

# Council Open Agenda



---

**Meeting to be held following a Powhiri at 10am on Friday 4 October  
2013**

**at Otakou Marae, Tamatea Road, Otakou**

---

## Contents

1.	APOLOGIES .....	2
2.	CONFLICT OF INTEREST .....	2
3.	MINUTES 6 SEPTEMBER 2013.....	6
4.	MATTERS ARISING .....	12
5.	CHAIR'S REPORT (verbal).....	12
6.	ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT .....	12
7.	MAORI ANNUAL REPORT.....	15
8.	CULTURAL EVALUATION REPORT.....	15
9.	MATTERS FOR NOTING .....	35
10.	ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS .....	50

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

Council members should declare any potential conflict (pecuniary or non-pecuniary) they may have regarding any item on the agenda, or in relation to any discussion during the meeting. These declarations will be recorded on a separate register as well as in the minutes.

Attached is a register of Council members' interests. Any changes must be advised to the Secretary to Council.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeanette Corson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "J".

Jeanette Corson  
Secretary to Council

**OTAGO POLYTECHNIC COUNCIL  
INTERESTS REGISTER**

<b>Council Member</b>	<b>Updated</b>	<b>Interest Disclosed</b>	<b>Nature of Potential Interest with the Otago Polytechnic</b>
<b>Paul ALLISON</b>	02-08-13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chief Executive – Central Lakes Trust</li> <li>2. Board Member – Sport NZ</li> <li>3. Regional Chair – Halberg Trust</li> <li>4. Trustee – Winter Games NZ</li> <li>5. Trustee – Duncan Laing Trust</li> <li>6. Sports Commentator – The Radio Network</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CLT is a community funder, with the Polytechnic's Cromwell Campus within its beneficiary region. OP may well be an applicant for CLT funding in Central Otago</li> <li>2 – 6 Nil</li> </ol>
<b>Gillian BREMNER</b>	21-06-10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chief Executive Presbyterian Support Otago</li> <li>2. Director Well Dunedin PHO</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student placements for Nursing, Occupational Therapy and CAPS within PSO Residential facilities</li> <li>2. Nil</li> </ol>
<b>John CHRISTIE</b>	03-08-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chief Executive Otago Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>2. Trustee 4 Trades Apprenticeship Trust</li> <li>3. Chairman and Director BIZ Otago Ltd</li> <li>4. Director New Zealand Chambers of Commerce</li> <li>5. Director Biz Networks Ltd</li> <li>6. Manager – Otago/Southland Manufacturers Trust</li> <li>7. Deputy Chair Southern Health Services</li> <li>8. Director Warbirds Over Wanaka Limited</li> </ol> <p><b>Spouse Teresa Christie</b> Member of Mosgiel Community Board for Dunedin City Council</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Joint partnerships between OP and OCC.</li> <li>2. Contractor to OP for apprenticeship services.</li> <li>3. Joint provider of delivery of training initiatives.</li> <li>4. Nil</li> <li>5. Nil</li> <li>6. Nil</li> <li>7. Nil</li> <li>8. Nil</li> </ol> <p>Nil</p>
<b>Kathy GRANT</b>	03-08-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dunedin International Airport Limited (Director)</li> <li>2. Dunedin City Holdings Ltd (Director)</li> <li>3. Sport Otago (Trustee)</li> <li>4. Trustee of numerous private trusts</li> <li>5. Gallaway Cook Allan (Associate)</li> <li>6. Trustee - Anglican Family Care</li> <li>7. Dunedin Sinfonia Board</li> </ol>	

Council Member	Updated	Interest Disclosed	Nature of Potential Interest with the Otago Polytechnic
<b>Kathy GRANT</b>		<b>Spouse</b> 1. Gallaway Cook Allan (Partner) 2. Hazlett & Sons Limited (Chair) 3. South Link Health Services Limited (Director) 4. Warbirds Over Wanaka Community Trust (Board Member) 5. Warbirds Over Wanaka Limited (Director) 6. Warbirds Over Wanaka (2008) Limited (Director) 7. Warbirds Over Wanaka (2010) Limited (Director) 8. Leslie Groves Home & Hospital (Board Member) 9. Dunedin Diocesan Trust Board (Board Member) 10. Nominee Companies associated with Gallaway Cook Allan (Director) Trustee of numerous private trusts	
<b>Susan JOHNSTONE</b>	03-03-11	1. Shand Thomson Ltd (Principal) 2. Shand Thomson Nominees Ltd; Shand Thomson Nominees (2005) Ltd; Abacus ST01 Ltd; Abacus ST02 Ltd, Abacus ST03 Ltd; Abacus ST04 Ltd; Abacus ST05 Ltd; Abacus ST06 Ltd; Abacus ST 99 Ltd 3. Johnstone Afforestation Ltd (Director and Shareholder) 4. Member of the Research Education Advanced Network NZ Board	1 – 3 Nil 4. REANNZ owns/runs the KAREN network, to which Otago Polytechnic subscribes
<b>Thomas Kenneth PREBBLE</b>	13-08-12	1. Member, UCOL Council 2. Member, Ako Aotearoa Board 3. Member, Teaching and Learning Research Initiative (TLRI) Advisory Board 4. Honorary Auditor, Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) Australia 5. A contract with ACE Aotearoa to develop a set of professional standards for the Adult and Community Education sector	1. Competitive or collaborative relationships between the two institutions 2. Policy and funding decisions affecting the other institution or organisation 3. Funding decisions on research applications from across the education sector 4. No known relationship to Otago Polytechnic 5. Otago Polytechnic has some ACE engagement and funding

Council Member	Updated	Interest Disclosed	Nature of Potential Interest with the Otago Polytechnic
<b>Christopher John STAYNES</b>	30-03-09	1. Director and shareholder, Scott Technology Limited 2. Chairperson, Cargill Enterprises 3. Director, Otago Chamber of Commerce & Industry 4. Councillor, Dunedin City Council 5. Trustee, Otago Southland Manufacturers Trust 6. Director & shareholder, George Street Wines Limited. (Trading as Munslovs Fine Wines) <b>Spouse Cheryl Ann Staynes</b> 7. Deputy Principal Northeast Valley Normal School	1. Nil  2. Potential supplier 3. Potential customer and or supplier. 4. Nil 5. Nil 6. Potential supplier  7. Nil
<b>Rebecca WILLIAMS</b>	03-04-08	1. Trustee, Dunedin City Tertiary Accommodation Trust 2. Trustee, Araiteuru Kokiri Centre Charitable Trust 3. Employee, Dunedin City Council	1. From time to time the Polytechnic receives funds from the DCTAT. The Trust was established to meet the accommodation needs of students from Dunedin's three tertiary institutions. 2. The Kokiri Centre and the Otago Polytechnic have a MoU. There is potential for services to be provided from one to the other. 3. Nil

**3. MINUTES 6 SEPTEMBER 2013**

The minutes of the open section of the Council meeting held on 6 September 2013 are attached.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That the minutes are approved as an accurate record of the open section of the meeting.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeanette Corson', written over a large, irregular, teardrop-shaped scribble.

Jeanette Corson  
Secretary to Council

---

# Minutes of the Open Section of a Meeting of the Otago Polytechnic Council



---

held at 1.20pm on Friday 6 September 2013 in Puna Kawa, The Geoff Mason Administration Building, Otago Polytechnic, Forth Street, Dunedin.

**PRESENT:** Mrs K Grant (Chair)  
Mr P Allison  
Mrs G Bremner  
Prof T Prebble  
Mr C Staynes

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mr M Carter (Director: Organisational Development)  
Mr M Collins (Director: Learning Environment)  
Mrs J Corson (Secretary to Council)  
Mr P Cullen (Chief Operating Officer)  
Mr V Elder (Otago Daily Times)  
Mr P Ker (Chief Executive)  
Mr C Morland (Director: School Success)  
Mr T Naylor (Student Subcommittee)  
Mrs J O'Fee (Staff Subcommittee)  
Prof S Pairman (Director: Learning and Teaching)  
Mr A Regan (Director, Research and Enterprise)  
Ms S Thompson (Director: Quality)  
Mr M Waddell (Director: Communications)

**APOLOGIES:** Mr J Christie  
Mrs S Johnstone  
Mrs R Williams

---

## 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Mr Christie, Mrs Johnstone and Mrs Williams.

### RECOMMENDATION

**K Grant/C Staynes**

**That the apologies be sustained.**

**AGREED.**

## 2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A register of Council members' interests was attached. No further conflicts were declared.

### 3. MINUTES – 2 AUGUST 2013

The minutes of the open section of the meeting held on 2 August 2013 were attached.

#### RECOMMENDATION

K Grant/C Staynes

**That the minutes be approved as a true and correct record of the open section of the meeting.**

**AGREED.**

### 4. MATTERS ARISING

The meeting in relation to the student subcommittee was yet to be held.

### 5. CHAIR'S REPORT

#### Long Service Dinner

Mrs Grant advised that she had attended the staff long service dinner that week, recognizing terms of service from 10 to 30 years.

#### Fellowship Award

Mrs Williams was congratulated on her selection in a professional fellowship programme which would have her studying and observing in the United States for almost a month.

#### Tertiary Sector Steering Group

Mrs Grant advised that at a recent meeting of the Tertiary Sector Steering Group, members were advised that OPSA was proposing to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Dunedin City Council on terms similar to that between the Council and OUSA.

### 6. COUNCIL SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL

The Self-Assessment Tool used in 2012 had been circulated for comment. It was agreed that:

- Answer options for Questions 39 and 40 to be reworded
- Question 50 to be deleted

Subject to these amendments, the survey would be set up and a link sent to Council members, in a time period which would allow discussion of the survey results at the November meeting.

### 7. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

#### Ako Aotearoa

Mr Ker advised that he had come to the end of his second term on the Ako Aotearoa Board, and taken on the role of chair of the ITP Steering Group to NZQA.

#### Good News

Five students from the Central Otago campus had taken part in the annual Toque D'Or competitions for chefs under 25 years old, winning four silver medals between them.

#### Applications

It was reported that the number of applications to date was well ahead for the same time

period in 2012.

### **Collaborations Report**

A separate report on the Polytechnic's significant collaborations was provided for the Council's information.

### **Nursing School Collaboration with AD Instruments**

The School of Nursing had embarked on a collaboration with local education software company ADInstruments and leading manikin provider Gaurnard Scientific to pilot a new platform for health professional education.

### **Summarised Finance Report for the period ended 31 July 2013**

A table provided an overview of Otago Polytechnic's 2013 financial performance to date, compared against budget with variances.

Key points:

- Net operating surplus a favourable variance of \$378k
- EFTS enrolments at 3,923 ahead of forecast YTD
- Capex \$184k favourable to forecast YTD
- Current Monetary Assets \$984k more than forecast YTD. Total cash almost \$2.3m better than the same time last year.

### **Cricket Sponsorship: International**

The Polytechnic had signed a sponsorship arrangement with the Otago Cricket Association for a 12 month period which would include increased exposure in the Indian market.

### **Lean Workshop and Symposium**

Council members were encouraged to attend the Lean Transformation Workshop and Symposium to be held at Otago Polytechnic on 24/25 February 2014.

### **Media Clippings**

Media clippings related to Otago Polytechnic gathered since the last meeting were provided.

### **External Liaison**

Mr Ker had met with a number of groups and individuals since the last meeting.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**K Grant/C Staynes**

**That the Council receives this report.**

**AGREED.**

## **8. LEADERSHIP TEAM REPORTS**

Quarterly reports were provided by Mike Collins, Alistair Regan and Sue Thompson.

## **9. NAMING OTAGO POLYTECHNIC BUILDINGS AND SPACES**

### **Discussion Paper – naming OP buildings and spaces**

Mr Ker spoke to a Discussion Paper proposing a process for developing a naming

convention for Otago Polytechnic buildings and spaces and identified a number of issues which needed to be considered.

It was agreed that this paper lie on the table pending further discussion of all options and the outcomes to be achieved.

Mr Ker intended to initiate a process of staff consultation (including Komiti Kawanataka), to be completed by 30 November, with recommendations brought to Council for the February 2014 meeting.

## **10. POLICY FOR APPROVAL**

The Sensitive Expenditure had been reviewed by the Finance and Audit Committee and was attached showing tracked changes.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**K Grant/C Staynes**

**That the Council approves the Sensitive Expenditure Policy in the form recommended by the Finance and Audit Committee.**

### **AGREED.**

Mrs Bremner and Mr Staynes left the meeting at 1.50pm.

## **11. MATTERS FOR NOTING**

The following items were noted:

- Council Calendar  
Travel to Otakou Marae to be coordinated.
- Minutes of a meeting of Komiti Kawanataka held on 18 July 2013
- Minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 16 August 2013
- Minutes of the Student Subcommittee meeting held on 6 August 2013
- The Staff Subcommittee had not met formally during August.

It was noted that a further round of discussion was to be held on the role of the student subcommittee.

## **12. GENERAL BUSINESS**

None

## **13. MATTERS MOVED FROM CLOSED SESSION**

None.

The meeting closed at 2pm.

Signed as a true and correct record of the open section of the meeting.

.....Chair

.....Date

**OPEN SECTION  
ACTION LIST**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>To be completed by</b>	<b>By when</b>
03/08/12	Update on dialogue with the four runaka in relation to appointment to Komiti Kawanataka	Komiti Kawanataka	4 October
02/08/13	Rebecca Williams, Phil Ker and Matt Carter to meet with OPSA re Student Subcommittee	Rebecca Williams/Phil Ker/Matt Carter	1 November
	Arrange for Council Self Assessment Survey to be completed and results circulated	Jeanette Corson	1 November
	Recommendation as to naming convention for buildings and spaces	Phil Ker	February 2014

**4. MATTERS ARISING**

**5. CHAIR'S REPORT (verbal)**

**6. ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT**

**Maori Annual report**

We are very pleased to present Whakakaha te Hoataka (Strengthening the Partnership), our third annual Maori Annual Report focusing on the 2012 year. We are most pleased that the educational outcomes our Maori Learners are achieving continue to improve. However, we still have a lot of work to do to achieve parity of performance for Maori and non-Maori learners which is our goal. The report details these outcomes, as well as the expansion of our Maori workforce in 2012 and highlights such as the Maori Trades Training initiative.

The Maori Annual report has been sent as a separate document and is the subject of a separate agenda item.

**MSF Evaluation**

We had our second external cultural evaluation panel visit on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> of September. We were very fortunate to have both Dr Lyn Carter (University of Otago) and Catherine Savage (Te Tapuae O Rehua) as our external panel. Once again, this process was thorough, challenging and provided very useful input into our development as an organization according to the MSF. The external evaluation panel report is provided as a separate agenda item.

**Summarised Finance Report for the Period Ended 31 August 2013**

The following table provides an overview of Otago Polytechnic's 2013 financial performance to date and compares this against the budget with variances.

<b>August 2013</b>	<b>2013 Year to Date Actual</b>	<b>2013 Year to Date Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>
	<b>(\$000s)</b>	<b>(\$000s)</b>	<b>(\$000s)</b>
Revenue	<b>\$ 60,068</b>	<b>\$ 59,925</b>	<b>\$ 143</b>
Expenditure	<b>\$ 59,131</b>	<b>\$ 59,248</b>	<b>\$ 116</b>
Net Surplus (000's)	<b>\$ 937</b>	<b>\$ 678</b>	<b>\$ 260</b>
Capital Expenditure	<b>\$ 4,320</b>	<b>\$ 4,759</b>	<b>\$ 439</b>
Employment Cost as a percentage of revenue	<b>41.9%</b>	<b>42.2%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
Student Fees as a % of revenue	<b>21.9%</b>	<b>22.1%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
Government Funding as a % of revenue	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	<b>(0.1)%</b>
Working Capital	<b>106.8%</b>	<b>102.1%</b>	<b>4.8%</b>
Cash In/Cash Out	<b>126.7%</b>	<b>126.5%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
Current Monetary Assets (000's)	<b>\$ 9,240</b>	<b>\$ 9,128</b>	<b>\$ 112</b>
Debt / Equity Ratio	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
EFTS	<b>3,895.4</b>	<b>3,893.5</b>	<b>1.9</b>

#### **Key Points:**

- The net operating surplus shows a favourable variance of \$260k, with compensating timing variances remaining in both revenue and expenditure area.
- EFTS enrolments at 3,895 almost match forecast YTD and we still expect to hit overall EFTS forecast targets by year end.
- Capex is \$439k favourable to forecast YTD with some timing issues in plant & equipment and computer projects, although the year-end outturn remains dependent on the commencement of the major building project approved recently.
- Current Monetary Assets are now \$112k higher than forecast YTD partially due to underspends as above with total cash \$1.4m better than the same time last year.

#### **Media Clippings**

Attached as a separate document are media clippings related to Otago Polytechnic which have been gathered since the last meeting.

**External Liaison**

- Lisa Baillie, Acting HR Manager, Aoraki Polytechnic
- TANZ meeting, Wellington
- Metro meeting, Auckland (Mike Collins attended in my place)
- Chamber of Commerce luncheon with John Key
- Claire Aitken, Moana House
- ODT Class Act 2013
- Maori and Pasifika in Vocational Education and Training forum, Wellington
- Human Resources Institute of NZ Monthly networking meeting
- Careers Day at North East Valley Primary School

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council receives this report.**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt Carter". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Matt Carter  
Acting Chief Executive

**7. MAORI ANNUAL REPORT**

The Maori Annual Report has been sent separately.

**8. CULTURAL EVALUATION REPORT**

The report from the external evaluation panel follows.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

*Māori Strategic Framework Review for Te Kura Matatini -  
Otago Polytechnic Undertaken 3-4 September 2013*

*Professor Lyn Carter and Dr Catherine Savage*

*18 September 2013*

## Purpose

In September 2013 Professor Lyn Carter and Dr Catherine Savage (henceforth The Panel) were appointed to conduct a review of the progress made by Otago Polytechnic (OP) in implementing the Māori Strategic Framework (MSF) and acting to ensure the aspirations of the Memorandum of Understanding between the four Papatipu Rūnaka were being realised.

The 2013 Panel was to review three key areas that Otago Polytechnic had identified for review through an Internal Panel Assessment process. Otago Polytechnic progress was measured by assessing,

1. The extent to which aspirations within the updated Māori Strategic Framework 2012-2014 were to be realised;
2. Individual School Self-assessment to progress based on the 2011 Cultural Audit Internal Panel Report; and
3. The extent to which the recommendations from the External Panel Report 2011, had been implemented.

In late 2012 an Internal Assessment Panel (IAP) was convened to evaluate the implementation of the Māori Strategic Framework during the two years following the 2011 Cultural Audit. The IAP members were Mike Collins, John Findlay, Dr Margo Barton, Ronda McLaren, Professor Khyla Russell (Kaitohutohu) and Rachael Dibble (Office of the Kaitohutohu). The IAP devised a set of questions that would capture the aspirations reflected in the MSF and this was rolled out as an on-line survey tool on 10 April 2013. There were six key priority areas forming the assessment framework used to measure the progress of MSF implementation.

**Priority One: The Treaty of Waitangi.** Strategic Objective: *To have an effective partnership with Kāi Tahu/Māori.*

**Priority Two: Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing.** Strategic Objective: *To attract, support and retain Kāi Tahu/Māori staff at all levels within Otago Polytechnic.*

**Priority Three: Kāi Tahu/Māori students – Achievement and support.** Strategic Objective: *To have Māori participation and success at all levels of learning.*

**Priority Four: Kāi Tahu/Māori Programmes.** Strategic Objective: *To develop quality course and programmes in Te Ao Māori, Te Reo Māori and other robust Kaupapa Māori options and to incorporate Māori knowledge into all qualification areas.*

**Priority Five: Inclusive Learning Environments.** Strategic Objective: *Kāi Tahu/Te Ao Māori values are understood, recognised and valued within Otago Polytechnic environment and delivery of programmes.*

**Priority Six: Research and Māori-centered Knowledge Creation.** *Developing.*

The internal report was submitted to the Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team for self-review and comment before being forwarded to the Komiti Kawanataka and Otago Polytechnic Council.<sup>1</sup>

Following this process, an External team was appointed to conduct a MSF Evaluation on 3-4 September 2013. The members of the external panel were Professor Lyn Carter (University of Otago) and Dr Catherine Savage (CEO, Te Tapuae o Rehua).

## Terms of Reference

The Panel was tasked to review Otago Polytechnic progress across six key priority areas. These Priorities are informed by the MOU and the MSF and were premised through the *Report of the Cultural Audit Panel, 2011*. This 2011 Report set a framework in place for beginning the journey to achieving the priorities, aspirations of both the four Papatipu Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic.

The external panel carried out their review following the priorities framework set out in the internal assessment and review.

Priority One: The Treaty of Waitangi.

Priority Two: Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing.

Priority Three: Kāi Tahu/Māori students – Achievement and support.

Priority Four: Kāi Tahu/Māori Programmes.

Priority Five: Inclusive Learning Environments.

Priority Six: Research and Māori-centered Knowledge Creation.

The Panel met with a number of groups from within Otago Polytechnic as well as the Komiti Kawanataka and the Komiti ki Waho who represent the four Papatipu Rūnaka and oversee the relationship between the Papatipu Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic.

Other groups interviewed were the Kāi Tahu Otago Polytechnic staff; Otago Polytechnic Internal Assessment Panel; Kāi Tahu students; The Otago Polytechnic Students Success Team; the Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team; Mātāwaka staff; Otago Polytechnic Heads of Schools; and Mātāwaka students

## Limitations

One limitation for the Panel was the opportunity to speak with students apart from the level four Māori Trades Training students. There are degree-level Kāi Tahu/Māori students and also post-graduate students who The Panel considers would have had different perspectives, aims and objectives to the level four students. There appeared to be no reason for the lack of non-level four students appearing before The Panel, apart from a communication issue in which many students were not aware of the Review and the invitation to come and have their say on how they perceived 'life' at Otago Polytechnic. This small representation of students – and predominantly male – would have potential to skew the findings for Priorities Three and Four. That said the contribution from these students is by no means irrelevant, but very useful in gauging the levels of support and achievement across the Otago Polytechnic level four programmes that admittedly require more work in achieving success and retention.

Another limitation was the lack of time and capacity to review programme documentation to triangulate findings when looking for evidence of matauraka Māori in the curriculum (priority four). We were dependent on the qualitative data achieved through the interviews, and were not able to ascertain if it was present within the curriculum through document review.

The Panel would like to commend the staff and leadership teams at Otago Polytechnic for their positive attitude towards the MSF and the MOU with Kāi Tahu Rūnaka. Some positive advancement has been made since the Cultural Audit in 2011 and there is a sense that staff members understand they are on a journey towards changing attitudes, practice and operating methods. As such The Panel noted that there was significant goodwill by all staff interviewed and a willingness to build on the successful outcomes following the 2011 Cultural Audit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix Two: *Māori Strategic Framework evaluation 2013. Internal Report.* Otago Polytechnic – Te Kura Matatini o Otago, 2013.

A summary of the recommendations for each of the six key Priorities is outlined below. For the rationale that underpins each recommendation please refer to the *Report of the External Audit Panel*, 18 September 2013.

## **Priority One. The Treaty of Waitangi.**

Strategic Objective: *To have an effective partnership with Kāi Tahu/Māori*

### **Recommendation 1**

That the Heads of School work with the Komiti Kawanataka to further develop the relationship between Papatipu Rūnaka and the Schools to ensure that the objectives and aspirations for Kāi Tahu/Māori tertiary education in the Otago region are being met through curriculum development, inclusive learning environments, and Kāi Tahu/Māori-centered research and knowledge creation.

### **Recommendation 2**

That the Otago Polytechnic leadership team develops a Polytechnic-wide planning process that will provide a cohesive responsiveness to the implementation of the MSF and a cohesive engagement with the MOU and Rūnaka partnerships.

### **Recommendation 3**

That the Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team ensure that the planning process for a cohesive implementation of the MSF and MOU include the provision of matauraka Kāi Tahu/Māori across the curriculum, thus meeting the objectives under *Priority One (Treaty of Waitangi)*, and *Priority Five (Inclusive Learning Environments)*.

### **Recommendation 4**

That Otago Polytechnic meet with Rūnaka to discuss how the research strategy might align with Rūnaka aspirations and support capacity building.

### **Recommendation 5**

That the Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team provides posters for each area of responsibility and classrooms within the Otago Polytechnic campuses that state clearly the two sets of values, and how they may align.

**Recommendation 6**

That the Otago Polytechnic third tier management team add the application of the values to the performance appraisals of staff – to ensure that staff understand how to apply the values in day-to-day work situations, thus creating an inclusive learning environment.

**Recommendation 7**

That all Otago Polytechnic staff members have a responsibility to the Treaty Partnership and enabling the principles of partnership within the MOU between the four Papatipu Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic.

**Recommendation 8**

That all Otago Polytechnic staff should ensure that Kāi Tahu values and matauraka are utilised to best effect in the curriculum as practical and relevant models for meeting the Treaty of Waitangi obligations and the inclusive classrooms strategy.

## Priority Two. Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing.

Strategic Objective: *to attract, support and retain Kāi Tahu/Māori staff at all levels within Otago Polytechnic.*

**Recommendation 9**

That the current staffing of the Office of the Kaitohutohu be reconfigured through consultation with the Kaitohutohu, and one extra staff member be employed. This is to ensure that the predicted extra workload put upon the Office to ensure the successful implementation of the MSF can be effectively and efficiently met.<sup>2</sup>

**Recommendation 10**

That the recruitment effort needs to be strategically focused in appointing Kāi Tahu/Māori staff to ensure realistic capacity and development for successful implementation of the MSF priorities for Kāi Tahu Māori staffing.

**Recommendation 11**

The Otago Polytechnic undertakes strategic recruiting of Kāi Tahu/Māori staff for areas of curriculum development and implementation of matauraka Kāi Tahu/Māori across Otago Polytechnic programmes.

**Recommendation 12**

That Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team take leadership in recognising that Kāi Tahu/Māori staff can 'live as Kāi Tahu/Māori' on campus, by ensuring due recognition is given to the obligations and responsibilities that Kāi Tahu/Māori staff have with their Whānau, Hapū and Iwi.

**Recommendation 13**

That the Treaty of Waitangi Implementation Unit be tasked with moving staff onto the next level after undertaking the *Mata a Māori* course, and develop an model/process for applied practice in understanding and implementing what they have been taught.

**Recommendation 14**

That the Senior Leadership team and Heads of School actively consider how decisions are made to ensure that Māori voice is given equal status to that of mainstream staff, and that Māori staff are given opportunity to seek support when marginalised or isolated in management tiers.

**Recommendation 15**

That Otago Polytechnic actively seeks to ensure that Māori are part of the second and third management tier.

## Priority Three. Kāi Tahu/Māori Students - Achievement and Support.

Strategic Objective: *To have Māori participation and success at all levels of learning.*

---

<sup>2</sup> The Panel recommends that this is an additional staff member to the Kaiarahi Rakahau, and not intended to be the research role (refer to *Recommendation 22*).

**Recommendation 16**

That Kāi Tahu/Māori student pastoral services are supported by a clear Māori model that could be designed specifically for Otago Polytechnic. This model will need to incorporate not only individual pastoral support but also opportunities to build whanaukataka across schools, and provide transition and career study planning for students and their whānau.

**Recommendation 17**

That one Kāi Tahu/ Māori student leadership position is established within Otago Polytechnic.

**Recommendation 18**

That a Kāi Tahu/Māori student feedback opportunity to the leadership team (potentially kanohi ki te kanohi/ face to face) is organised and followed up as a process within the organisation.

**Priority Four: Kāi Tahu /Māori Programmes.**

Strategic Objective: *to develop quality course and programmes in Te Ao Māori, Te Reo Māori and other robust Kaupapa Māori options and to incorporate Māori knowledge into all qualification areas.*

**Recommendation 19**

An investment in Kāi Tahu/Māori curriculum leadership and planning needs to be made by the Polytechnic.

**Priority Five: Inclusive Learning Environments.**

Strategic Objective: *Kāi Tahu/Te Ao Māori values are understood, recognised and valued within Otago Polytechnic environment and delivery of programmes.*

**Recommendation 20**

That Otago Polytechnic implements a disputes resolution process so that students have a way of reporting racism or discrimination in a culturally sensitive and/or confidential manner.

**Recommendation 21**

That Otago Polytechnic work with the Office of the Kaitohutohu and Heads of Schools to determine what are the key indicators of an Inclusive Learning Environment and create an implementation plan with goals, timelines and resources required.

**Priority Six: Research and Kāi Tahu/Māori-centered Knowledge Creation.**

Strategic Objective: *Developing*

**Recommendation 22**

That Otago Polytechnic appoint a Kaiarahi Rakahau (1FTE) to ensure the implementation of a robust research strategy, that meets the principles of the MSF and increases the research capacity and capability across Otago Polytechnic.

## **Report of the External Audit Panel**

*Māori Strategic Framework Review for Te Kura Matatini -  
Otago Polytechnic Undertaken 3-4 September 2013*

*Professor Lyn Carter and Dr Catherine Savage*

*18 September 2013*

## Table of Contents

Purpose.....	17
Terms of Reference.....	18
Limitations .....	18
Priority One. The Treaty of Waitangi.....	19
Priority Two. Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing.....	20
Priority Three. Kāi Tahu/Māori Students - Achievement and Support.....	20
Priority Four: Kāi Tahu /Māori Programmes.....	21
Priority Five: Inclusive Learning Environments.....	21
Priority Six: Research and Kāi Tahu/Māori-centered Knowledge Creation.....	21
Purpose.....	24
Background.....	24
Terms of Reference.....	26
Limitations .....	26
Overview.....	26
Priority One. The Treaty of Waitangi.....	27
Priority Two. Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing.....	30
Priority Three. Kāi Tahu/Māori Students - Achievement and Support.....	31
Priority Four: Kāi Tahu /Māori Programmes.....	32
Priority Five: Inclusive Learning Environments.....	33
Priority Six: Research and Kāi Tahu/Māori-centered Knowledge Creation.....	33
Concluding Remarks .....	34

## Purpose

In September 2013 Professor Lyn Carter and Dr Catherine Savage (henceforth The Panel) were appointed to conduct a review of the progress made by Otago Polytechnic (OP) in implementing the Māori Strategic Framework (MSF) and acting to ensure the aspirations of the Memorandum of Understanding between the four Papatipu Rūnaka were being realised.

The 2013 Panel was to review three key areas that Otago Polytechnic had identified for review through an Internal Panel Assessment process. Otago Polytechnic progress was measured by assessing;

1. The extent to which aspirations within the updated Māori Strategic Framework 2012-2014 were to be realised;
2. Individual School Self-assessment to progress based on the 2011 Cultural Audit Internal Panel Report; and
3. The extent to which the recommendations from the External Panel Report 2011, had been implemented.

## Background

In 2011 Professor Lyn Carter and Mr Phillip Broughton were appointed to conduct a Cultural Audit of Otago Polytechnic that focused on two key areas: to what extent have the priorities within the MSF been implemented across the Polytechnic; to what extent has the partnership relationship with the four Papatipu Rūnaka (The Treaty Partners) been established on a firm footing. The four Papatipu Rūnaka are Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtakou Ltd, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, and Hokonui Rūnanga Inc. The two key documents that formed the focus of the cultural audit were the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the four Otago Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic, and the Māori Strategic Framework (MSF).

The MOU was put in place to provide practical steps towards incorporating a Treaty framework into the fabric of Otago Polytechnic life for all staff and students. The framework was developed from the National Māori Tertiary Education Framework and is aligned with the MOU, Kāi Tahu *Vision 2025* document and the Otago Polytechnic Charter.

The MSF was put in place to apply the objectives, aims and aspirations of the MOU signed between the four Otago Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic.

The 2011 Cultural Audit team made a number of recommendations after consulting with Kāi Tahu/Māori staff and students; Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team; the Office of the Kaitohutohu; Otago Polytechnic staff and Heads of Schools. The recommendations set a two-year framework in place firstly to ensure that Otago Polytechnic could move towards successful implementation of the MSF.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, to ensure that the relationship between the Treaty Partners moved forward in meeting the aspirations of the four Otago Papatipu Rūnaka in meeting their needs, long-term aspirations and strategies in tertiary education.<sup>4</sup>

In 2013 the Memorandum of Understanding between the four Papatipu Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic was reviewed and the aspirations reinstated. The four key Priorities in the MOU are;

1. The Treaty of Waitangi. The Kāi Tahu Treaty of Waitangi Principles are the foundation on which all negotiations with Government funded organisations are based. They establish the rights and obligations under statute of *both* partners and underpin relationships with Government funded organisations. The MOU gives effect to the Tertiary Education Commission requirements for Tertiary Education Institutions to “*contribute to the achievement of Māori development aspirations*” as required by the Treaty Education Strategy.

---

<sup>3</sup> Please refer to Appendix One: Carter, L., Broughton, P. (2011) *Report of the Cultural Audit Panel. Cultural Audit of Otago Polytechnic undertaken 30-31 March 2011*. Specific recommendations will be referred to in the main body of this report but will not be detailed here.

<sup>4</sup> Carter, L., Broughton, P. (2011). *Report of the Cultural Audit Panel. Cultural Audit of Otago Polytechnic undertaken 30-31 March 2011*.

2. Alignment with *Ngāi Tahu 2025* and the *Ngāi Tahu Education Plan* - including milestones and 25-year outcomes as interpreted by Arai-Te-Uru Rūnaka.
3. Relationships. The MOU reinforces the status of the four Papatipu Rūnaka as manawhenua and as such the sole Treaty Partners on the Otago Polytechnic. Kā Papatipu Rūnaka will ensure the relationships between manawhenua and mātāwaka are maintained to address the needs of all Māori in the region.
4. Implementation. That the four Papatipu Rūnaka work together to: identify specific education needs of Kāi Tahu and other Māori within Rūnaka takiwā; agree on programmes, student support systems, learning environments and student funding strategies, which meet the identified needs of Kāi Tahu and other Māori within Otago; to identify specific participation, retention, and education outcomes for Kāi Tahu and other Māori studying at Otago Polytechnic; and to monitor progress towards achieving agreed strategies and negotiated outcomes.<sup>5</sup>

The MSF was also reviewed in 2012 and now incorporates recommendations of the 2011 Cultural Audit. The MSF stands alongside the Otago Polytechnic Strategic Plan as one of two key strategy documents and proposes that, “*With a three year timeline, the objectives and priorities set out in the Framework signal our intent to accelerate our overarching goal to earn the confidence of our communities, particularly Kāi Tahu*”.<sup>6</sup>

In late 2012 an Internal Assessment Panel (IAP) was convened to evaluate the implementation of the Māori Strategic Framework during the two years following the 2011 Cultural Audit. The IAP members were Mike Collins, John Findlay, Dr Margo Barton, Ronda McLaren, Professor Khyla Russell (Kaitohutohu) and Rachael Dibble (Office of the Kaitohutohu). The IAP devised a set of questions that would capture the aspirations reflected in the MSF and this was rolled out as an on-line survey tool on 10 April 2013. There were six key priority areas forming the assessment framework used to measure the progress of MSF implementation.

**Priority 1: The Treaty of Waitangi.** Strategic Objective: *To have an effective partnership with Kāi Tahu/Māori*

**Priority 2: Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing.** Strategic Objective: *To attract, support and retain Kāi Tahu/Māori staff at all levels within Otago Polytechnic*

**Priority 3: Kāi Tahu/Māori students – Achievement and support.** Strategic Objective: *To have Māori participation and succeed at all levels of learning.*

**Priority 4: Kāi Tahu/Māori Programmes.** Strategic Objective: *to develop quality course and programmes in Te Ao Māori, Te Reo Māori and other robust Kaupapa Māori options and to incorporate Māori knowledge into all qualification areas.*

**Priority 5: Inclusive Learning Environments.** Strategic Objective: *Kāi Tahu/Te Ao Māori values are understood, recognised and valued within Otago Polytechnic environment and delivery of programmes*

**Priority 6: Research and Māori-centered Knowledge Creation.** *Developing.*

The internal report was submitted to the Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team for self-review and comment before being forwarded to the Komiti Kawanataka and Otago Polytechnic Council.<sup>7</sup>

Following this process, an external team was appointed to conduct a MSF Evaluation on 3-4 September. The members of the external panel were Professor Lyn Carter (University of Otago) and Dr Catherine Savage (CEO, Te Tapuae o Rehua).

<sup>5</sup> *Memorandum of Understanding Between Te Rūnaka o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtakou, Hokonui Rūnanga Inc (Papatipu Rūnaka) and Otago Polytechnic*, pp. 1-2.

<sup>6</sup> Ker, P, CEO, Otago Polytechnic. (2013). CEO’s Comments in, *Te Kura Matatini ki Otago. Māori Strategic Framework 2012-2014*, p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Appendix Two: *Māori Strategic Framework evaluation 2013. Internal Report.* Otago Polytechnic – Te Kura Matatini o Otago, 2013.

## Terms of Reference

The Panel was tasked to review Otago Polytechnic progress across six key priority areas. These Priorities are informed by the MOU and the MSF and were premised through the *Report of the Cultural Audit Panel, 2011*. This 2011 Report set a framework in place for beginning the journey to achieving the priorities, aspirations of both the four Papatipu Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic.

The external panel carried out their review following the priorities framework set out in the internal assessment and review.

Priority One: The Treaty of Waitangi.

Priority Two: Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing.

Priority Three: Kāi Tahu/Māori students – Achievement and support.

Priority Four: Kāi Tahu/Māori Programmes.

Priority Five: Inclusive Learning Environments.

Priority Six: Research and Māori-centered Knowledge Creation.

The Panel met with a number of groups from within Otago Polytechnic as well as the Komiti Kawanataka and the Komiti ki Waho who represent the four Papatipu Rūnaka and oversee the relationship between the Papatipu Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic.

Other groups interviewed were the Kāi Tahu Otago Polytechnic staff; Otago Polytechnic Internal Assessment Panel; Kāi Tahu students; The Otago Polytechnic Students Success Team; the Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team; Mātāwaka staff; Otago Polytechnic Heads of Schools; and Mātāwaka students

## Limitations

One limitation for the Panel was the opportunity to speak with students apart from the level four Māori Trades Training students. There are a number of degree-level Kāi Tahu/Māori students and also post-graduate students who The Panel considers would have had different perspectives, aims and objectives to the level four students. There appeared to be no reason for the lack of non-level four students appearing before The Panel, apart from a communication issue in which many students were not aware of the Review and the invitation to come and have their say on how they perceived 'life' at Otago Polytechnic. This small representation of students – and predominantly male – would have potential to skew the findings for Priorities Three and Four. That said the contribution from these students is by no means irrelevant, but very useful in gauging the levels of support and achievement across the Otago Polytechnic level four programmes that admittedly require more work in achieving success and retention.

Another limitation was the lack of time and capacity to review programme documentation to triangulate findings when looking for evidence of matauraka Māori in the curriculum (priority four). We were dependent on the qualitative data achieved through the interviews, and were not able to ascertain if it was present within the curriculum through document review.

## Overview

The Panel noted that the staff members at Otago Polytechnic are to be commended for their positive attitude towards the MSF and the MOU with Kāi Tahu Rūnaka. Some positive advancement has been made since the Cultural Audit in 2011 and many of the recommendations have been acted upon to some degree. There is a sense that staff members understand they are on a journey towards changing attitudes, practice and operating methods and as such The Panel noted that there are several pockets of excellence across Otago Polytechnic. The Panel is confident that these will serve as models for implementing the six key Priorities of the MSF across the Schools and Operations units.

Positive areas of note include the increase in staff engagement with *Mata a Māori* and the courses run by the Treaty of Waitangi Education Training Unit (an initiative put in place as a result of the 2011 Cultural Audit). All the Heads of School stated that they have prioritised this as part of the individual staff member's performance assessments. Some were also encouraging staff to engage in refresher courses if it was more than three years since the staff member had undertaken the programmes.

In terms of student achievement and success, the Panel noted the 'closing of gaps' between Kāi Tahu/Māori success rates and that of non-Māori. It was also noted the steady increase in retention figures since 2010.

Kāi Tahu/Māori students' feeling of well-being had increased since the 2011 Cultural Audit and The Panel credited this to the work being carried out in Kāi Tahu/Māori student support by Braydon Murray. Braydon's work was commended to The Panel by both Kāi Tahu and Non-Kāi Tahu Māori students as 'key to their success' and important to their individual well-being on campus. Tama Tuirirangi was also mentioned, as was his work with High Schools that will increase the awareness of Otago Polytechnic as a Tertiary Institute of choice. Some of the students considered Tama's work important in ensuring that High Schools promoted Otago Polytechnic as a local tertiary institution worthy of support.

The Kāi Tahu/Māori whare, Poho, has increased in use since the 2011 Cultural Audit and has become established in the campus landscape as a Māori student space. Students are using this as a place to gather and it has the potential to further cement the whakawhanaukatata among Kāi Tahu/Māori Students, if managed appropriately.

One key positive factor was that Kāi Tahu/Māori staff members are now being seen as key enablers across Otago Polytechnic by other staff. This however has some draw backs in terms of Kāi Tahu staff and their role as manawhenua – something we will elaborate upon when discussing our findings for *Priority Two (Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing)*.

The Panel noted that the Rūnaka are well informed and applauded the increase in success, retention rates and increased participation of Kāi Tahu/Māori students. Rūnaka commented positively on the increase in noho marae and marae based learning and expressed a desire to further investigate the potential of placed based education as part of the Otago Polytechnic learning environment.

The Panel recognised the need to add a note of caution to the report. An organisation the size of Otago Polytechnic needs to be aware of institutionalised racism and colonising practices and language. This awareness should lead to creating opportunities that reflect on how assumed power and decision-making processes may be marginalising Kāi Tahu/Māori staff and students – consciously or unconsciously.

That said The Panel would like to commend Otago Polytechnic staff and students for the genuineness to demonstrate manaakitaka and we would like to thank Otago Polytechnic for the warmth and hospitality shown to us during our two days on Otago Polytechnic Campus.

## **Priority One. The Treaty of Waitangi.**

Strategic Objective: *To have an effective partnership with Kāi Tahu/Māori*

The Komiti Kawanataka is well organised and supported by key Institution staff such as the Council Chair, Deputy CE and Kāi Tahu/Māori staff. The Komiti is a key driver for change within the Institution and clearly has developed strong positive relationships with Rūnaka. Rūnaka members noted the high levels of trust they placed in the Kaitohutohu and stated that she was pivotal to the strengthening relationship between Papatipu Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic.

Otago Polytechnic staff members are aware of the importance of the Papatipu Rūnaka relationships, and the role of the Komiti Kawanataka in representing the four Papatipu Rūnaka as part of the Otago Polytechnic governance structure. It is through this structure that the strategies for fully realising the partnership and achieving a successful implementation of the MSF are put in place. The Heads of School were however unsure as to how to participate at the governance level – particularly in progressing their School's relationship with the Papatipu Rūnaka. Most were unaware, for example, that they could attend the Komiti Kawanataka meetings. The Komiti Kawanataka had in the past invited the Leadership Team to meetings to introduce the senior decision-making group to the Papatipu Rūnaka. It would be useful if the same invitations were extended to the third level management tier in order to progress the relationships and the opportunities to develop curriculum at programme level. This would enable the Schools to plan for future engagement with the Treaty Partners that would enable the key Priority areas of both the MSF and the MOU to be progressed at programme and student levels.

### **Recommendation 1**

That the Heads of School work with the Komiti Kawanataka to further develop the relationship between Papatipu Rūnaka and the Schools to ensure that the objectives and aspirations for Kāi

Tahu/Māori tertiary education in the Otago region are being met through curriculum development, inclusive learning environments, and Kāi Tahu/Māori-centered research and knowledge creation.

The Panel noted that there is a lack of a comprehensive planning across Otago Polytechnic for implementing the MSF. This has resulted in small pockets of best practice within the Schools, but significant variability in the uptake across Schools. It appears that those Schools that have made significant gains in the past two years have done so with passionate leadership, committing additional resources and incorporating a whole of School approach. Otago Polytechnic needs to build on these success factors and develop a planned School-by-School implementation of the MSF rather than allow them to continue on an adhoc basis. This will ensure that there is a cohesive responsiveness to the implementation of the MSF and a cohesive engagement with the MOU and Rūnaka partnerships. The planning process should also provide for strategies to speed up the inclusion of matauraka Kāi Tahu/Māori across the curriculum, thus meeting the objectives under *Priority One (Treaty of Waitangi)*, and *Priority Five (Inclusive Learning Environments)*.

#### **Recommendation 2**

That the Otago Polytechnic leadership team develops a Polytechnic-wide planning process that will provide a cohesive responsiveness to the implementation of the MSF and a cohesive engagement with the MOU and Rūnaka partnerships.

#### **Recommendation 3**

That the Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team ensure that the planning process for a cohesive implementation of the MSF and MOU include the provision of matauraka Kāi Tahu/Māori across the curriculum, thus meeting the objectives under *Priority One (Treaty of Waitangi)*, and *Priority Five (Inclusive Learning Environments)*.

The Panel acknowledges the positive shift in the strategic research direction for Otago Polytechnic and that this creates an opportunity to further develop the partnership with Rūnaka through aligning research interests. An applied research strategy could encompass Rūnaka aspirations and assist Rūnaka to build capacity.

#### **Recommendation 4**

That Otago Polytechnic meet with Rūnaka to discuss how the research strategy might align with Rūnaka aspirations and support capacity building.

As values underpin practices within an institution The Panel was interested in the alignment of Otago Polytechnic values and those articulated through the 2025 Kāi Tahu *Mō Tātou* documentation. It appears that these are not well known by the senior leadership team. An alignment of Otago Polytechnic values and Kai Tahu values would clearly articulate to staff the 'values vision' for Otago Polytechnic. It is also important that staff understand how to apply the values within their classrooms and day-to-day work situations.

#### **Recommendation 5**

That the Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team provides posters for each area of responsibility and classrooms within the Otago Polytechnic campuses that state clearly the two sets of values, and how they may align.

#### **Recommendation 6**

That the Otago Polytechnic third tier management team add the application of the values to the performance appraisals of staff – to ensure that staff understand how to apply the values in day-to-day work situations, thus creating an inclusive learning environment.

We note that at least two of the degree-level programmes are governed partly by Codes of Conduct from external bodies (New Zealand Nursing Council and The New Zealand Teachers' Council for example). While the school leaders were able to articulate how general Māori or cultural content was taught, they did not appear to move past these external requirements and discuss how the Kāi Tahu MOU was enacted in their coursework. We do not consider that the staff can default responsibility for the MOU – the partnership with Kāi Tahu – to these external bodies and the respective Codes of Conduct. The MOU is quite clear in that Otago Polytechnic staff have a Treaty of Waitangi responsibility to their Treaty partner – in this case Kāi Tahu Iwi and more specifically the four Papatipu Rūnaka. The external Codes of Conduct provide some general principles and codes of behavior that practitioners must adhere to once they are practicing in their respective professions. They do not therefore eliminate Iwi-specific knowledge and practices being part of the curriculum as examples of best practice within communities. Therefore all

of the staff and Schools at Otago Polytechnic have a responsibility to ensure that these are included within the curriculum and modeled through behavior towards both Kāi Tahu/Māori staff and students.

**Recommendation 7**

That all Otago Polytechnic staff members have a responsibility to the Treaty Partnership and enabling the principles of partnership within the MOU between the four Papatipu Rūnaka and Otago Polytechnic.

**Recommendation 8**

That all Otago Polytechnic staff should ensure that Kāi Tahu values and matauraka are utilised to best effect in the curriculum as practical and relevant models for meeting the Treaty of Waitangi obligations and the inclusive classrooms strategy.

## Priority Two. Kāi Tahu/Māori Leadership and Staffing

Strategic Objective: *to attract, support and retain Kāi Tahu/Māori staff at all levels within Otago Polytechnic.*

The Panel noted that the Office of the Kaitohutohu, led by Professor Khyla Russell, continues to be held in high regard. Staff and the Leadership Team were complementary of the help and guidance received from the Office, and the support received in negotiating relationships with the Papatipu Rūnaka.

The Kaitohutohu has a pivotal role, which has been enhanced by the addition of 1FTE. However, to realise the successful implementation of much of the MSF, the resourcing of this unit needs to be further addressed.

It was noted that the capacity of the Office was increased by 1FTE following the recommendation to do so in the 2011 Cultural Audit Report. There was some discussion however, as to the wisdom of having one role (1FTE) divided between three people. The Panel would like to see a continued growth of staff capacity being undertaken to ensure that the Office can continue to provide the support needed. The Office of the Kaitohutohu will become increasingly busier as more Otago Polytechnic Schools make use of the expertise from the Office to ensure a successful implementation of the MSF.

### **Recommendation 9**

That the current staffing of the Office of the Kaitohutohu be reconfigured through consultation with the Kaitohutohu, and one extra staff member be employed. This is to ensure that the predicted extra workload put upon the Office to ensure the successful implementation of the MSF can be effectively and efficiently met.<sup>8</sup>

The Panel acknowledges that Māori staff numbers have increased. We noted that where schools had purchased additional Māori staffing to focus on supporting general staff the uptake of the MSF was more visible. However, this practice meant that one person could be holding many small jobs across the schools, which may have implications for workload, career progression and staff development of Māori staff. Further, comments received insisted that the current Kāi Tahu/Māori staff were being expected to carry out any 'Māori things' in the Schools, thus alleviating non-Māori staff of the responsibility to apply the knowledge they were gaining from the *Mata a Māori* courses and the Treaty of Waitangi Implementation Unit. There were two key themes in this area. One, that current Kāi Tahu/Māori staff members were continuing to collect extra responsibilities over and above their standard workloads simply because they were 'Māori'. This is closely aligned to a challenge facing the successful implementation of the MSF. The non-Māori staff were either reluctant, or not being shown how, to apply the knowledge that they were gaining in the *Mata-a Māori* courses and the Treaty of Waitangi courses. Although some of the knowledge is specific to Kāi Tahu and can only successfully be delivered by Kāi Tahu, this does not prevent staff from applying the principles and values within their curriculum and ensuring it is embedded within all new courses. Nor does it prevent non-Māori staff from consulting with the Office of the Kaitohutohu as to the best way to increase Kāi Tahu/Māori content into the courses so as to meet the strategic objective for more inclusive classrooms.

The recruitment effort needs to refocus to strategically appointed Kāi Tahu/Māori staff to ensure a successful implementation of the priorities in the MSF – for example in the areas of curriculum development and implementation of matauraka Kāi Tahu/Māori across programmes.

### **Recommendation 10**

That the recruitment effort needs to be strategically focused in appointing Kāi Tahu/Māori staff to ensure realistic capacity and development for successful implementation of the MSF priorities for Kāi Tahu Māori staffing,

### **Recommendation 11**

That Otago Polytechnic undertakes strategic recruiting of Kāi Tahu/Māori staff for areas of curriculum development and implementation of matauraka Kāi Tahu/Māori across Otago Polytechnic programmes.

Tikaka dictates particular behavior in living as Māori. Kāi Tahu staff members in particular, have obligations within their rohe to their Whānau, Hapū and Iwi as well as to mātāwaka. This was noted in the

---

<sup>8</sup> The Panel recommends that this is an additional staff member to the Kaiarahi Rakahau, and not intended to be the research role (refer to *Recommendation 22*).

2011 report and it continues to be a weakness of the successful implementation of the MSF across Otago Polytechnic. The principles that exist under the Treaty of Waitangi (*Priority One*) emphasise the right of Kāi Tahu/Māori staff to live as Māori within their workplaces and that requires that cultural obligations and relationships need to be carried out. There needs to be a deeper level understanding on behalf of the Polytechnic management and non- Māori staff so that this becomes a lived reality. A common occurrence during data collection was the often, unintended commentary by mainstream staff that was inherently colonising and marginalising of Māori voice and world view. This can have a significant effect on Māori staff well-being, job satisfaction and the right to live 'as Māori' in Aotearoa. This could be emphasised through the *Mata a Māori* courses and also the Treaty of Waitangi Implementation Unit courses. Both these areas have opportunity to demonstrate to staff how the role of being Kāi Tahu/Māori does not stop at the Otago Polytechnic gate and how mainstream staff may often, albeit unintentionally, impose their value system and assume a privileged position over Māori.

This fits within both *Priority One* and *Priority Two* in terms of giving full recognition to the relationship with Papatipu Rūnaka, and supporting Kāi Tahu/Māori staff in their roles at Otago Polytechnic. A fuller understanding of this should be emphasised and understood among Non-Māori staff and Leadership.

#### **Recommendation 12**

That Otago Polytechnic Leadership Team take leadership in recognising that Kāi Tahu/Māori staff can 'live as Kāi Tahu/Māori' on campus, by ensuring due recognition is given to the obligations and responsibilities that Kāi Tahu/Māori staff have with their Whānau, Hapū and Iwi.

#### **Recommendation 13**

That the Treaty of Waitangi Implementation Unit be tasked with moving staff onto the next level after undertaking the *Mata a Māori* course, and develop an model/process for applied practice in understanding and implementing what they have been taught.

Leadership succession within the Otago Polytechnic needs to be addressed. Otago Polytechnic is highly dependent on the skill and mana of the Kaitohutohu, and while this leadership is clearly valued the Kaitohutohu is often a lone Māori voice in management and leadership decisions. The imbalance of Māori voice has two significant outcomes, firstly the Māori voice is marginalised in decision-making and secondly it leaves Māori staff to be singled out and seen as a potential threat to the dominant voice and decision. The imbalance of Māori - Non-Māori ratio across the second and third tier management teams is clearly apparent, and it is this tier that is responsible for the active implementation of the MSF. The lack of Māori leadership at this level has a significant impact on the implementation of the MSF. There is potential in the future development of the Māori specific curriculum and course work to ensure that Māori hold these leaderships positions and influence the second and third tier of management at Otago Polytechnic.

#### **Recommendation 14**

That the Senior Leadership team and Heads of School actively consider how decisions are made to ensure that Māori voice is given equal status to that of mainstream staff, and that Māori staff are given opportunity to seek support when marginalised or isolated in management tiers.

#### **Recommendation 15**

That Otago Polytechnic actively seeks to ensure that Māori are part of the second and third management tier.

### **Priority Three. Kāi Tahu/Māori Students - Achievement and Support.**

Strategic Objective: *To have Māori participation and success at all levels of learning.*

The Panel noted the increase in achievement rates for Kāi Tahu/Māori students and the closing of the achievement gap between Māori and non-Māori. Particularly pleasing is the obvious success of Kāi Tahu/Māori students in the degree level programmes. Polytechnic staff members acknowledge that an emphasis needs to be placed on improving outcomes at the foundation, certificate and diploma level programmes.

Pastoral support as noted earlier is appreciated by the students. This support is highly dependent on the staff members who enact a whānau model of support moving past a typical pastoral support relationship. This support could be further enhanced by implementing a Māori model of pastoral care to support the practices of Māori staff (see Kerehoma, et al, 2013; Macfarlane, 2007). There is a lack of whanaukataka

opportunities across the campus, and a lack of strong Māori networks particularly across the schools. It is apparent that Poho is developing as a place for Kāi Tahu/Māori students to gather but a lack of whanaukataka opportunities means that students are not well organised and do not know other Māori students. Students commented that a Kāi Tahu/Māori student noho and continued networking opportunities would enable whanaukataka and move pastoral care past the segregated course based delivery to a tuakana-teina whānau based model.

The Panel noted that better recruitment and support processes need to be implemented. Several students commented that they defaulted to the Māori Trades Training because it had the word 'Māori' in the title: they were not given information and advice on academic aspirational planning. The students interviewed in the certificate programmes clearly lacked guidance in career and study planning with many opting for courses that their friends were in. They did not feel confident pursuing pathways they were more interested in alone. There is an opportunity here for staff to support Kāi Tahu/Māori students entering into study, by ensuring that an academic planning process that could incorporate whānau is conducted. There are several models (such as star path in Auckland which begins in secondary school) that have been shown to have positive outcomes for Māori students.

#### **Recommendation 16**

That Kāi Tahu/Māori student pastoral services are supported by a clear Māori model that could be designed specifically for Otago Polytechnic. This model will need to incorporate not only individual pastoral support but also opportunities to build whanaukataka across schools, and provide transition and career study planning for students and their whānau.

The Panel noted the opportunity to progress Kāi Tahu/Māori student leadership activities and ensure that Māori students have processes by which to provide feedback directly to the leadership team. Although the Council may have provision for one Māori student representative it appears to be difficult for this position to be filled when it is voluntary. As there was clear dissonance between the views of leadership team, Heads of School and the actual experience of Kāi Tahu/Māori students at Otago Polytechnic (those at certificate levels that were interviewed), if Māori voice is not 'heard' it is unlikely that the decisions made at a leadership level will incorporate Kāi Tahu/Māori student experience. Otago Polytechnic needs to make provision for student feedback directly to the leadership team creating opportunities for effective and relevant Kāi Tahu/Māori student engagement in the leadership and processes. The Komiti Kawanataka may wish to incorporate a Kāi Tahu/ Māori student representative to ensure that they are also cognisant of the student experience and the impact this has on their decisions.

#### **Recommendation 17**

That a Kāi Tahu/ Māori student leadership position is established within Otago Polytechnic.

#### **Recommendation 18**

That a Kāi Tahu/Māori student feedback opportunity to the leadership team (potentially kanohi ki te kanohi/ face to face) is organised and followed up as a process within the organisation.

### **Priority Four: Kāi Tahu /Māori Programmes.**

*Strategic Objective: to develop quality course and programmes in Te Ao Māori, Te Reo Māori and other robust Kaupapa Māori options and to incorporate Māori knowledge into all qualification areas.*

There is clearly a need for quality relevant programmes incorporating (or solely in) tikaka/Te Reo Māori and robust kaupapa Māori processes and kaupapa Māori/matauraka Māori. The Kāi Tahu/Māori students stated that they would like to be able to take Te Reo Māori regardless of their course of study, while others specifically requested a course of study in Te Reo me ōna Tikanga. The Māori trades course has several students who are not particularly committed to a trade's pathway but have a desire to be part of a Māori kaupapa.

There also needs to be a committed investment to move and shift matauraka Kāi Tahu/Māori across the curriculum and across schools. The Panel noted some particularly good examples of inclusion of Kāi Tahu/ Māori matauraka for example the Nexus Design group, however these examples are not replicated across schools. There is an assumption that mainstream staff will be able to access this knowledge and incorporate this into their course work, however the evidence would suggest that staff require scaffolding to ensure that this is implemented with integrity into their programmes.

The establishment of the Capable Iwi Unit has the potential to be a space for the innovation and creation of Kāi Tahu/Māori matauraka and aromatawai. This unit if led by Māori for Māori will have the potential to create significant amounts of practice-based evidence that could be used to enhance curricula. As an example the graduates of the Applied Business Degree - *Māori Organisational Leadership* - will be producing casework around Iwi and indigenous business models, which with permission could be used to enhance teaching and learning across the Business School. All courses across the curriculum should be able to clearly demonstrate not only Kāi Tahu/Māori matauraka content but also pedagogical practices that ensure Māori learn as Māori.

**Recommendation 19**

An investment in Kāi Tahu/Māori curriculum leadership and planning needs to be made by the Polytechnic.

## Priority Five: Inclusive Learning Environments.

Strategic Objective: *Kāi Tahu/Te Ao Māori values are understood, recognised and valued within Otago Polytechnic environment and delivery of programmes*

There is evidence of quality inclusive learning environments for Kāi Tahu/Māori at Otago Polytechnic. It appears however that there is tremendous variability across the Schools with how these are defined, described and enacted as inclusive learning environments. The notable increase in the use of local <sup>33</sup>Rūnaka Marae for noho is an indicator that the Marae is being utilised by some Schools as a learning environment. This is particularly important for Māori students as learning is taken to a cultural space that privilege Māori ways of being. The Panel noted that the increase in noho, is draining on the resources of the Office of the Kaitohutohu and this needs to be addressed through increased resources as the noho occur.

The Māori students interviewed by The Panel appreciated the effort to ensure that <sup>33</sup>tikaka was followed in the Māori trade's course. It appears that this is contained to the Māori trade's courses however and other students reported that they would appreciate staff being able to karakia and use more Te Reo in the classroom. Several students did note that the tutors realised that they should not sit on desks or allow hats inside and addressed this with Non-Māori students. However, students reported incidents of blatant racism from other students and were unsure of how they should deal with this or respond to it. It is clear that the students' were not aware of any pathways to resolving disputes and concerns that they had.

**Recommendation 20**

That Otago Polytechnic implements a disputes resolution process so that students have a way of reporting racism or discrimination in a culturally sensitive and/or confidential manner.

There is an opportunity to develop consistency in the definition of what makes an inclusive learning environment across the schools; while there may be some contextual differences there are key indicators that staff could use to examine how inclusive the learning environment is, particularly for Māori. This would enable a more thorough implementation of the MSF across schools. It would appear that many of the other priorities are required to ensure that this occurs for Māori. For instance the presence of matauraka Māori, as mentioned previously will take an investment to ensure that this occurs systemically across the Polytechnic.

**Recommendation 21**

That Otago Polytechnic work with the Office of the Kaitohutohu and Heads of Schools to determine what are the key indicators of an Inclusive Learning Environment and create an implementation plan with goals, timelines and resources required.

## Priority Six: Research and Kāi Tahu/Māori-centered Knowledge Creation.

Strategic objective: *Developing*

The Panel noted that Otago Polytechnic is part of the Performance Based Research Fund process (PBRF). This is commendable and works towards ensuring that Otago Polytechnic develops research-led programmes that are current, relevant and consistent with the vocationally-aligned learning and teaching

objectives of a Polytechnic. The Panel further noted the ongoing publication of *Scope* and the emphasis placed on Māori success through this publication.

The Panel also noted that some Schools (notably Midwifery) are participating in research to establish the best possible delivery and outcomes of their programmes for Kāi Tahu/Māori students. There is a move toward an applied research focus within the Institution, which will provide opportunity for Rūnaka and the Polytechnic to work together to achieve common aspirations through research.

It was pleasing to see that the Polytechnic had a process to ensure that ethics was addressed for Māori in research. With an increase in focus and potential partnership it is important that the Polytechnic invest in ensuring non-Māori staff understand the ethical responsibility and protocols for working with Māori. There may need to be mechanisms set up to ensure that lead researchers have access to quality cultural supervision.

The Panel noted the comments from the Otago Polytechnic CEO, Phil Ker about the increase in a research focus, particularly to ensure research-led teaching. It was also noted that Otago Polytechnic is still developing a research strategy and The Panel considers this needs to be advanced in light of Otago Polytechnic's commitment to the PBRF process.

The 2011 cultural audit recommended that a Kaiarahi Rakahau be appointed, and this has still to be put in place by Otago Polytechnic. The Panel considers that this as a strategic position that meets the aspirations for a stronger focus on research-led teaching within an inclusive learning environment. A Kaiarahi Rakahau position would also allow Heads of School to further develop their relationships with the Papatipu Rūnaka – so that research could be incorporated into teaching and learning and ensure currency, relevancy and consistency within programme delivery. The position could report to the Office of the Kaitohutohu, as the work of the Kaiarahi Rakahau would complement the work of the Office.

#### **Recommendation 22**

That Otago Polytechnic appoint a Kaiarahi Rakahau (1FTE) to ensure the implementation of a robust research strategy, that meets the principles of the MSF and increases the research capacity and capability across Otago Polytechnic.

## **Concluding Remarks**

The Panel would like to reiterate that the staff and leadership teams at Otago Polytechnic needed to be commended for their positive attitude towards the MSF and the MOU with Kāi Tahu Rūnaka. Some positive advancement has been made since the Cultural Audit in 2011 and there is a sense that staff members understand they are on a journey towards changing attitudes, practice and operating methods. As such The Panel noted that there was significant goodwill by all staff interviewed and a willingness to build on the successful outcomes following the 2011 Cultural Audit.

The Rūnaka are well informed and had noted the increase in success, retention rates and increased participation of Kāi Tahu/Māori students. As such the Rūnaka are further cementing their relationship with Otago Polytechnic by committing to the 2013/2016 MOU.

Once again the Panel would also like to thank Otago Polytechnic for the goodwill expressed and exemplary manaakitaka shown to us during our stay.

Ngā mihi mahana māua ki a koutou katoa  
E noho koutou i te rakimarie ā kā wā e heke mai nei.  
Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā rā tātou katoa.

Nāhāku noa,  
Nā Professor Lyn Carter and Dr Catherine Savage.

## **9. MATTERS FOR NOTING**

The following documents are attached:

- Council Calendar (Appendix 1)
- Minutes of a meeting of Komiti Kawanataka held on 15 August 2013 (Appendix 2)
- Minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 23 September 2013 (Appendix 3)
- Minutes of the Staff Subcommittee meeting held on 10 September 2013 (Appendix 4)
- Minutes of the Student Subcommittee held on 10 September 2013 (Appendix 5).

APPENDIX 1

Council Calendar 2013/2014

Meeting/Event	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan 2014	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
<b>Audit Process</b>												
Interim			6 Dec									
Signoff							4 April					
<b>Forecast</b>												
<b>Budget</b>												
Workshop												
Draft												
Signoff												
<b>Council Meeting Fridays</b>	4 Oct Otakou	1 Nov			7 Feb	7 Mar	4 April	2 May	6 June	4 July	1 Aug	
Evaluations - Reviews - Report	Oct											
Function			6 Dec									
Photo												
<b>Fees Set</b>												
International												
Domestic												
<b>Finance and Audit Ctee</b>	24 Oct	29 Nov		31 Jan	28 Feb	28 Mar	24 April TBC	30 May	27 June	25 July	29 Aug	
<b>Graduation</b>			6 Dec			14 Mar						
<b>Maori Pre-Grad</b>			5 Dec			13 Mar						

Meeting/Event	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan 2014	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
<b>Komiti Kawanataka</b> Thurs at 8am	17 Oct	21 Nov		16 Jan	20 Feb	20 Mar	17 April	15 May	19 June	17 July	21 Aug	
<b>Investment Plan</b> Draft												
Approval												
Report												
<b>Risk Management</b> Review Policy												
<b>Strategy</b> Workshop Approval												
<b>Dept Showcases</b>		Nov										



# Komiti Kawanataka

## Minutes

Held at 8.00am on 15 August 2013 in Puna Kawa, Otago Polytechnic, Dunedin.

**PRESENT:** Rebecca Williams (Chair)  
 Khyla Russell  
 Huata Holmes  
 Jamie Te Hiwi  
 Mike Collins  
 Eleanor Murphy

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Debbie Davie (Minutes)

**Karakia:** Huata Holmes

Rebecca welcomed Komiti members.

**1. Apologies:**

Kathy Grant (leaving the meeting early), Nicola Taylor, Justine Camp, John Findlay

**2. Minutes**

Minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> of July 2013 in Poho were approved as a true and correct record of the meeting.

**Moved – Khyla Russell    Seconded – Mike Collins**  
**All in Agreement**

**3. Matters Arising**

**Trades Training**

Report distributed. The report was difficult to read without John or a representative attending the meeting who could speak to it.

The Komiti has been involved in this programme from the beginning and therefore is particularly interested in its progress.

*John Findlay is to be emailed and asked again to attend our meeting. (Rebecca)*

**2013 Scope**

Tessa Thomson (EA/Research Assistant replacing .2 of Rachel's' proportion while teaching in semester 2) has taken over the Scope project. Because of illness and other proprieties we will not now meet the original deadline. Tessa is editing/formatting the articles, ensuring all the information required from our contributors has been provided. She will meet with Pam McKinlay (Art School) tomorrow (16 Aug) to discuss the timeline, images and articles.

*Because of other projects Pam will only be available until the end of August.*

**Capable Iwi – Bachelor or Applied Management (BAM) (Mike)**

Further discussion around this new initiative is planned for the Leadership Team on Monday (19 Aug).

Justine, Tama & Richard have another trip to Tauranga planned (23 – 27 August), a follow up from the previous trip in July.

**Cultural Evaluation**

Report tabled.

Because of the lateness of the Komiti receiving the report it was not possible to have expected members to have read it. Suggestion that the Komiti read this prior to the meeting scheduled with the external panel.

*A reminder to go out advising that reports are to be with Debbie on the Friday prior to our meeting if they are expecting a response from the Komiti.*

Notes from discussion:

- Good read, nice to see the progress to date, positive report
- Where is the information from 2010 onwards and the steps to move forward?
- How does it evolve without compromising the history?

All strategic frameworks will now follow this same process; it has proven to have worked so well. We have a more comprehensive report and have had higher staff involvement, thought to be more beneficial than just relying on HOS/HOD's for information.

Table/Scale – What is the best practice? This next step will add weight to the process.

What is the capability of this organisation adopting what Rūnaka suggest? How do we grow together, keep up with what is written, put it into practice? Rūnaka have asked about the report, they are interested, and interested in getting involved.

All research comes through the KTO office; resulting in increasing workloads for both Justine and Gina who are on the Ethics committee. What other resources are needed to ensure this continues to move forward – building on our foundation of students?

External Panel

Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> and Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> of September  
Mihi Whakatau / Feedback Session / Dinner at Plato

If there are any questions re the report, email Mike.

### **Māori Report**

Again a late report received, would have preferred this to have been out earlier to at least give the Komiti a weekend to read the report.

Suggestions to report:

- Pg 1 – There is a conversation taking place about the inclusion of a piece on Huata Holmes (Kathy Grant is discussing with Phil K). Acknowledgement in Rebecca's report is minimal.
- Pg 2 (1st paragraph, 2nd column)  
We are pleased to present this **third** annual report (not second annual report as printed).
- Pg 4 – From the Komiti Kawanataka, Rebecca's Report, the paragraph acknowledging Huata Holmes is missing. It is to sit between 'At the time of writing ..... and 'Over the Years .....
- Pg 7 (Under 2011 Cultural Audit Recommendations – 2nd Recommendation),  
Replace 'Achieved' and the following sentence with **On-going – The four Papatipu Rūnaka have been involved in this current process. This is supported by Komiti Ki Waho and Komiti Ki Kawanataka.**
- Pg 10 (table column 5 & 13) 9 Māori staff didn't respond, why? Suggest including a sentence of explanation.
- Pg 13 Statistics table – Why is retention not included, it is mentioned elsewhere in the report. Do these figures relate to a course or per student?
- Pg 14 (2nd column, last paragraph under Programme type and percentage of Māori and Kai Tahu successful completions, 2012  
.....retention of learners from the beginning of their studies through to graduation – what does this mean, where is this shown in the statistics?
- Pg 14 Course Completions for Programmes with high Māori EFTS  
Is this a list of all programmes with more than 10 Māori efts or just the high performing ones?  
Certificate in Sport and Exercise and Bachelor of Applied Science – are the students in the Certificate also counted in the Bachelors programme – is it a double count?
- Pg 17 Cohort Qualification Completions – the last paragraph 'When the all student cohort ..... This paragraph seems very complicated and difficult to understand. Consider deleting the last sentence and simplifying the text.
- Pg 20 (1st column, 4th paragraph) missing word  
.....tools were modified in 2012 **to** ensure that learners .....
- Pg 20 (1st column, 5th paragraph – wording amendment)

- .....performance portal specifically **identify** Māori retention and success and **enable** comparison with non-Māori. ....
- Reconsider following sentence ..... that indicate the staff completing course in the Certificate in Mata ā Ao Māori. Indicates what?
- Pg 20 – Good to Great, the photos don't seem to fit with the text, suggest swapping with the one photo on pg 30.
- Pg 24 – AWESOME 😊
- Pg 30 – Remove 'caption to come' on photo, suggest shift photo to pg 20

Overall this was an 'awesome' report – thank you to all those involved in the production. By the level of comments around suggested changes this shows how far we have come. A well written report.

*How do we socialise this document, it's a good conversation, broader contribution. Impressive stories!!*

#### 4. Kaitohutohu Report

Besides all the Leadership Team meetings and associated luncheons the KTO Office also attended to the following:

##### **ACHIEVED**

- CSAFE all day meeting
- Met with Jo Smith – Post Doc Research
- Attended Eleanor's Retirement function
- Attended the Arai Te Uru regional Tiaki/takata tiaki hui at Otakou
- Met with Ruma Karaitiana – BCITO Wellington
- Team workshop on the Self managing team that OP is now establishing. It will place responsibility for performance on the members and encourage all staff to be innovative in what they do and how they might do things better.
- Te Mata Ira Research Team Hui (teleconference)
- Two Day Leadership Team Retreat – Careys Bay Hotel
- Te roopu – hui at Zoology Department
- Welcome and hui with Ngāti Pōrou Runanganui representatives re OISA and CAPABLE Iwi
- OCC Mihi Whakatau for Dr Priscilla Harries, Brunel University in London

Progress against priorities

- On-going work around the Cultural Audit continues
- Preparation and support for 2013 Scope journal continues
- Preparation for 2013 Student and Staff hui continues (OT 1st yrs - Aug/OISA Adventure - Sept/OISA Staff Hui – Oct)
- Occupational Therapy Postgraduate programme review on-going
- On-going commitment to build our external relationships around partnering Māori business with Schools

When one of your priorities is "closed"

N/A

Great news, issues/challenges

- Appointment of Tessa Thomson to cover .2 of Rachel Dibbles' EA duties while she is away teaching in the second semester
- Ethics Applications – looking at our process how it can be streamlined
- Capable iwi – another Tauranga trip planned (22 – 27 August)
- Northtech visit re Capable iwi
- Ngati Porou to Capable iwi

Significant items on your/team agenda for the coming month

- Completing the Editing of Scope articles
- On-going work around the Cultural Evaluation continues
- Ethics Applications – a steady increasing quantity coming through
- Meeting with Northtech re relationships/collaborations CAPABLE Iwi

Beginning conversations with Ngāti Whatua re CAPABLE Iwi and Northtech proposals

Notes from Discussion:

*Suggestion that Pania Tyson-Nathan would also be an interesting person for Alistair to meet at some stage – in particular around China connections.*

Huata closed the meeting at 10.00am.

Signed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

..... Chair ..... Date  
Rebecca Williams



## Academic Board

Minutes of the *electronic* Academic Board held on Monday, 23 September 2013

Responses:	Sally Baddock	Richard Mitchell	Rebecca Swindells
	Phil Ker	Chris Morland	Sue Thompson
	Linda Kinniburgh	Sally Pairman	Kate Timms-Dean
	Bridie Lonie	Alistair Regan	
	Samuel Mann	Khyla Russell	

✓ *quorum achieved 13/15*

The Academic Board meeting scheduled for 20 September 2013 at 9.00am was cancelled due to lack of quorum. An electronic meeting was held to deal with items requiring approval or with consultation deadlines; all other items to be carried forward to 18 October 2014.

### NZQA consultation on “International” NZQF qualifications

#### Paper A57/13

Feedback to Sue Thompson by 1 October 2013.

### Quality and Approvals Committee

#### Paper A58/13

#### Recommendations:

1. That Quality and Approvals Committee recommends that Academic Board approves the reviewed Programme document for OT5061-62-63-64 Certificate in Foundation Studies (L1-4).  
(QAC26/13 – OT5061-62-63-64 Certificate in Foundation Studies (L1-4))
2. That Quality and Approvals Committee recommends that Academic Board approves the revised Programme document for OT5005 Certificate in Electrical Technology (L4).  
(QAC27/13 – OT5005 Certificate in Electrical Technology (L4))
3. That Quality and Approvals Committee recommends that Academic Board approves the revised Programme document for OT4987 Certificate in English and Engineering (L4).  
(QAC28/13 – OT4987 Certificate in English and Engineering (L4))
4. That Quality and Approvals Committee recommends that Academic Board approves the Type 2 change for the 180 Credit Master's degree for the Master of Visual Arts.  
(QAC29/13 – OT5070 Master of Visual Arts)
5. That Quality and Approvals Committee recommends that Academic Board approves the Programme document and EFTS factors for Graduate Diploma in Applied Science (Specialty).  
(QAC30/13 – OT5104 Graduate Diploma in Applied Science (Specialty))
6. That Quality and Approvals Committee recommends that Academic Board approves the Programme document and EFTS factors for NC1509 National Certificate in Farming Skills (Work Ready) (Level 3).  
QAC22/13 NC1509 National Certificate in Farming Skills (Work Ready) (Level 3)
7. That Academic Board approves the delay of the application to NZQA and TEC for NC in Farming Skills (Work Ready) (Level 3) until Animal Ethics approval has been obtained from the University of Otago through the School of Veterinary Nursing processes and guidelines

8. That Quality and Approvals Committee recommends to Academic Board to approve the NZQA Application for Degrees by Distance for flexible/online/distance delivery.  
(QAC33/13 NZQA Application – Degrees by Distance)

**AGREED: L Kinniburgh/S Pairman**

**OP Application for NZICA Accreditation for Bachelor of Applied Management**

**Paper A59/13**

**Recommendation:**

That Quality and Approvals Committee recommends that Academic Board approve the Otago Polytechnic accreditation application to the New Zealand Institute of Chartered Accountants.

**AGREED: L Kinniburgh/S Pairman**

**Type 1 Approvals**

**Paper A63/13**

**Recommendation:**

That Academic Board approves the Type 1 Approvals as listed)

**AGREED: L Kinniburgh/S Pairman**

**NC1013 National Certificate in Horticulture (Introductory) (Level 2)**

**Paper A64/13**

**Recommendation:**

That Academic Board approves the Programme Data and EFTS for NC1013 National Certificate in Horticulture (Introductory) (Level 2)

**AGREED: L Kinniburgh/S Pairman**

# Minutes of a Meeting of the Staff Subcommittee of the Otago Polytechnic Council



Held at 12-15pm on 10 September 2013 in Puna Kawa

**Subcommittee members present:** Jeanette O'Fee (Convener) (VET), Bevan Rickerby (MKT), D'Arcy Dalzell (OID), Geoff Simons (ISA), Dale Parsons (ICT), Phillip Ballard (ABE), De-Am Buchholz (ART), Sue Eden (CSD)

Council Representative: John Christie  
 Leadership Team Representative: Matt Carter  
 Minute Secretary: Michaela Moore

## 1. Apologies

Bridie Lonie (ART), Rachel Dibble (KTO), Samuel Mann (ICT)

## 2. Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting located on the Team Site on Insite along with the agenda were reviewed.

### RECOMMENDATION

**That the minutes be approved as an accurate record with the exception of correcting Jeanette O'Fee as absent from the previous meeting**

### AGREED.

## 3. Feedback on the naming of OP Buildings proposal

Leadership Team has proposed to Council that Otago Polytechnic buildings are rebranded with names rather than the current letters. Initial feedback from the Subcommittee is;

- Commercial sponsors can come and go too easily.
- Would need to be chosen ethically
- Clear signage will be needed

The Jeanette O'Fee (Convener), will ask Leadership Team if they would like the Subcommittee to canvas staff opinion via a survey on Insite.

## 4. Nominations and profile of Staff Subcommittee

### 5. Nominations:

- Due to recent resignations expressions of interest will be called for on Insite and via \*Email.
- **Profile:** An email address to be requested for Staff Sub-committee to provide a vehicle for staff to approach Committee with any governance issues
- Meeting reminders posted on Insite
- School and Service Area meeting roster currently being collated and will be used to request invite to attend and promote Subcommittee

## 6. General Business

- **WES Feedback**  
Demographics graphs were removed from the 2013 WES. This was communicated to staff.
- **Robertson Database**  
ABE would also like access to engineering databases for their students. Budget is currently being discussed.
- **Council links to Schools**

This is being strengthened with shared lunches during 2013. It was suggested that Council members may like to attend Staff Development Day on 30 January 2014 and introduce themselves in an all staff forum.

- **Council details on OP Website**  
Marketing to update Council page on website and to communicate any changes to Council via internal communication 'Leading News'
- **OP Website**  
Course information and enrolment availability need to be expanded, specific to Art. This is a school matter.
- **Feedback for Finance and Audit Committee**  
Feedback was given to the Finance and Audit Committee as requested on the Student Subcommittee structure and delegation section within the Terms of Reference (attached).

#### 7. Actions

Activity	Who Responsible	Outcome/Notes
Contact the Robertson Library regarding access to databases including engineering (as above)	Bridie & Samuel Mann & Philip Ballard	Raise with Sally Pairman & Alistair Regan
Offer to run staff survey on Insite re OP naming of buildings	Jeanette O'Fee	Approach LT with offer
Nominations for Subcommittee Email etc	Jeanette O'Fee and Michaela Moore	
Include Council in January 30 <sup>th</sup> Development Day	Jeanette O'Fee	Matt
Council page on website updated	Jeanette O'Fee - DONE	To request of Marketing Dept
Process for Council changes to be included in Leading News	Matt Carter	

## STAFF COMMITTEE

<b>REPORTING TO:</b>	Council
<b>CONVENOR AND DEPUTY DEPUTY CONVENOR:</b>	The Committee shall appoint its own convenor and deputy convenor, one of which shall be a general staff member and the other an academic staff member
<b>MEMBERS:</b>	Up to 14 members being equal numbers of general and academic staff elected by the staff at large; 1 member of the Leadership Team; and 1 member of Council. The member of Council will preferably be a member appointed to Council by virtue of his or her educational experience and expertise. The elected staff members must be permanent members of the Otago Polytechnic staff; full time or <b>proportional</b> .
<b>MEETING FREQUENCY:</b>	Regularly, consistent with the annual cycle of Council <b>meetings</b> .
<b>AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY:</b>	To consult widely with staff at large, so that a broad staff view is brought to bear on the matters about which the Committee offers <b>advice</b> .
<b>POWER TO ACT:</b>	As delegated by Council
<b>POWER TO RECOMMEND:</b>	<p>The Committee shall advise Council on matters considered to be of a governance nature. Advice may be by way of a recommendation, or by providing a range of diverse views that reflect the staff perspectives.</p> <p>The Committee shall also provide advice to the CEO on matters which should be addressed by the Polytechnic management; <b>including any employment matters</b>.</p>

**Comment [OP1]:** Given a two year term from date of anniversary

**Comment [OP2]:** Members must attend regularly

**Comment [OP3]:** The Subcommittee needs to formalise the involvement of members with each OP area

**Comment [OP4]:** This was not explicit in the Terms of Reference

# Minutes of a Meeting of the Student Subcommittee of the Otago Polytechnic Council



Held at 12 midday on 10 September 2013 in Puna Kawa

**PRESENT:** Tom Naylor (Convener) (SAB), Fabienne Lecomte (DES)

**Leadership Rep:** Matt Carter (apologies)

**Council Rep:** Gillian Bremner

**Student Services Manager:** Kitty Keogh

**OPSA Rep:** Rebecca Swindells

**Minute Secretary:** Michaela Moore

## 1. Apologies

Suzie Townshend (SAB), Jamie Robinson (SAB), Jeremy Hall (SAB)

## 2. Minutes

### RECOMMENDATION

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 August 2013 were approved as an accurate record.

### AGREED

## 3. Convener Update from September Council meeting

- Chief Executive, Phil Ker is currently on sabbatical. Matt Carter, Director: Organisational Development is Acting Chief Executive in his absence.
- Otago Polytechnic Work Environment Survey for staff has just been conducted.
- The Maori Annual Report has been completed and will be presented to Council at the October meeting which is being held at the Otakau Marae
- Council self-assessment survey has been completed
- Accommodation for Cromwell students, which has been a challenge is now resolved.
- Otago Polytechnic Strategic Directions has been approved by Council

## 4. Feedback on the naming of Otago Polytechnic Buildings proposal

Leadership Team has proposed to Council that Otago Polytechnic buildings are rebranded with names rather than the current letters. Initial feedback from the Subcommittee is;

- Good idea, however careful planning should be given to the transition phase.
- Rebranding would need to include improved and increased signage and maps available online and around the whole campus.
- The Subcommittee were open to buildings being named in a number of ways
  - Commercially  
Good for sponsorship and revenue. Did not want to see names changed to often so would need to be for a long term with a viable business. Would be good if business was related to School housed in the building ie Forsyth Barr for School of Business building
  - Alumni  
Would be very good linkage with past staff/students. Difficulty might be reaching a consensus and causing offence.

## 5. General Business

- Feedback given to the Finance and Audit Committee as requested on the Student Subcommittee structure and delegation section within the Terms of Reference. (attached)
- Fabienne Lecomte agreed to attend the October Council meeting as the representative for the Subcommittee if possible.
- Kitty Keogh and Tom Naylor to attend Programme Managers meeting to request nominations of students for the subcommittee for 2014.

## Actions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fabienne Lecomte to attend October Council meeting in Tom Naylor's absence if possible</li> </ul>	Fabienne Lecomte
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fabienne Lecomte to meet with Rebecca Swindells to go over Marae protocol if attending October Council meeting</li> </ul>	Fabienne Lecomte and Rebecca Swindell
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tom Naylor and Kitty Keogh to meet on the 8 October to further develop Subcommittee profile</li> </ul>	Tom Naylor and Kitty Keogh
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebecca to invite 4 OPISA Student Representatives to the next Subcommittee meeting</li> </ul>	Rebecca Swindells
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tom Naylor and Kitty Keogh to attend Programme Managers meeting on the 11 October</li> </ul>	Tom Naylor and Kitty Keogh Michaela Moore to send appointment and add to agenda
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• October Subcommittee meeting to be moved to 15 October due to holiday break</li> </ul>	Michaela Moore to reschedule
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calendar of topics considered by Council on an annual basis to be put together for 2014</li> </ul>	Michaela Moore

**STUDENT COMMITTEE**

**REPORTING TO:** Council

**CONVENOR AND DEPUTY CONVENOR:** The Committee shall appoint its own convenor and deputy convenor

**MEMBERS:** One representative from each designated school; one member or nominee of the Leadership Team; one member of Council and the elected president of OPISA.

The representatives from each school shall be selected from the class representatives, or such other representative structure as may exist in the School, and will have a term of up to 3 years provided that they remain enrolled as students at Otago Polytechnic.

**MEETING FREQUENCY:** Regularly, consistent with the annual cycle of Council meetings.

**AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY:** To consult widely with students at large, so that a broad student view is brought to bear on the matters about which the Committee offers advice

**POWER TO ACT:** As delegated by Council

**POWER TO RECOMMEND:** The Committee shall advise Council on matters considered to be of a governance nature. Advice may be by way of a recommendation, or by providing a range of diverse views that reflect the student perspectives.

The Committee shall also provide advice to the CEO on matters which should be addressed by the Polytechnic management, including any employment matters.

**Comment [OP1]:** Should also include Student Success representative. They have close ties with the student body.

**Comment [OP2]:** There is no formal mechanism for this currently. The Subcommittee would like Programme Managers to nominate a representative from each School.

**Comment [OP3]:** For students? Was this a typo from Staff Subcommittee version?

## 10. ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS