive on-line learning is not greatly favoured. Rather, the preference was for a mixture of face-to-face, various on-line strategies and extramural instruction. Students who met the Panel welcomed the flexibility allowed by the opportunity provided to enrol concurrently in intramural and extramural paper offerings, and by the possibility of mixing modes of delivery in any one semester. Staff and union representatives who met with the Panel expressed concern about the implications of flexible learning for an individual staff member’s workload.

By the beginning of 2003, the number of modes of delivery, and the possibility of a student enrolling concurrently in papers delivered in different modes had eroded the traditional bi-modal concept of internal/extramural enrolment and delivery. As a consequence, a Review of Codes and Modes Taskforce (subsequently renamed the Flexible Learning and Teaching Taskforce) has been established to review current practices and to make recommendations designed to provide support for enhanced pedagogies of teaching and learning, improved service delivery to students across their study careers, and greater efficiencies in administrative structures and processes. It was expected that the Taskforce would report to Council by November 2003.

The Panel was told about the blurring of extramural and internal modes of learning. The Panel heard of the advantages of semesterisation of taught papers and the introduction of uniform credit point values for papers, where each credit point represents a notional student workload of one hour per week. However, the Panel also heard about instances of uneven workload across papers of equal credit value.

As well, the Panel was told by extramural students that they regret the loss of their distinctive character and feared the loss of their particular identity as the 'fourth campus' as more flexible learning options became available and as the University moves towards its apparent goal of seamless teaching and learning over all modes of delivery. Massey University needs to ensure that the extramural students are 'taken with it' when changes are made to their status and study requirements.

Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified one key improvement in the area of programme delivery:

- Continue to review paper and programme offerings and complete the review of ‘Codes and Modes’ to explore more effective means of structuring the delivery systems to provide a quality learning experience for students.
Commendation

C 9 The Panel commends Massey University for its initiatives in the development and implementation of a flexible learning and teaching policy and associated strategies, and in the on-going monitoring of these initiatives.

Recommendations

R 15 The Panel recommends that Massey University reviews curriculum and assessment to identify and address uneven workloads for students and staff.

R 16 The Panel recommends that Massey University reviews the mix of different learning modes - face-to-face, on-line, extramural - in relation to staff workload, student preferences and pedagogy, and implements strategies by which changes consequent to the reviews of flexible learning and teaching are more effectively communicated throughout the University and better understood.

3.2.2 Equivalence policy

In 1999, Massey University approved an *Equivalence policy and procedures* statement aimed at ensuring that each offering of the same paper, regardless of mode and location, would provide a reliable and valid opportunity for students to achieve equal learning outcomes. This would involve equivalent curriculum, assessment and academic support for the learning process. This springs from the University's determination that there shall not be two classes of Massey University qualification - the 'superior' version taught on campus, and the 'lesser' version taught extramurally. To effect this policy of equivalence, each paper is to have a single Paper Outline - leading in 2001/2002 to the production of a *Proposal for consistence in Paper Outlines*, to ensure consistency of presentation of outline content - with the one set of published learning outcomes and prescription for each paper. Each qualification carries one graduate profile regardless of mode of delivery, and there is nothing in students' academic transcripts to indicate where or in what mode they were enrolled for in a paper. Implementation of the equivalence requirement, like the regular peer review of curriculum and content and moderation of assessment tasks, are the responsibility of the Colleges.

The Panel heard the opinion that the University stresses inputs in its policy on equivalence when greater emphasis on educational outputs would be more effective. There appeared to be agreement that effective course co-ordination is vital in ensuring equivalence, but the way that this is administered varies across the University. Another concern expressed to the Panel was that the University's equivalence policy may inadvertently suppress the distinctive qualities of the campus where study is undertaken. It would appear that equivalence is a 'live issue' for the University, in part because the type and amount of assessment, content and mode of course delivery can be affected by lecturers' teaching skills, the resources and support available to staff and students, and the size of classes.

Massey University might usefully explore whether equivalence between modes is essential if the University can demonstrate that the learning outcomes of a paper are met, regardless of mode of learning.

Graduate profiles are important instruments in ensuring qualification equivalence across the University, and learning outcomes perform the same service for papers delivered across more than one campus. The Panel is uncertain to what extent graduate profiles influence programme
delivery and assessment, and hopes that this will be addressed as part of the on-going Qualification Review process.

Recommendation

R 17 The Panel recommends that Massey University reviews its policy of course equivalence across all campuses to ensure that the implementation of that policy does not constrain local initiatives.

3.2.3 On-line Learning

In 1997 an ‘Online Learning Monitoring Group’ was established to facilitate the development of an on-line (web) teaching strategy and to co-ordinate the services required to support this. By 1998, a specific platform – WebCT – was selected and adopted as Massey University’s on-line delivery platform. Since then, on-line learning has been the subject of constant review, including those by the Information Technology and Distance Education Taskforce in 2000, and the ‘Online Learning and Teaching Support Working Group’ in 2000. The Vice-Chancellor’s Symposium in 2001 was on ‘Online learning: meeting the challenge’.

The ongoing overview of on-line learning is the responsibility of the ‘Online Learning and Monitoring Group’ which supports and promotes the attainment of Massey University’s flexible learning and teaching strategy with reference to well-established e-learning pedagogies. The Group’s purpose is to provide advice, guidance and support with respect to the co-ordination, implementation and innovative use of electronic media, information and communication technologies. The Group reports annually to the University community.

In its quest for information to help inform its approach to support e-learning, Massey University conducted an on-line survey in 2003 of co-ordinators of papers that are web-based, web-enhanced or web-supported. The results of that survey appeared in An investigation of e-learning at Massey University and provides baseline data for an evaluation of the tools and strategies used by staff members for e-learning from which approaches for further support might be identified. The report concludes that the use of e-learning arises largely from the commitment and expertise of individual staff, and continued success in e-learning will depend on the ability of the University to provide appropriate support while at the same time enabling staff to ‘experiment’ and innovate by using the medium.

The Panel heard evidence that on-line learning is, as one might expect, currently dependent on the enthusiasm of individual lecturers keen to develop such courses. The Panel heard positive reports as well as evidence that the amount, quality and support for on-line learning is variable across the three campuses and five Colleges. In part, this reflects the competing capital demands across the University and their impact on quality provision for students. The Panel also heard that while many students feel empowered by the implementation of on-line and web-supported learning, some academic staff feel disempowered by it. In addition, some staff also raised concerns as to whether the University’s computer system could cope with wider extension of on-line learning. There were also concerns as to whether students who live in rural areas have ready and speedy access to web-based course materials.

Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified one key improvement in the area of e-learning:

- Develop and implement an appropriate strategy for supporting staff in their use of e-learning.
Commendation

C 10 The Panel commends Massey University for recognising the diverse needs of staff and students arising from the challenges posed by on-line learning.

Recommendation

R 18 The Panel recommends that Massey University develops and implements an appropriate strategy for supporting staff in their use of e-learning, ensuring appropriate support and development across all campuses of the University.

3.2.4 Interdependence of research and teaching

In 2000, a Vice-Chancellor’s Symposium on the research-teaching nexus was held as part of the self-review process associated with the Cycle 2 audit. The papers presented ranged from enquiries about the nature of the nexus, to case studies and personal experiences. They were subsequently published in 2001 as Towards understanding the interdependence of research and teaching: occasional papers from the Vice-Chancellor’s Symposium on the research teaching nexus, together with commentaries and an appendix which set out performance indicators for the interdependence of research and teaching. Further work led to a paper released in 2003, Strengthening the interdependence of research and teaching at Massey University: a proposal to further recognise and support the research teaching nexus, which proposes initiatives and activities that might be expected to further support and enhance the nexus.

The Panel heard from staff of several instances where their research outputs manifestly inform their teaching, but students tended to believe that the research standing of a lecturer is not as important as that person's skills as a teacher. The Panel was also informed that research-led teaching is difficult to achieve in extramural courses, although the manuals prepared by instructors are frequently significant reviews of, and often contributions to, the scholarship of the discipline. As well, some parts of the University are newly merged with Massey University, and in those sections teaching is a priority. This puts pressure on the University to develop and define the characteristics of the various types of links between research and teaching.

The first Performance Based Research Fund assessment round is now in progress, and the University is coming to terms with the exercise. The Panel heard examples of staff concern about a perceived need to increase research output to ensure good funding levels for the University, and about the influence of this attitude on the commitment to improvement in teaching. While research on teaching is encouraged by the University, this activity is currently unlikely to attract external funding. The Panel heard of intentions of individual staff to pull back from teaching innovation and to emphasise research.

Recommendation

R 19 The Panel recommends that Massey University supports the implementation of initiatives contained in Towards understanding the interdependence of research and teaching (2001) and Strengthening the interdependence of research and teaching (2003).
3.3 The learning environment
3.3.1 The support for student learning

Massey University provides many services to support student learning.

- Massey University Library has collections in all campuses, available to students and staff independent of their physical location. The Library provides print and electronic information resources, research consultations, and information literacy services.

- The National Student Administration and Teaching Support is grouped into three units - Assessment, Enrolment and Learning Support – and provides core administrative services to support and sustain a student’s enrolment and study. Each campus has a Student Learning Centre.

- The National Student Relations delivers the primary points of contact between the University and its prospective and current students; it is organised into three units – Massey University Contact National (with ‘Massey Contact’ personnel at each campus), National Liaison and Recruitment, and Student Information Unit.

- The International Students’ Office is based at Palmerston North and offers pre-admission advice to students and receives applications for admission. Each campus has an International Students Support Office with staff who interact with students enrolled in Massey programmes.

- The Massey University English Language Centres are located on each of the three campuses and each offers a range of pre-degree English language programmes.

The Panel was impressed by the extent to which students describe staff as accessible; this was especially evident in discussions with students in Albany. The Panel heard evidence that learning support staff organised their work to take advantage of individual expertise and that they constantly monitored the appropriateness of their support of students. They also sought to monitor change in student independence and reported that while there is repeat usage of services beyond the first year, there is also a growing confidence as student users progress through an academic programme and a steady decline in repeat calls for assistance and guidance. A concern raised by staff was that fear of failure among some international students caused them to seek proof-reading support for all their assignments. This raises issues for the assessment of their work. Disabled students at Albany were particularly appreciative of the support they received.

As reported in 'General', the development of Māori issues on campus is largely left to interested individuals. One of the consequences for support of Māori students is the 'disconnections' in some aspects. For example, the kaitautoko and the 'mainstream' student learning support areas do not seem to have any formal relationship, and some of the kaitautoko spoke of heavy workloads.

The Panel heard from Library staff and students about the difficulties associated with inadequate facilities, especially at Wellington, where the Deputy Vice-Chancellor has publicly recognised this as a development and budget priority.

Commendation

C 11 The Panel commends Massey University for the level of support generally available to its students.
Recommendation

R 20 The Panel recommends that Massey University ensures its student learning facilities are of a consistently high quality across all campuses.

3.3.2 Students’ associations

Massey University’s students associations provide services on all three campuses while also having a University-wide voice. The Federation of Massey University Students’ Associations comprises:

- the Albany Students’ Association,
- the Massey University Students’ Association (Palmerston North)
- Massey at Wellington Students’ Association,
- Extramural Students’ Society,
- Māori Students’ Roopu: Manawatuhia (Palmerston North), Te Waka O Ngā Ākonga Māori (Albany), and Te Atawhai (Wellington).

The Panel met with representatives of the student associations on each campus as well as representatives of the student body. Those meetings provided useful student perspectives on study at Massey University, as well as raising some issues of concern, the substance of which informs the relevant sections of this Report.

3.3.3 Access versus excellence

The Panel notes Massey University's traditional and commendable emphasis on access, facilitated by its presence on three campuses in Palmerston North, Albany and Wellington and by the offering of many papers through extramural education. Improved access and increasing numbers of students raise problems about the extent and type of student support required. At the same time, Massey University is committing itself to recognising and rewarding excellence in student achievement. The Panel noted that Section ‘D: Students’ in the Statement of objectives/profile for 2003-2005 has as an objective ‘To seek enrolment of high calibre students and support them in reaching their potential’. While applauding this proposal, the Panel remains uncertain as to how the traditional emphasis on access will affect the University’s more recent objectives and drive for excellence.

In recent years there has been a very rapid growth in the number of international students in several programmes and it has caused pressure on facilities at Albany and Wellington campuses in particular. This growth, and the variations in student preparedness, is impacting on the University and putting pressure on support services. It has also affected the University's ability to provide accommodation. Māori students at Albany and Wellington were concerned that Māori issues were being marginalised by the more immediate needs and concerns of international students. Unlike the research, academic and administrative structures in a University, the University-wide 'Māori' structures are possibly more difficult to implement and measure successfully.

Commendation
C 12 The Panel commends Massey University for its intention to attract high-achieving first-year students, and for its policy of providing scholarships for students from low decile high schools.

Recommendation

R 21 The Panel recommends that Massey University progresses ways to recognise and reward excellence in learning and student achievement, and develops measures of success in the enrolment of high calibre students and their achievements.

3.3.4 Student preparation and English language skills

The Panel heard a variety of understandings about ‘internationalisation’ and how it is, or will be, reflected in the University’s coursework and research programmes. However, the Panel did hear of concerns about the significant number of students lacking the appropriate preparation for university study and inadequate English language skills, and about the need for the University to provide a high level of resource for student support. It was apparent to the Panel that the recent rapid increase in international student numbers carries with it a substantial cost in teaching support, with some staff and students suggesting that some taught courses were being ‘dumbed-down’ to accommodate students with poor preparation and inadequate English language skills. These problems may be associated with an international student’s first year of study. One senior administrator referred to the steady growth in independence and performance in the second and subsequent years of study, which is consistent with the views expressed by student learning centres and reported earlier in this Report (see section 3.3.1).

The self-review portfolio reports that in 2002, recommendations arising from a review of the University's English to Speakers of Other Languages services called for expansion in the range of credit papers in English skills. The portfolio also reports that the self-review for this academic audit had found concerns about the literacy levels of some students. As an interim measure, the Academic Board approved an amendment to the general admission regulations advising students whose prior education was not in English to enrol in a paper in English for Academic Purposes for Speakers of Other Languages in their first year at Massey University. This reflects the difficulties associated with open entry which, at present, are faced by all New Zealand universities.

Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified one key improvement in the area of English as a Second Language.

- Continue to implement the recommendations of the English and Speakers of Other Languages/Second Language Teaching Review which will provide current and potential students with greater access to English language services.

Commendation

C 13 The Panel commends Massey University for its efforts to address the problems arising from students with inadequate preparation for university-level study and from students’ problems with English-language academic instruction.

3.4 Evaluation and feedback
Student feedback on the quality of the learning environment appears to be limited to questions within *Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching* (SECAT). (See section 2.4 for comments on the use of this instrument to evaluate the quality of teaching.)
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4

The achievement of learning outcomes

4.1 Objectives
Massey University has set itself the following objectives regarding the achievement of learning outcomes:

Completion and retention

- Develop a strategy for enhancing the first year experience of students and completion and retention rates by major undergraduate programmes.
- To achieve greater academic success by, and retention of, Māori undergraduate and postgraduate students.
- To continue to encourage enrolment from under-represented groups and to support their progress.
- Increase enrolment of Māori undergraduate and postgraduate students.

4.2 Moderation and benchmarking
The Panel was provided with information on the criteria for accreditation by professional bodies of ten academic programmes in Business, Health Sciences, Education, Technology and Engineering, and Veterinary Science. These accreditations are carried out by professional bodies to ensure that graduates from those programmes are properly equipped for professional practice. In a number of cases, accreditation has been sought as a means to benchmark the programmes nationally or internationally with appropriate national and international professional organisations. In the implementation of its Qualification Review policy, Massey University will consider the extent to which such accreditation can provide input into the reviews and avoid duplication of effort.

While applauding the extent of professional accreditation of relevant programmes, the Panel notes that the accreditation process is related to the specific needs of professional bodies and is not necessarily a substitute for qualification review or benchmarking of standards. The Panel heard and saw little evidence of formal external benchmarking of programmes other than those which had gained accreditation; some staff seemed reluctant to consider benchmarking as having a role in achieving quality improvement. One potential problem mentioned to the Panel was that with its variety of teaching and learning modes, the University may experience difficulty finding a comparable organisation outside New Zealand with which to compare performance. For many Māori academic staff, benchmarking may appear inappropriate and unhelpful, yet international benchmarking would probably be effective against approaches to teaching and learning for indigenous people in other countries.

During interviews, the Panel heard of indicators such as the success of students in international competitions, the acceptance of Massey University graduates into overseas postgraduate programmes, the impact of study leave by staff, visits by international academics, and the employment of academic staff with experience in teaching at other universities. While informative, these indicators are informally gathered and their impact appears to be uneven.
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across the University. The Panel believes there should be a greater emphasis on the benchmarking of processes and outcomes. The Panel also appreciates that the newly-approved Qualification Review process may require evidence of comparability of standards, where the review process itself should assist in the development of benchmarks and indicators of standards.

Recommendations

R 22 The Panel recommends that Massey University identifies appropriate benchmarks and implements these as measures of key processes and outcomes across the University in support of its declared aim of excellence in research, teaching and learning, and community service.

R 23 The Panel recommends that Massey University identifies appropriate benchmarks and implements these as measures of the quality of teaching and learning for those academic programmes not subject to accreditation by professional bodies.

4.3 The first year experience

In 2001, Massey University established a working group to review student retention, with a particular focus on the student first year experience. A First Year Experience Taskforce was established in 2003 to summarise recommendations of the working group in the areas of the enhancement of learning support for extramural students, connections with careers advice, strategies to address disproportionately high levels of failure in first year papers and programmes; linkages with the Certificate of University Preparation and the Student Learning Centre services to provide support to students at risk, and College and programme-specific strategies to identify and support students at risk of failure after their first semester of study in a university programme.

Subsequent to the Audit Visit, the Unit took up an invitation to view the proceedings of the November 2003 Vice-Chancellor’s Symposium on ‘The first year experience’. The Symposium, led by an overseas keynote speaker, was designed for staff to discuss current thinking, research and best practice in their fields. The Symposium also included the presentation and discussion of the First Year Experience Taskforce Report, copies of which the Unit later distributed to the Panel. Obviously the Panel has had no opportunity to discuss the findings of the report with members of the University community, but it would appear from the Taskforce report that the University recognises there are particular problems associated with the first year of study, and has proposed strategies for improvement.

The Panel notes that the investigation of retention and progress of Māori students is part of the Māori @ Massey policy projects.

Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified two key improvements in the area of student support and reward.

• Consider the report of the First Year Experience Taskforce when submitted, and implement the recommendations as appropriate, within resourcing limitations.

• Develop appropriate strategies for encouraging and rewarding student achievement.
The achievement of learning outcomes

Commendation

C 14 The Panel commends Massey University for its initiative in examining the first–year experience and notes the process for discussion and identification of strategies for improvement as outlined in the First Year Experience Taskforce Report.

4.4 Assessment

The Panel heard that staff strive to ensure equivalence in assessment through such processes as cross-campus moderation. The Panel was unable to gauge to what extent assessment was aligned with the overall programme learning outcomes, but heard that assessment of outcomes for individual papers received serious consideration.

Key improvements

The Massey University Audit Portfolio identified two key improvements in the area of assessment.

- Continue to revise and refine assessment policies and procedures across the University and promote fair, valid and reliable assessment practices.
- Continue to refine the Exclusions Procedures in the context of their ability to identify and monitor students whose academic progress is unsatisfactory.

Recommendation

R 24 The Panel recommends that Massey University monitors the effectiveness of any revisions and refinements to its assessment policies and practices and their impact on the alignment of assessment to learning outcomes.

4.5 External stakeholder involvement

In Massey University Palmerston North, the Panel met with a selection of external stakeholders who complimented Massey University on its effective consultation, collaborative research, and support for community groups. In recent years, there have been more frequent calls on academic staff to become involved in community initiatives, particularly those involving Māori communities and lower-decile schools. Increasingly a place in the University 'on the hill' (a reference to the Turitea site) is seen as attainable by mature students and high school leavers from disadvantaged schools, all of whom appreciate the opportunities and support available to them. The Panel was impressed by the expressions of this public-spirited work and of the plans and opportunities that exist for more, but the Panel hopes that the University will recognise the need to be fully informed about this outreach and to become rather more selective in encouraging what staff do under the umbrella of community work.

While the Panel noted strong personal allegiances to Massey University among stakeholders, it was less sure of ways by which the University as an institution plans to establish and maintain its links beyond individuals, in particular with tangata whenua. Whilst having strong connections that allow the University to observe the correct protocols through kaumāua, kaiwawao, individual staff and their Assistant Vice-Chancellors, the Panel heard nothing of any institutional structures that helped Council ensure Māori iwi in their regions were represented and consulted on important decisions.

The Panel also noted that some programmes in the University have established relationships with relevant Māori communities but that this practice does not appear to be widespread throughout
the University. They are more established on the Palmerston North campus and the Panel found there are some initial connections that were spoken of on the other two campuses.

Commendation

C 15 The Panel commends Massey University for the strong personal relations of staff with external stakeholders and the way that the stakeholders are consulted and involved in programme design.

Recommendation

R 25 The Panel recommends that Massey University ensures the existing structures adequately facilitate consultation on policy development with appropriate community groups.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Massey University

Massey Agricultural College - named after William Ferguson Massey, Prime Minister of New Zealand from 1912 to 1925 - dates from 1927 by the amalgamation of Schools of Agriculture at the then-named Auckland University College and Victoria University College and the combining of their resources into the establishment of a single institution in the Manawatu. For 25 years, Massey Agricultural College consolidated its reputation as a residential agricultural college and as a developing research institution. Horticulture was introduced in 1948.

In 1960 a branch of Victoria University of Wellington was founded in Palmerston North, offering Arts courses in Manawatu and extramural courses throughout the country. Agricultural College and the branch of the Victoria University of Wellington were amalgamated in 1963 and the 'Massey University of Manawatu' (now Massey University) was granted autonomy and degree-conferring powers from 1 January 1964 with faculties of Agriculture and Horticulture, Technology and Veterinary Science. The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Science were established in 1965, a School of Graduate Studies in 1969, and a Faculty of Business Studies and a Faculty of Education in 1977. A School of Aviation was established in 1990, and in the early 1990s, further schools were formed - one in Applied and International Economics and one in Mathematical and Information Sciences (the latter to become a Faculty of Information and Mathematical Sciences).

Co-operation between the University and the Palmerston North Teachers' College was formalised in 1972 with the creation of a School of Education, and in 1996 the Teachers College - now a College of Education - merged with the University's School of Education to create a new Massey University College of Education.

In 1993, a new campus was opened in Albany, on the northern outskirts of Auckland, and in 1999, Massey University merged with the Wellington Polytechnic. The adidas Institute of Rugby opened at the Palmerston North Campus in 1999.

In 1997 the University's faculties were reorganised into Colleges - Business; Education; Humanities and Social Sciences; and Sciences - with a fifth College - Design, Fine Arts and Music - added with the merger with Wellington Polytechnic. Massey University now has five Colleges and 43 academic units located across three campuses in the North Island of New Zealand.

Student and staff profiles are summarised in Table 1.
### Student profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By campus</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Equivalent Full-Time Students</th>
<th>By College</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Equivalent Full-Time Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>9 267</td>
<td>7 339</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15 925</td>
<td>7 816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>5 619</td>
<td>4 030</td>
<td>Design, Fine Arts and Music</td>
<td>1 642</td>
<td>1 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>4 620</td>
<td>3 629</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4 738</td>
<td>2 676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extramural enrolments</td>
<td>20 239</td>
<td>6 529</td>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>10 488</td>
<td>4 903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>6 952</td>
<td>4 677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 745</td>
<td>21 527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massey University, *Academic Audit Portfolio 2003: 65*

### Staff profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By campus</th>
<th>Academic staff</th>
<th>General staff</th>
<th>By College</th>
<th>All staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1 138</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Design, Fine Arts and Music</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regions and Divisions</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 349</td>
<td>1 424</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massey University, *Annual report 2002: 78-79*
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New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit

Terms of reference

- To consider and review the universities’ mechanisms for monitoring and enhancing the academic quality and standards which are necessary for achieving their stated aims and objectives.

- To comment on the extent to which procedures in place in individual universities are applied effectively.

- To comment on the extent to which procedures in place in individual universities reflect good practice in maintaining quality.

- To identify and commend to universities good practice in regard to the maintenance and enhancement of academic standards at national level.

- To assist the university sector to improve its educational quality.

- To advise the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee on quality assurance matters.

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

- To carry out such contract work as is compatible with its audit role.

Vision

- To have contributed to the achievement of quality, quality enhancement and excellence in New Zealand universities as measured by the improved quality of their scholarly activities and outcomes – namely, research, teaching, learning and community service provided by their graduates and staff to the measurable benefit of people and societies both inside and outside of New Zealand.

Objective with respect to academic audits conducted during the period 2003-2006

- To have successfully administered audits of all New Zealand universities and to have produced audit reports which are acknowledged as being authoritative, rigorous, fair and perceptive and which are acknowledged by the universities as being of assistance to them in improving their own programmes of continuous improvement of quality and added value.
Appendix 3

Cycle 3 focus

General
With respect to teaching quality, programme delivery, and the achievement of learning outcomes, how does the institution ensure:

- the effective involvement of students, staff and other communities of interest in the review and improvement of plans, strategies, regulations, policies and guidelines?
- the effective implementation of institutional, college, division, faculty and school plans, strategies, regulations, policies and guidelines?
- the taking into account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi?
- appropriate lines of responsibility and allocation of resources to planning and monitoring?

Teaching quality

Assignment of staff
How does the institution ensure:

- the most appropriate and effective assignment of staff to teaching in programmes at various levels?
- the appropriate balance of staff time in teaching, research, administration, consulting and community activities?

Development of teaching competence
How does the institution ensure:

- effective development of individual teachers through activities that characterise, recognise, enhance and reward teaching quality?
- effective support for staff to review teaching practices and to develop appropriate skills and expertise and to explore and apply a range of flexible and innovative learning methodologies including e-learning?

Evaluation of teaching
How does the institution ensure:

- effective evaluation of the quality of teaching?
- the appropriate support and advice for those (both students and staff) involved in the evaluation of the quality of teaching?

Feedback
How does the institution ensure:

- effective feedback to teachers and students?
- effective application of feedback into the enhancement of teaching?
**Programme delivery**

**Context**

How does the institution ensure:

- effective understanding by staff of regulations, policies and guidelines related to teaching, assessment and workload?
- effective understanding by students of course and assessment requirements, learning opportunities, study skills support and access to facilities and resources?

**Design**

How does the institution ensure:

- effective design of the teaching of courses to use ways most appropriate for the discipline, levels of courses, learning outcomes, student preparation and student learning styles?
- effective use of an appropriate range of teaching methods that incorporate flexible and innovative learning methodologies including e-learning?
- effective realisation of links between research and teaching?
- effective provision and use of facilities and services in support of student learning?

**Evaluation**

How does the institution ensure:

- effective evaluation of the quality of the learning environment?
- the most appropriate support and advice for those involved in the evaluation of the quality of the learning environment?

**Feedback**

How does the institution ensure:

- effective feedback to teachers and students?
- effective application of feedback into the enhancement of the learning environment?

**The achievement of learning outcomes**

How does the institution ensure:

- the alignment of learning outcomes in programmes and courses with the institution's goals and objectives for teaching and learning?
- the application of appropriate and effective assessment practices in testing the achievement of learning outcomes?
- the excellence of scholarly standards of achievement?
- effective benchmarking of standards nationally and internationally?