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New Zealand -

or Aotearoa, the ‘country of the long white cloud’ – is a country of filmic beauty, where the real-world views slip easily into the cinematic visions of wide-screen fantasies. This is also a small country; in terms of landmass New Zealand is a little larger than the UK, slightly smaller than Italy, but the population is only just over four million (with approximately one quarter of the population living in Auckland). New Zealand is a young country: the Treaty of Waitangi, generally considered the founding document of the modern nation and a very real (if hotly debated) force in contemporary society, was signed in 1840; the Māori people emigrated to the islands between the 12th and 14th Centuries (though perhaps as early as the 9th Century); and the land itself is formed in part by surprisingly recent volcanic eruptions. Auckland, for example is built largely upon an active volcanic field created over the last 150,000 years, with the youngest volcano (Rangitoto) being formed a mere 600 years ago. The people of New Zealand hold passions dearly; visiting New Zealand at a time when we could experience the aftermath of an early exit from the Rugby world cup provided us with sufficient evidence to confirm that statement!
It is within this broader context that New Zealand has developed a successful higher education system that, despite its size, competes with the USA, UK, Canada and Australia for international students (and institutions worry about reliance on this source of income as much as any UK institutions do). Nevertheless, the sector remains concerned about its competitiveness for the most talented staff and students and the government wishes to enhance the ability of TEIs (Tertiary Education Institutions) to contribute to the development of the New Zealand economy and people. For example, the proportion of 25–64 year olds in New Zealand that have completed tertiary education is at the OECD average (25%) and the government wishes to increase participation. Within the startling natural beauty of the New Zealand islands, however, can be found some of the country’s most pressing challenges: its small size, physical isolation and multi-cultural society. The OECD report, Thematic Review of Tertiary Education, comments on the response of the government and the tertiary sector in New Zealand to these challenges, which “have been addressed through a major socio-economic reform agenda in which deregulation and liberalization are key features. Tertiary education policy reforms have reflected this overall trend, resulting in a system that in both size and shape bears little resemblance to that existing some 20 years ago.”

TEIs in New Zealand are diverse, though the university sector is small by UK standards (there are eight universities1), and this helps create a great sense of collegiality between the institutions. In addition to the universities in New Zealand, the thriving polytechnic and wānanga sectors make a distinctive and valuable contribution to tertiary education. In total, there are twenty polytechnics in New Zealand, spread across the country providing educational opportunities to approximately 214,000 students (representing 79,500 FTEs): this compares to 168,000 students in the universities (representing 128,000 FTEs). The distinct contribution of polytechnics, as providers of high-level primarily vocationally-orientated education, is highly valued and enables pathways into tertiary education for adult learners and for learners with low prior qualifications. Some members of the study tour were left thinking whether the complete amalgamation of the polytechnic sector within the university sector has helped move forward with this aspect of vocational life-long learning in the UK. The wānanga are formally recognised tertiary level institutions that provide pathways for Māori-centred education from foundation programmes to postgraduate study. There are three wānanga, with approximately 62,200 students enrolled (or 30,900 FTEs). The Treaty of Waitangi provides a special status for Māori students in New Zealand that is not easily transferable to the UK context but, nevertheless, the principles of student-centred educational provision, delivering education in a meaningful way to individual students, is a lesson in best practice which can be considered more fully. Finally, colleges of education and private and government training establishments make up a diverse tertiary sector.

1 The term Māori means ‘normal’ or ‘ordinary’; according to ancient tradition the term connotes the mortal nature of man as against that of God.

2 Tertiary Education is used in a similar sense to that adopted in the UK, and covers what in the UK would be FE and HE provision, i.e. all education post-secondary. As the term in New Zealand covers all post-secondary education it is slightly broader than the term used by the OECD.

3 See appendix one for more details.

Māori artwork in the main meeting room of the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors’ Committee: the circle represents the people of New Zealand in union (the circle) and together (the alternating panels of traditional Māori and European materials) though the four strands do not meet in the middle as the union is not complete.
Despite the sense of collegiality and informal partnership, some aspects of university provision are much more centrally controlled than in the UK. For example, new degree-level programmes must be approved by a central sub-committee of the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (NZVCC) before they can be established by an institution. This itself highlights an interesting difference between UIUK and NZVCC because the latter, in addition to its role as a lobby group for the university sector and discussion forum for vice-chancellors, also derives authority from the Education Act 1989. The powers handed to the NZVCC (which it enacts through various sub-committees) give to it, *inter alia*, the power to approve and moderate course provision, comment on academic developments, encourage coherent and balanced development of curricula, facilitate credit transfer between institutions and provide advice on a common standard of entrance to universities. All areas considered central to the notion of institutional autonomy in the UK.

Differences too can be found in governance structures: perhaps the greatest difference can be found in the level of state involvement with institutions’ internal affairs. A prime example of this involvement is that the governing bodies (Councils) of all TEIs in New Zealand have four members appointed by the national government’s Minister of Education. This reflects the fact that the TEIs are in-substance owned by the Crown: “The Crown is the in-substance owner of TEIs, though direct ownership of assets is largely vested in the Councils of each institution, though some assets are still in Crown title. In-substance ownership is based on the Crown’s role as funder in the sector, and on its liability for the debts of an institution, should one be disestablished... Whilst the Crown accepts that it does not legally own TEIs, it has a long-term interest in these institutions and a large public investment.” As Crown entities, therefore, some commentators note that even four Crown appointees is insufficient when the entire Board of other Crown entities is generally appointed by a Minister.

The diversity of the sector and the comparative ability of the government to control macro-educational policies on a micro level seems to help bring about two aspects of the New Zealand tertiary system which are (at least by some) seen as aspirations in the UK. First, part of the strength of the diversity within New Zealand TEIs is that they seem able, by and large, to clearly differentiate their offerings from one another and to know their place in the broader tertiary sector. Whilst similar institutions compete, dissimilar ones do not, recognising the value and the distinctive mission of each institution or group of institutions. The potential meaning of the loss of the polytechnic sector in the UK, as providers of high-level vocational education, becomes all too readily apparent when the dynamic polytechnic sector in New Zealand is experienced first hand. Second, the direct links between TEIs and the government, as well as the comparatively small size of the sector, allow for the close alignment of institutional strategies with government aspirations. This does not, however, represent a recipe for slavish adherence to government dictates or trends, rather, institutional autonomy is prized and closely guarded. But the small size of the sector, and the inevitable overlaps between different groups and individuals, means that there is greater interaction (and thereby understanding) between the various tertiary-level bodies in New Zealand than is common in the UK.

By comparison with the UK, New Zealand appears to be a country less inclined to adopt regulations, codes and legislation; whether this means that New Zealand is ‘under-regulated’ or that the UK is ‘over-regulated’ could be debated at length. Nevertheless, this important comment should be remembered when considering tertiary education practice in New Zealand as it is an important part of the cultural context for appreciating the diverse system. In short: simply because there is no regulation, this does not mean the issues which have been codified in the UK have not been considered (or are not being addressed) in New Zealand.
New Zealand is therefore a country that presents interesting similarities and differences that benefit from closer investigation. This report presents the findings and reflections of the AUA-AHUA Study Tour to New Zealand in October 2007. There is a lot to be learned from the examples of best practice we discovered in New Zealand and we have gathered some of the most relevant examples together in this report.

About the study tour

The tour group contained ten members, divided into three groups of three, each examining a specific theme, plus the tour leader. The specific themes, and the sections of this report, are:

A Student application and progression, including student fees, the impact and reaction of marketisation and issues of widening participation in undergraduate programmes and progression into postgraduate study, diversity and equality issues especially the inclusion of minority groups under-represented in HE.

B Supporting professionalism and excellence in higher education management and administration, including the role and purpose of professional bodies in supporting and developing administrative and managerial staff.

C Universities, sustainable development and the integration of environmental, economic and social issues into university strategies and life.

In addition to these three specific themes, the group also set out to investigate the policy context of higher education in New Zealand, including best practice in institutional governance. Whilst not a separate theme, this general context was examined through the specific themes in order to place each of these specific themes in its broader context.

Prior to the tour itself, members of the tour group prepared a brief report for the institutions we would be visiting which expanded on the three themes and suggested the roles of staff with whom we would typically find it useful to meet. This helped focus our meetings with key staff but, nevertheless, the breadth of the topics covered (especially though not exclusively under the heading ‘sustainability’ in theme C), the limited amount of time at each institution and the availability of relevant staff proved challenging. Hence, this report is a distillation of our thoughts and ideas coupled with examples of best practice to provide a comparison with the UK system and a guide for future developments. Where possible, we have tried to write this report to provide a reflective account, rather than simply a descriptive account, of the tour. We hope you find these reflections interesting and supportive in helping to consider practice local to your own institution. However, reflection implies opinion and, whilst all the opinions we express in this report are based on the evidence of our study tour, all opinions can be debated.

Further details concerning the organisation of the tour can be found in appendix two.

Thanks

The introduction to this report would not be complete without offering many thanks (several times over!) to Ali Hughes, the President of ATEM in New Zealand (AUA’s partner organisation). Ali was instrumental in arranging the visit and without her it could not have happened. All the members of the tour group will remember the generous hospitality with which we were greeted in each and every institution we visited. All the staff we met gave generously of their time and engaged us in thoughtful conversations about their current provision. As a tour group, therefore, we would like to thank all those hard-working professional staff in New Zealand institutions that contributed towards making the studying tour interesting, productive, useful and enjoyable.

The New Zealand polytechnic sector

In terms of the effects of losing the polytechnic sector in the UK, New Zealand provides examples of good practice and innovation that could be examined by our colleges. Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology (CPIT) has developed a Trade Innovation Institute, founded because the number of skilled and trained trades people in New Zealand is in decline. The institute has a specific focus of providing comprehensive trade education and training in partnership with industry. For example, companies can brand workshops with their company logos, colours and tools thus establishing a recognition with students. In turn these students may then become highly trained employees with the skills these companies need from the very beginning. This partnership not only benefits the trades-sector, and hence the economy, but also has good knock-on effects for the community in general. For example, CPIT construction students then gain the skills they need by constructing mobile houses. Once completed CPIT donates the finished product to the community thus providing good quality social housing as a result of training and education.
There is no central admission service in New Zealand; instead students apply direct to each institution. This provides students with a high degree of choice. Each university (and sometimes each faculty) has developed their own application system. From an applicant’s perspective, this means tackling different application systems if they apply to more than one TEI. As a further consequence, although institutions can analyse their own application trends over time, they lack readily available national data against which to benchmark their performance. The admissions systems may also be more labour intensive for each TEI: more than one is trying to improve its data handling and reduce staff costs involved in the handling of admissions. From 2008 capped government funding will mean fines or lack of funding imposed on those TEIs which have a 3% variance on their predicted attendance; many institutions are concerned about how this will be managed.

Student application and progression

The application cycle is typically six months running from September to the start of term in February. Most institutions do not impose deadlines on student applications or decisions by faculties.

- September: applications start
- November: school term ends
- January: exam results available
- February: places confirmed
- Feb/March: university term begins

Applicants are able to apply for student loan funding which may be up to 100% of the fee. Student loans are also available for living costs. A minority of students are eligible for a means-tested student allowance from the government. For students under 25 this is tested against parental income at a level which makes most students ineligible. Institutions receive funding from the Tertiary Education Commission based on Single Data Returns prepared every four months. The 'SDR' is a prediction of the number of students taking up a course. Admission to university in New Zealand is based on students achieving University Entrance qualifications and courses in universities being classified as Open or Limited Entry. Limited entry courses have supplementary application forms, additional entry requirements, subject requirements and higher entry standards. Open entry courses simply require standard University Entrance qualifications.

There are four main admission categories:

1. NZ University entrance (either Bursaries and Scholarship Examinations up to and including 2003 or the National Certificate of Educational Achievement [NCEA] from 2005 – the NCEA is the national qualification for secondary students)
2. Special Admission
3. Discretionary Entrance
4. Admission ad eundem statum (admission at Entrance Level or with credit)

Special Admission is a unique admission type born out of the founding principles of New Zealand of education and health care for all. It means any applicant who is over 20, is a New Zealand or Australian citizen or permanent resident who is not otherwise qualified for University Entrance will be guaranteed a place at university – though not on any specific university course. The university would be obliged to offer the applicant a place but can determine whether it is to an Open or Limited entry course.

Although some courses have entry qualifications based upon success in school leaving qualifications (NCEA) others, particularly in the humanities, only require a minimum national standard entry. Any domestic applicant achieving the minimum standard is offered a place, as is anyone over 20 regardless of previous educational achievement. The New Zealand government requires that all residents achieving this level of qualification are offered a place at an institution, on a course. However, specific courses can set higher entry qualifications (e.g. some health professional programmes). Another means of effectively restricting entry is to have an open entry to year 1 and low progression to year 2 (for example, only 20% of year 1 law students proceed to year 2 at one university, with most of the remaining 80% studying social science or humanities programmes). This is a fundamental difference from the UK system, and ensures that all residents can attend their local university, or choose to travel elsewhere. It seemingly reflects the principle of a more “level” socio-economic structure in New Zealand as against the UK.

6 42 credits from a range of specified subjects at NCEA level 3 plus literacy and numeracy requirements. A few polytechnics admit students under 20 to degrees with lower entry qualifications but most require standard University Entrance.
There is no central admission service in New Zealand; instead students apply directly to each institution. This provides students with a high degree of choice. Each university (and sometimes each faculty) has developed their own application system. From an applicant’s perspective, this means tackling different application systems if they apply to more than one TEI. As a further consequence, although institutions can analyse their own application trends over time, they lack readily available national data against which to benchmark their performance. The admissions systems may also be more labour intensive for each TEI: more than one is trying to improve its data handling and reduce staff costs involved in the handling of admissions. From 2008 capped government funding will mean fines or lack of funding imposed on those TEIs which have a 3% variance on their predicted attendance; many institutions are concerned about how this will be managed.

Student application and progression

The application cycle is typically six months running from September to the start of term in February. Most institutions do not impose deadlines on student applications or decisions by faculties.

Applicants are able to apply for student loan funding which may be up to 100% of the fee. Student loans are also available for living costs. A minority of students are eligible for a means-tested student allowance from the government. For students under 25 this is tested against parental income at a level which makes most students ineligible. Institutions receive funding from the Tertiary Education Commission based on Single Data Returns prepared every four months. The ‘SDR’ is a prediction of the number of students taking up a course. Admission to university in New Zealand is based on students achieving University Entrance qualifications and courses in universities being classified as Open or Limited Entry. Limited entry courses have supplementary application forms, additional entry requirements, subject requirements and higher entry standards. Open entry courses simply require standard University Entrance qualifications.

There are four main admission categories:

- NZ University entrance (either Bursaries and Scholarship Examinations up to and including 2003 or the National Certificate of Educational Achievement [NCEA] from 2005 – the NCEA is the national qualification for secondary students)
- Special Admission
- Discretionary Entrance
- Admission *ad eundem statum* (admission at Entrance Level or with credit)

Special Admission is a unique admission type born out of the founding principles of New Zealand of education and health care for all. It means any applicant who is over 20, is a New Zealand or Australian citizen or permanent resident who is not otherwise qualified for University Entrance will be guaranteed a place at university – though not on any specific university course. The university would be obliged to offer the applicant a place but can determine whether it is to an Open or Limited entry course.

Although some courses have entry qualifications based upon success in school leaving qualifications (NCEA) others, particularly in the humanities, only require a minimum national standard entry. Any domestic applicant achieving the minimum standard is offered a place, as is anyone over 20 regardless of previous educational achievement. The New Zealand government requires that all residents achieving this level of qualification are offered a place at an institution, on a course. However, specific courses can set higher entry qualifications (e.g. some health professional programmes). Another means of effectively restricting entry is to have an open entry to year 1 and low progression to year 2 (for example, only 20% of year 1 law students proceed to year 2 at one university, with most of the remaining 80% studying social science or humanities programmes). This is a fundamental difference from the UK system, and ensures that all residents can attend their local university, or choose to travel elsewhere. It seemingly reflects the principle of a more “level” socio-economic structure in New Zealand as against the UK.
Most non-professional degrees are genuinely modular in a manner similar to the USA – students are free to pick modules across a wide range of options to ‘assemble’ a degree. All institutions visited appear to offer semesterised programmes, with modules contained in a single semester.

When first founded, each college and subsequent university had a specialism: Medicine at Otago, Veterinary Science at Massey for example. While this is still true for those two particular subjects, nearly all universities now offer a mixture of Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities.

Although New Zealand institutions charge fees which vary between subjects and institutions, staff in institutions did not believe this significantly affected choice of institution or subject by domestic students. However, it was noticeable that the charging of fees was an issue in the polytechnics, or non-degree courses. Except in this latter case, no marketing around fees was obvious, with each institution instead competing on brand image, facilities, reputation and course choice.

Changes to domestic fees, and the maximum fees chargeable, are broadly controlled by the New Zealand government: each institution was locked in to its historic fees, with the maximum permissible increase normally capped at 5% per annum. TEIs can apply to the TEC for permission to increase fees by up to 10%. Massey University was successful, but most of those who have applied have been refused. For those institutions which had historically charged low fees, there was no way to increase fees up to the higher levels charged in some other institutions. The long term implications of this were possibly apparent in that certain institutions stressed their lack of resources and this seemed to coincide with low fee levels. (Although no institution claimed sufficient resource either!)

As part of the New Zealand government’s initiative to increase research, all international doctoral students are charged domestic fees, with universities counting all such students for the purposes of receiving government funding per EFTS². Some institutions were hoping to increase significantly their research student numbers, but this was in order to improve their own standing in future national research assessments, rather than in response to the government fee subsidy.

Every institution visited had a marketing plan which incorporated a range of campaigns. This included a typical mix of outdoor media, regional and national TV, regional and national radio, print adverts in newspapers, websites and the ubiquitous prospectus. Outreach programmes included open days, fairs and school visits. What really stood out was the acceptance of brand identity at every level within an institution.
There are three main groups of students whose participation in tertiary education the New Zealand government has highlighted as being in need of improvement: Māori, Pasifika1 and students with special educational needs. Many of the universities we visited had set their own targets for recruitment of students from these groups. For example, the Auckland University of Technology: target of 10.8% of student population Māori, and 14% Pasifika and Manukau Institute of Technology: 2010 target*, 20% Māori students, 20% Pasifika students. Generally these targets represent achieving a student population representative of their local population and catchment area, as many institutions recruit quite locally.

One of the main reasons Māori and Pasifika students are under-represented in tertiary education is that these groups generally under-perform in school (for further details see the Te Kotahitanga project reports, published by the Ministry of Education10). Many of the staff we spoke to believe the Māori attitude towards tertiary education is often based on negative experiences in compulsory school-based education over several generations. It is felt that, because of these experiences, many Māori students do not feel comfortable in a tertiary education setting. It is assumed that students from other ethnic backgrounds (e.g. Korean, Malaysian, Chinese) do not require similar support; most immigrants are assumed to assimilate successfully and rapidly, and hence no specific support is given to these groups, unlike the UK. Staff were asked if the attention and additional support given to Māori caused difficulties with Pākehā11 students, who might feel ignored, but this was not felt to occur.

In order to encourage more Māori and Pasifika students all of the institutions we visited employ specific recruitment strategies for these groups and provide physical centres for cultural activities. They have identified that for Māori students it is important to get the families and wider Māori community involved when recruiting and also for retention. For Pasifika students the church appears to play an important role. For both of these communities oral communication is very important, therefore institutions need to ensure that students from these groups are enjoying their student experience as they will then tell their communities (from the first day of their studies, not simply after graduating). Having individual strategies to target students from different ethnic and cultural groups is something that could be used more in the UK, as it is important to recognise that they have different needs, however ethnic minority communities in the UK are more diverse than those in New Zealand, which may make this approach useful only in specific circumstances.

In addition to encouraging students from under-represented groups to sign up to tertiary education, the institutions also see retention and student support as being of the utmost importance. The institutions all have good support systems for students - they don’t just view widening participation as getting the students through the door in the first place. A prime example of this support is Massey’s Assignment Pre-reading service.

Most institutions also target the low decile schools in their local area12, much like the widening participation work undertaken in many UK institutions. In the UK we have the support of organisations such as Aim Higher and regional initiatives throughout the country such as LEAPS in the Lothian area in order to address the issues of under representation. In New Zealand all of the work is done on an individual institution basis and there appears to be no collaboration between institutions. When the collaborative models adopted in the UK were described to some of the institutions’ staff, they were interested in this approach, but thought the New Zealand tertiary education market was too competitive at the moment for them to adopt collaboration in a sensitive area such as recruitment.

All the universities and polytechnics visited had a senior member of staff responsible for Māori affairs, and had constructed a marae. Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Māori) were a normal part of the governance system in universities, and equivalents exist in polytechnics. This aims to ensure that Māori issues are taken full account of throughout each TEI.

All the TEIs visited had constructed a marae: traditional sacred meeting halls for communities, with attached open space for discussions, kitchens and dining space. These provide a centre for Māori cultural activities involving not just the students, but their extended families.
Massey University offers a wide range of extramural studies and attracts a large number of students to such courses. In 2006 they had 17,709 extramural students, equating to 5,835 EFTS, and 34% of their student population. Due to the variety of courses they offer on an extramural basis they have a large number of adult returners, in 2006 45% of new students' last occupation before enrolling at Massey was 'wage/salary worker', while only 12% came directly from secondary school. One of the issues affecting the low participation of Māori students in tertiary education is that they often do not feel comfortable in a tertiary education environment due to negative experiences at school. Massey find that the extramural option attracts a lot of Māori students to their institution. The above features of the University's student population require Massey to approach their student support in a non-traditional manner and tailor it to their students’ needs, something they have achieved with success.

At Massey they recognise that support in the first couple of weeks on a course is essential, therefore every student who enrolls for extramural study gets a call within the first two weeks to check that everything’s going OK and that they’ve settled into study. After this students can attend ‘Staying on Track’ evenings, which are held in a number of locations throughout New Zealand. If extramural students are on campus they can access the entire student services open to the student body as a whole, and they can also access many of the services online. They also have a dedicated Extramural Student Society.

One of the most impressive student support services offered at Massey University is the pre-reading service. Students can hand in their first essay and a Student Learning Service Consultant will read it over and check if the student is on course, is structuring the essay in the right way, and so on. When students do not have face-to-face contact with a tutor it can be hard for them to know if they are on the right track, so this service is one way of offering reassurance. Students can hand in a maximum of two essays per year and there is a three-day turnaround for this service. If there is a problem with the essay they will direct the student to the relevant study skills support department for advice. This is a web-based service.

Further information on this service can be found at: www.massey.ac.nz/massey/students/extraурural/services/resources/extraурural-assignment-pre-reading-service.cfm

For further information on the extramural courses and support offered at Massey University visit: www.massey.ac.nz/massey/students/extraурural/extraурural_home.cfm
A primary role of the marae is to be a support facility that enhances the teaching, learning and cultural needs of Māori at the university. The marae is available for use by non-university groups. Their value is sufficiently high that many TEIs are considering building equivalent buildings (farlee) for the Pasifika communities to use. It is possible that some community issues in the UK could be addressed in a similar way.

In most institutions visited, a high proportion of students came from the local area. Few hall places are available in general, whether owned by the university or private developers. As a consequence, many students commute to study, and a number of institutions mentioned that social life for students was often limited, especially in the evenings. A similar phenomenon is apparent in many UK HEIs.

In a system of eight universities, it is possible for staff within each, and in government, to know all relevant staff individually. It is difficult for institutions to benchmark themselves domestically, and therefore a mix of local knowledge of the New Zealand system plus institutional benchmarking replaces the complex system of national comparisons between institutions familiar for many purposes in the UK.

Some key points of reflection for the UK:

- In New Zealand most institutions have individual support services for different ethnic groups. This is easier to do in a country like New Zealand where there a small number of large ethnic groups, and more difficult in the UK where there are multiple ethnic groups. However, UK institutions may wish to consider whether the ethnicity of their support staff is representative of their student body and, if not, how this might affect some students from ethnic groups seeking support.

- In New Zealand many of the universities employ different recruitment strategies for different ethnic groups, taking into account their culture. Could this be used more in the UK context? This might work not only for groups of different ethnicity but also for groups with different backgrounds e.g. students from rural communities, students who are first in their family to enter HE, as for such groups there may be specific barriers to entering HE.

13 When referring to Massey University it is worth noting that the group visited only the Palmerston North campus of Massey, consequently references in this report about ‘Massey’ do not necessarily apply to its Wellington or Auckland campuses which together have more students than Palmerston North.
Supporting professionalism and excellence in higher education management

Reflecting on the purpose of our investigations we could agree that professional development is as important to each AUA member and their career as it is to the institution in which they work. To enable opportunities for development requires commitment from all concerned; a planning process; appropriate (and adequate) resourcing and an ethos of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) within the organisation. CPD encompasses a wide range of initiatives from narrowly task-focused in-house training for specific skills to high-level development for Senior Management and Leadership, and our group wished to consider the whole spectrum in our discussions. It is commonly reported now in HR/CPD research that one of the major motivators and incentives for professional support staff is development for career advancement (with the enticing possibility that salary enhancement will accompany the advancement). The career development may take place in ‘the Unit’ which initially sponsors/funds the development, but a large organisation such as a university is able to offer a range of advancement opportunities in a different department or Central Service Unit. In this way the organisation as a whole benefits from the accumulated development opportunities taking place across campus14.
Why excellence? Why not just ‘doing a good job properly’? Hallinger & Leithwood (1996) and also Moses (1987) put the case very succinctly. A recurring theme within this report will be the need for and desire within professional support staff continuously to improve their skills, expand their capabilities, enhance their performance, their career aspirations and ultimately, as Moses refers to, contribute to the “success of their University.”

It is perhaps proper to stress at this point that with regard to professional support staff - referred to in New Zealand as ‘general’ or ‘allied’ staff - and their development, members of Theme B travelled to NZ expecting to find structures for staff development within each Institution which might be broadly similar to examples in the UK. We also anticipated a commitment to professional development, in the sense of ‘bread and butter’ training provision, that we are familiar with from the UK e.g. in Equal Opportunities and Diversity, Recruitment, Communicating with people from different cultures, Information Technology and Business Systems, IT Competencies, and Accredited Management Training Programmes.

We were not to be disappointed in that respect. In all the institutions visited, we discovered a strong commitment towards the professional development of staff although, as also expected, we uncovered issues of resourcing, which varied between institutions. From induction training through training for university processes, (including special provision for Māori and Pasifika staff), to higher level training for leadership, the examples were numerous and of high quality. In one institution, as proof perhaps of the intercontinental nature of CPD strategy, some of the training on offer was based upon a model for training developed in a UK university. That said, we went to New Zealand looking for something else besides - innovative ideas and methods of working which would not be immediately familiar to UK professional support staff, emanating from the highly individual nature of tertiary education in New Zealand.

Tertiary Education Institutions rank amongst some of the largest employers in New Zealand, yet in many instances their staff maintain a remarkably strong identity with their community. This can be compared to examples in the UK but seems to be much stronger in the New Zealand TEIs visited. Much of the foundation of this relationship can be attributed to the bi-cultural identity so important to the people of New Zealand. It should not be surprising therefore that the attitudes we discovered in NZ institutions towards the professionalisation of the modern administrator, and their staff development practices to support this, have a national significance beyond the tertiary education sector.

As mentioned before, resourcing for CPD is inevitably limited within the overall funding regimes of the institution, and is rightly prioritised according to what will most directly improve the student experience. This can have several implications:

- it can make the training very functional - training and re-training staff for very specific roles (mentioned, for example, during conversations at Manukau Institute of Technology)

- it can disadvantage general and allied staff, with a lower entitlement to development days (typically five, compared with ten for their academic peers), and variable employer-financed payment of professional body membership fees

- in several instances, CPD was also considered to as primarily ‘personal refreshment’, which employers can naturally find hard to justify paying for within a constrained resourcing environment

---

14 Hodgkin and Whalley: “The external evaluation of a university’s learning and teaching by, for example, professional bodies, might fulfil several functions but of particular importance must be the use the university can make of it in improving the quality of its provision… sometimes, however, aspects seen to be in need of improvement might arise not directly from the learning and teaching itself but from the administrative context in which it takes place.” Hodgson, Kath and Whalley, Gordon (2007), The effectiveness of a university’s administration of its learning and teaching. Teaching in Higher Education, 12:2, 275-279.

15 “Hallinger & Leithwood”, Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 34 No. 5, 1996, pp. 98-116. © MCB University Press, 0957-8234, Culture and educational administration: A case of finding out what you don’t know you don’t know: “The past 15 years …… Policy makers have questioned the results being produced by educational systems and their managers. From Australia to Europe to the USA to Asia, policy makers have sought more effective and efficient ways to deliver quality education… calling for revamping of administrative training as a corollary of system reorganization. This has kept practitioners busy trying to understand the nature of their changing professional roles and up-to-date in terms of the skills demanded in their rapidly changing organizations… For almost two decades, practitioners have themselves called for more training and support to meet these changing job pressures and expectations.”

16 Moses: “Effective PD in HE should serve the generic needs of all members as it promotes the interests of the institution.” Moses, I. (1987), cited in “The Centre for Professional Development at the University of Auckland: towards creating networks of moral obligations”. Reynold J.S. Macpherson, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

17 General staff = non-academic staff in universities
Allied staff = non academic staff in polytechnics
To meet this challenge, instances were reported of general staff investing a significant proportion of their own time and money into their professional advancement, a situation which is not wholly absent in UK institutions today but is perhaps proportionately less significant an occurrence. It was found also that many opt to study for higher qualifications ahead of joining a professional association, suggesting that membership of such an Association was not viewed as a direct route to advancement but another worthwhile product of developmental activity. The resourcing environment of New Zealand tertiary education institutions is an area which it is suggested could benefit from a separate study to supplement this.

The team were keen to investigate the importance of Union membership to staff. That such membership was considered to be of value was reported by staff in several institutions. General staff in the universities claimed a strong voice in the Association of University Staff (AUS)¹⁸, and we were interested to learn that some unions co-ordinate or enable provision for members to take leave in order to undertake professional development activities. Where staff do elect to belong to professional associations, national cross-sectoral bodies such as the Human Resources Institute of New Zealand (formerly the New Zealand Institute of Personnel Management) and the New Zealand Institute of Management, seemed the more popular choices.

All of this presents a real challenge for ‘generalist’ tertiary education administration associations such as the Association for Tertiary Education Management (ATEM). As with AUA in the UK, continuing success (both in the recruitment of new members and in providing the services which current members value) rests on these Associations being able to demonstrate that membership confers sufficient added value (often in competition with the more specialist associations which may offer the added incentive of chartered status). One such benefit we identified was the ability to offer corporate membership through financial packages attractive to employers. An interesting development is the proposed collaboration between ATEM and the L H Martin Institute at the University of Melbourne¹⁹ in two key areas, both of which are expected to “greatly improve the offerings that ATEM provides to its members” - (a) Equal partnership with ATEM in the Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, and (b) Accrediting certain ATEM courses as counting towards the Masters Degree in Higher Education Management which the Institute would be offering²⁰.

Another key question for staff and associations in New Zealand, as in the UK, concerns how best to serve the needs of more senior managerial staff. It was suggested by staff in New Zealand that ‘management’ are not included in the coverage clauses of all teaching and non-teaching unions (AUS, ASTE and TIASA). As in the UK, managerial staff tend to belong to a variety of associations, often aligned with their specialist area. It might be expected then that an organisation such as ATEM may seem to be a less appropriate choice (especially in the light of section 3.9) unless they offer an innovative benefit such as the Masters proposal noted above.

As reported earlier, ‘Leadership’ was an area which the group was particularly keen to explore, viewing it as a key area for CPD for managers and administrators in the UK. This was mirrored in New Zealand, where ‘Leadership’ was widely viewed as one of, if not the, key skill (or portfolio of skills) which general and allied staff need to develop to meet future demands and expectations of a transforming tertiary education administration. As in the UK, this is being addressed in a largely traditional way, mainly through specialist leadership development programmes being run by institutions and sector bodies such as the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (NZVCC). We heard that there is scope for collaboration between the university and polytechnic sectors in this area - something which could benefit from a cross-sector co-ordinating or management role by an organisation such as ATEM - and might, with imaginative leadership, offer scope for developing a programme for the public sector as a whole.

18 The Association of University Staff (AUS) represents the industrial and professional interests of over 6,500 staff employed in universities and a range of organisations related to tertiary education across New Zealand: www.aus.ac.nz/default.asp
19 LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management was designed to meet the urgent need in Australia and the region for high quality leadership and management education in higher education and Vocational Education and Training (VET) institutions. The Institute’s courses and services are aimed at leaders and managers in higher education and VET and those aspiring to be, or who have been identified as, future leaders: www.mihelm.unimelb.edu.au/
20 Minutes of a meeting of the ATEM Council held on Sunday 23 September 2007, Canberra. The LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management
We heard in several institutions of an emphasis on women in leadership and management programmes, but as a corollary to that we found mixed views about the success of this. Several of the HR managers we spoke to recognised that attending a course which is focused too narrowly upon a single staff grouping or specialism is often not the most effective way of developing an individual’s leadership skills and abilities. This view, that leaders are developed better through interaction with a range of diverse peers, is reflected globally through the Teaching and Learning Development Institute at the University of Queensland, Australia and closer to home in the Leadership Foundation funded Action Learning Sets for senior staff run between the six East Midlands Universities (Universities of Derby, DeMontfort, Leicester, Loughborough, Northampton and Nottingham Trent).

Whilst programmes run by the UK’s flagship Leadership Foundation for Higher Education are admired, we found in New Zealand that approaches such as one-to-one coaching and mentoring at a senior level are proving successful, and UK institutions might also wish to reflect on the potential benefits to be gained from more emphasis on individually tailored and workplace-based initiatives. The work of the LH Martin Institute based in Australia was highly praised by several individuals we spoke to, and there is a hope it may also be able to deliver initiatives in New Zealand institutions.

A second important aim of institutions’ management and administration development is to generate improvements in the standard of general/allied staff qualifications. We learned that many institutions encourage staff to take internal courses by offering a general fee waiver, and in the Canterbury area, a 50% discount with partner institutions in the region is available. It is interesting to compare this with the UK, where a reduction, discount or fee waiver is normally only offered if the course is taken at the home institution and sometimes specifically for a new programme which is being supported through HEFCE funding in its early years.

We also heard criticism of the practice of ‘bonding’ or ‘tie-ins’ attached to employer funding of CPD as being unnecessarily restrictive. It is impossible not to have sympathy for this view from both a staff and institutional perspective since for the staff in an institution such as a university, the ‘next opportunity’ may well come from a department other than the one which sponsored the staff, through funding from their local staff development budget and in time away from their core duties. The influence of Staff Development Units is key, both in the UK and New Zealand, to overcoming this ‘silo’ mentality and seeing CPD in a broader context. It is an issue which institutions (including those in the UK) would do well to reconsider if retention of excellent and well-trained staff is a key strategic aim for the institution.

General staff conference

General or allied staff conferences are designed to provide a range of opportunities for staff to consider current issues, learn new workplace skills and network with colleagues. The format typically includes a mix of external speakers, internal presentations, personal and professional development sessions, and cultural visits. We saw change related themes at both AUT “Living and Working in an ever-changing World … Thriving or Surviving?” and Massey “Working with Change in a Changing World” for their 2007 conferences. Topics included ‘Don’t play it safe: empower your audience’, ‘Creativity in the workplace’ and ‘The role of general staff in branding the University’. Conferences had a different focus and balance of activities to suit each particular institution. The models in evidence in New Zealand offer UK-institutions useful templates which they could consider promoting for administrative and managerial staff. They would be a significant addition to the more usual one-day and annual conferences in the UK, where staff from different institutions come together in a ‘neutral’ venue to share a CPD experience.
We saw clear evidence that general and allied staff are willing to engage in the broader strategic aspects of managing the institutions they belong to. They are engaged in professional networking, such as the ‘community of practice for administrators’ developed at the University of Canterbury, which meets on a monthly basis and offers guest speakers and networking opportunities. Several of the institutions we visited hold an annual one or two-day general/allied staff conference.

A further initiative we encountered at Auckland University of Technology and which we considered to be worthy of further investigation were the ‘four for five’ and ‘two for two-and-a-half’ employment options. Our first impression of these initiatives was that they were a generous concession to staff, (refreshingly) open to both academic and non-academic staff, might present difficulties for managers in departments, and seemed unlike anything we knew of in the UK. However, on reflection on our return to the UK, some similarities can be uncovered between these schemes and the types of ‘Career-break’ schemes on offer in UK universities designed to put new life into the work-life experience. Schemes for example at the University of Bristol, University of Sunderland and University of Nottingham show a similar ethos. However, the significant difference between the New Zealand scheme and the career-break schemes is that the former uses an imaginative ‘salary-sacrifice’ stratagem to ensure that the year out of work is ‘paid’ whereas the UK schemes offer unpaid leave. The attraction of the New Zealand option is obvious.

Some key points of reflection for the UK:

- In what way can professional support staff in the UK be engaged with AUA and others to further define ‘professionalism and excellence’ and help to devise strategies to inform institutions of the directions they could take? How can institutions be persuaded to make best use of this professionalism?

- Employment options: what can we learn from ‘four for five’ that is worth developing in the UK as a viable alternative to ‘career breaks’ and improve the range of services designed to help support staff balance work/family better?

- Support staff conferences: what can we learn from the reasons they matter to staff in New Zealand institutions and what can AUA do to help members facilitate developments from these examples within and between institutions in the same city or region?

- Diversity in support: how can we best use the web of support - Unions, Associations, institutions, peer groups - to enhance development for support staff?

A couple of the institutions we visited felt they would like to co-ordinate better the various development opportunities available internally from different parts of the organisation. At Victoria University an initiative to build ‘one doorway’ into all staff development opportunities is underway to address this. Other institutions in New Zealand and institutions in the UK might consider whether their range of staff training and development opportunities is sufficiently joined-up at institutional, regional and even national level.

A third key area for the professionalisation of tertiary education management and administration is a greater willingness by general staff to become more ‘business-aware’ in respect of the institutional processes they manage and the service they provide to students. Institutions need more of their administrative staff to leave behind their roles as regulators and become instead key stakeholders alongside academic colleagues in the process of delivering a high quality learning experience, encompassing a range of activities which address both academic needs and the life which students lead on campus outside of the lecture room or laboratory. The results of this are evidenced in the results of a THES survey of undergraduate students in the UK which graded the quality of service their universities provided over 21 criteria referring to the range of services which the universities provide outside of the classroom. The results seemed to suggest that professional support staff across campus can and do directly influence the student experience. We saw clear evidence of this approach too in Manukau Institute of Technology, whose community roots in the urban development of Ōtara, close to the motorway serving greater Auckland City, were proudly displayed. Manukau’s direct engagement with the student experience was exemplified in two very striking ways: first, the prominent position on campus given to the marae and, second, the loyalty of the professional support staff to the predominantly Māori and Pasifika student body, in maintaining an ‘association of students’ at times when the students themselves were not supporting a fully independent ‘students association’. 

We saw that diverse activities which address both academic needs and the life which students lead on campus outside of the lecture room or laboratory. The results of this are evidenced in the results of a THES survey of undergraduate students in the UK which graded the quality of service their universities provided over 21 criteria referring to the range of services which the universities provide outside of the classroom. The results seemed to suggest that professional support staff across campus can and do directly influence the student experience. We saw clear evidence of this approach too in Manukau Institute of Technology, whose community roots in the urban development of Ōtara, close to the motorway serving greater Auckland City, were proudly displayed. Manukau’s direct engagement with the student experience was exemplified in two very striking ways: first, the prominent position on campus given to the marae and, second, the loyalty of the professional support staff to the predominantly Māori and Pasifika student body, in maintaining an ‘association of students’ at times when the students themselves were not supporting a fully independent ‘students association’.
‘Four for five’ and ‘two for two-and-a-half’ employment options

The two for two-and-a-half scheme is basically the same scheme, but half the time period!

Full-time employees of the university may apply to enter an employment relationship under which, with no substantive change to duties, they would receive 80% of their full-time salary and after each four years of work take a fifth year off on pay. This scheme enables staff with opportunities for refreshment, both professionally and personally, which it is expected will enhance the quality of the academic environment of the university. The scheme is open to all staff satisfying the following criteria:

- full-time employment
- permanent tenure
- not subject to a current disciplinary action by the university

From the start date all taxable basic salary will be reduced to 0.8 of the full-time rate.

All other salary conditions shall continue to apply throughout the work years and the leave year, including annual increments, and general salary increases. Staff engaging in this scheme are permitted to enter into another agreement of employment or an agreement for services with the university on any mutually acceptable conditions. Special responsibility salary allowances or market forces salary allowances shall be paid in full, without the 0.8 factor applying during any work years to which they apply, and shall not be paid during the leave years of the four for five scheme.

Paid leave owing, due to premature termination of employment with the university during the course of four for five employment, may be taken on salary or cashed up as desired.

Any allowances or reimbursements will not be affected by the four for five scheme.

Cars and non-monetary benefits will be available only for work years of the scheme.

Entitlements to be in superannuation or insurance schemes will apply throughout all years of the scheme.

During every fifth year from the start date of an individual’s entry to the scheme, a full year’s leave shall be taken. During this year the university shall not claim any service from the employee under the substantive employment agreement, or seek to prevent the employee engaging in any lawful activity.

Existence of such an additional agreement shall not affect payment under the substantive agreement.

An employee may withdraw from the scheme at any time during the work years by giving three months’ notice in writing to the Executive Director - Corporate Services. Leave owing may be taken at a time agreed between the employee and the university or cashed up if so requested by the employee.

All grants and funding schemes available to university staff shall be available at all times to employees in the four for five scheme on the same terms and conditions as those for other staff.
Universities and sustainable development

The group explored three distinct elements of ‘sustainability’:

- **institutional sustainability**: how institutions invest for the future, maintain financial viability, generate resources for investment and plan generally to ensure long-term viability

- **physical environment**: how institutions establish environmental impacts, their policies and how they address a) biodiversity b) estate planning and development, maintenance, refurbishment/use, and c) sustainable construction criteria for contractors

- **students and the curriculum**: how has sustainable literacy been implemented into the curriculum?
Institutional funding sustainability
The precise detail of the funding arrangements in New Zealand, the mechanisms used, the cost base and the particular detail may vary when compared to the UK but the underlying challenges are the same.

Institutions in New Zealand are required to develop strategic plans and submit them to the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC). These ‘investment plans’ cover three years and encompass a range of issues from the immediate and urgent need of the next financial year to a more speculative wish list for later years. What is evident is the significant shortfall between need and the likelihood of assured funding from the TEC. The TEC requires that institutions plan for a 3% surplus. This applies regardless of size, or complexity of the institution’s funding challenges. Practice in the UK does not include a requirement to meet a particular percentage but indicative levels have been proposed and institutions are free to set their own financial targets taking into account their future investment needs and, more particularly, their ability to generate a surplus. The transparent approach to costing (TRAC) includes a percentage which is regarded by most as the minimum requirement necessary for financial sustainability.

There is no equivalent of TRAC in New Zealand and while there is a broad understanding of the financial pressures arising from the need to maintain sustainability, it is not clear that this message is fully understood at grass roots. It is not being suggested that this is the case in the UK but TRAC and the introduction of full economic costing for research projects has helped disseminate the message more widely.

New Zealand TEIs do not have access to capital grants except in very extreme circumstances. There is one example of NZ$100m being made to an institution which gave rise to policy conflict. This was resolved post hoc by rewriting the policy. Those institutions which have had to borrow heavily to meet their capital investment needs are faced with the double challenge of meeting the cost of borrowing and capital repayment as well as meet the 3% surplus target.

As with institutions in the UK, New Zealand TEIs have turned to the international student market to supplement the funds they can generate and have seen a measure of success in this strategy. However, they are now witnessing a downturn in demand, underlining the risk associated with placing too great a reliance on overseas student income and, in particular, too much reliance on a single country.

The scrutiny of the TEC is much more intrusive than the equivalent funding council in the UK. Institutional investment plans are approved by the TEC and only subsequent to their approval is funding released. In the UK the role of the governing body is paramount and as long as they accept the conditions of grant, abide by the financial memorandum and use resources for the purposes for which they are given it is the governing body that approves investment plans and budgets.

One new issue is now confronting New Zealand TEIs arising from the commitment that any student who has the appropriate qualifications has the right to attend university (though not the course) of their choice. Hitherto the government have provided the funding to back this up. Recently government has decided to cap the level of funding without the reciprocal change needed to limit demand. Therefore New Zealand TEIs remain obliged to take any qualifying student but will not get the additional resource necessary for those students in excess of funded numbers. By contrast in the UK we have the ability to limit the number of students which are admitted to the university within the funding that is made available.

An example of the financial challenges to be faced comes from the University of Auckland. They have produced a detailed ten year revenue and capital investment plan which identifies a need to spend NZ$1.5bn over a ten year period. They have identified their ability to generate circa NZ$100m per annum and therefore have a shortfall of NZ$500m which they have to bridge, thus presenting a clear challenge for senior management and the governing body which demands an action plan to be developed to enable that gap to be closed.

In parallel with the development of their revenue and capital investment plans they develop very specific business plans for each project requiring funds. There is extensive scrutiny to ensure business plans are robust and that management teams fully understand the consequences for their future funding if the project proceeds but does not fulfil its expectations. Once the business plan is agreed and the investment authorised, the departmental budget is adjusted accordingly. This mechanism ensures the department is held accountable for the successful implementation according to the criteria agreed and signed up to.
Institutional environmental sustainability

Overall, incorporating the principles of sustainability (i.e. balancing environmental, economical and social aspects) in decision making processes was seen as a luxury, with each institution stating that the funding regime does not support models such as Whole Life Costing, or facilitate linking maintenance budgets to capital project budgets. Hence, value engineering is considered an essential cost-cutting exercise, not an exercise in realising long-term efficiencies in building performance. The fact that an extra investment at the capital project stage might help to deliver the 3% surplus demanded by the TEC and have the added environmental/PR benefits is not considered.

Combined with little emphasis on competitive purchasing, environment/energy managers find it difficult to include sustainable construction criteria into tenders, contracts and employee requirements. This is an established trend which is slowly changing in the UK as environmental criteria are proving to be commercially viable, especially for capital release schemes.

Government investment in sustainability or implementation of legislation is not as prolific as in the UK. For example, no institution gave actual experience/critique of environmental building standards or made reference to legislation similar to those effecting UK HEIs - changes to the Part L Building regulations for example. The existence of supporting government-funded bodies similar to that of the Carbon Trust, Environwise or WRAP were not mentioned or in evidence.

Reference was made by Auckland University and CPIT to the Green Star NZ. This is New Zealand’s first comprehensive environmental rating system for buildings, launched April 2007 by the New Zealand Green Building Council (established July 2005). This compares to the UK’s BRE Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) and EcoHomes standards, BRE being privately run since March 1997 with numerous versions of the environmental building standards being developed ever since.

Hence, sustainable construction in New Zealand institutions is in its infancy with only a handful of examples of good practice. Finding double-glazed windows was a rarity!

Formal biodiversity action plans (BAPs) do not seem to feature heavily in any Estates Strategies with the emphasis being on formal gardens. However, woodland areas and indigenous species are used to enhance the look and feel of the campus.

Overall, energy is reasonably well-managed with at least two institutions employing energy managers who report to the Vice Chancellor. However, energy and environment managers did express frustration due to the limitations mentioned above and would welcome the legislative backing we have in the UK.

Very little emphasis is placed on managing water, as it is often free. The Massey University is built on an aquifer which supplies it, the surrounding town and businesses.

Recycling across all institutions was good, with the Massey University standing out as an exemplar. However, all recycling seemed to be conducted on a voluntary basis, producing good commitment levels, but limited assurance that items are being recycled or recovered in an environmentally/safe way (if at all). For example, there were no examples of Duty of Care Audits conducted on waste contractors.

Sustainable construction

A good example of sustainable construction was found in AUT. The picture demonstrates how flexible design has been implemented. The construction of the structural ceiling beams allows services to be run to any area with the minimum of disruption. There is no suspended ceiling, which would be expensive to replace and very energy inefficient as they trap warm area in the ceiling. A suspended ceiling will typically be replaced four times during the life time of a building, putting unnecessary costs on maintenance budgets.

The windows have solar shading on the outside of the building and there is the option for people to use blinds. Vegetation is used to good effect to provide further shading on the outside of the building. These measures will help ensure that the building (which has a low thermal mass) will not overheat in the summer. All desks are facing windows, with computer screens facing the centre of the office spaces. As ‘glare’ is not an issue, blinds are not used to the extent that they are in UK offices, allowing greater use of natural light.
Recycling at Massey University

Massey University excelled with its recycling initiatives. A main component of their success was the ability to store large volumes of waste in an old boiler house, making collection from waste companies economically viable.

Highly visible recycling bins were a common feature on the university campus.

There is no legal obligation for manufacturers of electrical/electronic goods to take back products. However, major companies actively support initiatives. Computer recycling

Bikes left on the university estate are collected and reconditioned. They are then given to any student wanting a bike to get round campus, forming a key part of a sustainable transport strategy.
Student study trends are remarkably similar to patterns recognisable in the UK in that they attend university for short periods of time, with a large proportion commuting from home. All institutions (with the exception of the University of Auckland) had problems with car parking, despite the low population compared to land mass. This is mainly because the major cities are compact and public transport from the suburbs is considered poor, although most cities had good public transport in the centre with some routes being free.

Massey University was the only example of a university setting up a dedicated bus contract to ensure buses terminate in the centre of the campus and that the timetable dovetails with other city services. Perhaps the key point of the Massey bus scheme is that it is free for staff and students, which is why patronage is so high and car trips to the campus have dropped so much. Demand for car parks has also dropped, and they are now deliberately located on the campus outskirts to make the heart of the campus more pedestrian and bike friendly and to encourage further bus use. This compares with almost every university in the UK which has to implement a detailed transport strategy as part of planning permission and actively promote all alternatives to the car.

A number of institutions stated that ethics is/would be integrated into every aspect of university life. However, on further investigation the emphasis was on research ethics with little consideration given to other areas such as volunteering, environmental ethics or ethics relating to the arts. In some institutions, ethics was taken to mean work life balance or social justice - especially in terms of the Māori community. Although achieving high ethical standards/environmental performance was mentioned in a number of strategic plans, value statements or mission statements, these where not translated into specific and measurable targets or high level objectives.

**Student engagement and the curriculum**

The general consensus was that there is little engagement in environmental campaigns because students have no interest in the issues. However, there was no indication of any research into the reasons for low participation, nor any push to encourage increased involvement. Low participation in all aspects of university life was apparent, with institutions quoting student election participation rates as low as 3-10%.

The concept of the student as a customer, increasingly apparent in the UK by the introduction of differential fees, was mentioned on several occasions but as a theory not an aspiration. This contrasts significantly with the UK where (at best) students can have their services tailored to their needs. New Zealand institutions considered their role as providing a generic service with the responsibility being on the student to access as necessary. There is an overall feeling that making everything too easy was not preparing students for life outside university.

The distinction between students simply using the services provided versus active promotion, lobbying and ownership of projects by students was striking. However, higher levels of engagement were obvious where there is good student representation. For example, the University of Auckland has a student environmental awareness group called Greens on Campus with 130 members.

Discussions with all universities confirmed that effective student representation was pivotal to student engagement. This suggested a reliance on individuals that lacked continuity planning for long-term engagement, especially given the short time representatives serve. One of the Environment Managers stated they had more success by concentrating on ideas that could be set-up and completed by students within a year.
The current context of fees in New Zealand, meaning more part-time students in employment, is resulting in a similar situation to that which can be found in the UK whereby students often choose paid work experience over voluntary activities. Many of the TEIs were faced with the additional problem of trying to keep students on campus outside lecture time.

The depopulation of city centres at night had a huge knock on effect on the vibrancy of city centre campuses like the University of Auckland. After-hours student involvement in public and community activities such as public lectures and debates (which might otherwise have been used to promote environmental issues and community involvement) was therefore limited. In contrast, at Christchurch, which is smaller and more compact, public engagement with the university is significant.

On the whole, where environmental strategies are being put in place, the curriculum was mentioned as a future project with some universities researching the key priorities for coming years within faculties. However, most institutions were keen to establish a wider base before developing policy in this area. In the experience of the staff we spoke to it seemed that a push for sustainability in the curriculum came mainly from academics rather than the students themselves and that environmental research tended to be confined to the natural academic areas such as geography and science.

Many staff involved in environmental management argued there is often a gap between the perceived environmental priorities and those set at an institutional level. The key perceived ‘big’ issues being highly visible ones (e.g. recycling) and those that students were perhaps more aware of. Further, it appeared that a key barrier to engaging students in sustainability was their lack of prior knowledge necessary to make informed decisions. This is a universal problem that may only be solved by embedding sustainability in the curriculum. For now, interest in sustainability seems to stem mainly from knowledge gained serendipitously from their courses.

The University of Canterbury gave us a unique example of successful student projects on campus (the live waterways project) that stemmed from what students had learned on their course. The university had taken the sensible step of deciding that projects started by students such as this should be taken over by facilities management when they are established. This was key to:

- ensuring the project continued to be effective after students moved on
- allowing new students to tackle new issues, and
- moving the agenda forward

There are, however, long-term projects at Canterbury that remain in the students’ hands e.g. the community garden, shown below.

Whilst a little way behind the UK there are signs that the TEIs, society generally, and students in particular, are becoming better informed and seeking to influence the development of the curriculum as well as raising awareness of the environmental and sustainability agenda.

**Some key points of reflection for the UK:**

- Given that a university’s greatest impact is, arguably, through the graduates it produces, in what ways might it be appropriate to consider embedding sustainability in the curriculum? How might a university encourage and promote sustainability through interaction with student societies?
- How can whole-life costing be used as a means to encourage sustainable practices in developing and maintaining the university estate?
- Do we make a number of assumptions about students’ motives regarding engagement, and is more research needed in this area to inform HE policies on participation generally - and sustainability in particular?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland University of Technology</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aut.ac.nz">www.aut.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lincoln.ac.nz">www.lincoln.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massey University</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td><a href="http://www.massey.ac.nz">www.massey.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Auckland</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td><a href="http://www.auckland.ac.nz">www.auckland.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Canterbury</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td><a href="http://www.canterbury.ac.nz">www.canterbury.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Otago</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td><a href="http://www.otago.ac.nz">www.otago.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waikato</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td><a href="http://www.waikato.ac.nz">www.waikato.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td><a href="http://www.victoria.ac.nz">www.victoria.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other bodies and institutions visited:
- NZVCC Academic Audit Unit
  www.nzuaau.ac.nz
- NZVCC
  www.nzvcc.ac.nz
- Tertiary Education Commission
  www.tec.govt.nz
- Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT)
  www.manukau.ac.nz
- ATEM
  www.atem.org.au
- Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology (CPIT)
  www.cpit.ac.nz
### University details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland University of Technology (AUT)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aut.ac.nz">www.aut.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lincoln.ac.nz">www.lincoln.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massey University</td>
<td>Palmerston, North, Auckland, Wellington</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td><a href="http://www.massey.ac.nz">www.massey.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td><a href="http://www.auckland.ac.nz">www.auckland.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Canterbury</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td><a href="http://www.canterbury.ac.nz">www.canterbury.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Otago</td>
<td>Dunedin, Wellington, Auckland</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td><a href="http://www.otago.ac.nz">www.otago.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waikato</td>
<td>Hamilton, Tauranga</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td><a href="http://www.waikato.ac.nz">www.waikato.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td><a href="http://www.victoria.ac.nz">www.victoria.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other bodies and institutions visited:

- NZVCC Academic Audit Unit
  www.nzuaau.ac.nz
- NZVCC
  www.nzvcc.ac.nz
- Tertiary Education Commission
  www.tec.govt.nz
- Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT)
  www.manukau.ac.nz
- ATEM
  www.atem.org.au
- Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology (CPIT)
  www.cpit.ac.nz
Appendix Two

Further details of the study tour and participants

The AUA-AHUA International Committee first raised the possibility of a study tour to New Zealand in May 2006. One of the members of this group, Matthew Andrews, was asked to make proposals. The International Committee then approved the plans for the Study Tour which were developed by Matthew Andrews in consultation with Ali Hughes, the President of ATEM in New Zealand.

The agreed objectives of the study tour were:

1) to provide AUA and AHUA members and associate members from HEIs and associated institutions working in a wide range of roles with an opportunity to investigate contemporary trends, pressures and future directions in higher education in New Zealand

2) to deepen AUA and AHUA's relationship with New Zealand higher education institutions and sister organisations such as ATEM

3) to provide colleagues in New Zealand with an appreciation of the major trends in contemporary UK higher education

The themes for the study tour were divided into the 'general context' of New Zealand higher education and three ‘specific themes’.

General context:

The policy context of New Zealand HE, including best practice in institutional governance. Whilst not a separate theme, this general context was examined through the themes in order to place each specific theme in context. Such questions which arose through examining this general context included the distinction (if there was one) between governance and management and how risk management was undertaken and who was responsible for this portfolio. We were interested in general decision-making and committee structures, particularly the Board/Council equivalents and how these responsibilities mapped to academic structures if they were not fully integrated. Finally, we wanted to ask generally what type of university strategy is employed at each institution and how this was actively amended and communicated at all levels of the institution.

Specific themes:

A Student application and progression, including student fees, the impact and reaction of marketisation and issues of widening participation in undergraduate programmes and progression into postgraduate study, diversity and equality issues especially the inclusion of minority groups under-represented in HE.

B Supporting professionalism and excellence in higher education management and administration, including the role and purpose of professional bodies in supporting and developing administrative and managerial staff.

C Universities, sustainable development and the integration of environmental, economic and social issues into university strategies and life.

The study tour itself ran from Sunday 7 to Tuesday 16 October 2007, with meetings at various institutions and other associated groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Itinerary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 7</td>
<td>Initial orientation meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 8</td>
<td>University of Auckland - <a href="http://www.auckland.ac.nz">www.auckland.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9</td>
<td>Auckland University of Technology (AUT) Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 10</td>
<td>Travel to Wellington Victoria University of Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 11</td>
<td>NZVCC Audit Unit Tertiary Education Commission NZVCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 12</td>
<td>Massey University, Palmerston North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 13</td>
<td>Free Day in Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 14</td>
<td>Travel to Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15</td>
<td>University of Canterbury ATEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 16</td>
<td>Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology (CPIT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further details of the study tour and participants

The AUA-AHUA International Committee first raised the possibility of a study tour to New Zealand in May 2006. One of the members of this group, Matthew Andrews, was asked to make proposals. The International Committee then approved the plans for the Study Tour which were developed by Matthew Andrews in consultation with Ali Hughes, the President of ATEM in New Zealand.

The agreed objectives of the study tour were:

1) to provide AUA and AHUA members and associate members from HEIs and associated institutions working in a wide range of roles with an opportunity to investigate contemporary trends, pressures and future directions in higher education in New Zealand
2) to deepen AUA and AHUA's relationship with New Zealand higher education institutions and sister organisations such as ATEM
3) to provide colleagues in New Zealand with an appreciation of the major trends in contemporary UK higher education

The themes for the study tour were divided into the 'general context' of New Zealand higher education and three 'specific themes'.

**General context:**
- The policy context of New Zealand HE, including best practice in institutional governance. Whilst not a separate theme, this general context was examined through the themes in order to place each specific theme in context. Such questions which arose through examining this general context included the distinction (if there was one) between governance and management and how risk management was undertaken and who was responsible for this portfolio. We were interested in general decision-making and committee structures, particularly the Board/Council equivalents and how these responsibilities mapped to academic structures if they were not fully integrated.
- Finally, we wanted to ask generally what type of university strategy is employed at each institution and how this was actively amended and communicated at all levels of the institution.

**Specific themes:**

- **A Student application and progression**, including student fees, the impact and reaction of marketisation and issues of widening participation in undergraduate programmes and progression into postgraduate study, diversity and equality issues especially the inclusion of minority groups under-represented in HE.
- **B Supporting professionalism and excellence in higher education management and administration**, including the role and purpose of professional bodies in supporting and developing administrative and managerial staff.
- **C Universities, sustainable development and the integration of environmental, economic and social issues into university strategies and life.**

The study tour itself ran from Sunday 7 to Tuesday 16 October 2007, with meetings at various institutions and other associated groups.

The opportunity to participate in the tour was advertised in early 2007 and applications received and considered in April 2007. The final membership of the tour group was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour Leader</th>
<th>Matthew Andrews</th>
<th>Director of the Graduate School Durham University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme A team leader</td>
<td>Nigel Phillips</td>
<td>Senior Executive Officer University of Huddersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme A team member</td>
<td>Christine Matthewson</td>
<td>Education Liaison Adviser University of Strathclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme A team member</td>
<td>Debbie Scott</td>
<td>Education Account Manager UCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme B team leader</td>
<td>Matthew Hisbent</td>
<td>School Manager, School of Civil Engineering University of Nottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme B team member</td>
<td>Helen Uglow</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Registrar City University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme B team member</td>
<td>Yvonne Salter Wright</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Registrar (Governance) University of Warwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme C team leader</td>
<td>John Gordon</td>
<td>Director of Finance University of Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme C team member</td>
<td>Jennifer Murray</td>
<td>Graduate Management Trainee Leeds Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme C team member</td>
<td>Mark Warner</td>
<td>Sustainability Manager Leeds Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From left to right (excluding the Māori dancers): Helen Uglow, Jennifer Murray, Mark Warner, Yvonne Salter Wright, Debbie Scott, Matthew Andrews, Nigel Phillips, Christine Matthewson, Matthew Hisbent and John Gordon.