Otago Polytechnic Council

BOARD PACK

for

Otago Polytechnic Council - Open

05 Apr 2019 12:30 PM

Held at:

Puna Kawa

Level 2, Mason Centre
Otago Polytechnic
Forth Street
Dunedin

Version 1
Generated: 29 Mar 2019 03:53 PM

INDEX

Cover Page

Index

Agenda

Attached Documents:

*** File not integrated in this board pack. Click on file name to download from BoardPro.*

AGENDA
OTAGO POLYTECHNIC COUNCIL - OPEN

Name:	Otago Polytechnic Council
Date:	Friday, April 5, 2019
Time:	12:30 PM to 2:00 PM
Location:	Puna Kawa, Level 2, Mason Centre Otago Polytechnic Forth Street Dunedin
Board Members:	Kathy Grant (Chair), Bill Moran, Megan Potiki, Neil Barns, Paul Allison, Peter Coolbear, Jamie Adamson
Apologies:	Mike Horne
Guests:	In Attendance: Jono Aldridge (Convenor, Staff Subcommittee), Jo Brady (Deputy Chief Executive, People, Performance and Development), Jeanette Corson (Secretary to Council), Philip Cullen (Deputy Chief Executive Corporate Services), Jordan Dargaville (Convenor, Student Council), Megan Gibbons (Acting Deputy Chief Executive Learner Experience), Janine Kapa (Deputy Chief Executive Māori Development/Kaitohutohu, Phil Ker (Chief Executive), Gagan Sachdeva (Chief Executive, Otago Polytechnic Auckland International Campus)
Notes:	Stuart Jeffcoat, Mobius Research, will attend the meeting at 1pm.

1. PROCEDURAL

1.1 Apologies

1.2 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.

Supporting Documents:

1.2.a Council Interests Register.docx	6

1.3 Confirm Minutes
RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the open section of the meeting held on 1 February 2019 be approved as a true and correct record.

Supporting Documents:

1.3.a Minutes : Otago Polytechnic Council - Open - 01 Feb, 2019	9

1.4   Matters Arising

1.5   Action Sheet

Date	Action	To be completed by	By when
03/07/2015	Naming of buildings	Phil Ker	Progressive reporting

2.   REPORTS

2.1   Chair (verbal)

2.2   Chief Executive

2.3   Mobius Research Results of Stakeholder Audit

Presentation by Stuart Jeffcoat

Supporting Documents:

2.3.a   Mobius OP Reputation 2019.pptx

2.3.b   Mobius Report.pptx

3.   VOCATIONAL EDUCATION REFORM

3.1   Draft OP Submission

Supporting Documents:

3.1.a   OP submission on RoVE March 28.docx   12

3.1.b   Phil Reform Model v7.pdf   25

3.1.c   Restructuring Vocational Education alternative model (V5 PK).docx   26

3.2   Academic Board paper

Supporting Documents:

3.2.a   Paper to Council AB Forums Feb 2019 and Nov 2018.docx   34

4.   POLICIES FOR APPROVAL

4.1   Policies for approval

AP0101 Academic Board showing tracked changes is presented for approval.

The following policies have been reviewed by the Finance and Audit Committee and are also recommended to the Council for approval:

- CP0005 Delegations from Council to the Chief Executive

- CP0008 Sensitive Expenditure

5. MATTERS FOR NOTING

5.1 Council Calendar

5.2 Executive Leadership Team Interests Register

5.3 Staff Subcommittee Minutes

6. CLOSE MEETING

6.1 Meeting Closed

Next meeting: Otago Polytechnic Council - Open - Thursday, 2 May 2019, 12:30 PM

OTAGO POLYTECHNIC COUNCIL
INTERESTS REGISTER

Council Member	Updated	Interest Disclosed	Nature of Potential Interest with the Otago Polytechnic
Jamie ADAMSON		1. Deloitte Limited (employee) 2. Otago Museum Trust Board (Treasurer)	1. Potential supplier 2. Potential customer
Paul ALLISON	20-04-18	1. Life Trustee – Halberg Disability Sport Foundation 2. Trustee – Winter Games NZ 3. Sports Commentator – NZME 4. Independent Director - University Bookshop (Otago) Ltd 5. Director - Waitaki District Health Services Ltd 6. Trustee – Waitaki District Health Services Trust 7. Independent Chair - Infinite Energy (design and installation of solar power) 8. South Island Regional Grants Committee – The Lion Foundation 9. Independent Contractor – The Lion Foundation 10. Independent Consultant - Impact Consulting	1 – 6 Nil 7 & 10 potential supplier 8 & 9 – potential funder
Neil BARNS	17-01-19	1. Board Chair – Otago Polytechnic Auckland International Campus 2. Director/Shareholder Neil Barns Consulting Limited 3. Partner – Barns-Davis Orchard Partnerships 4. Commissioner, Whitireia and Weltec Polytechnics 5. Director - WelTec Enterprises Ltd 6. Director - LCB Management NZ Ltd 7. Director - IEM Ltd	1. OP is a 50% owner of the limited partnership and is impacted directly by its operations in Auckland 2. The Company provides consultancy services mainly to TEOs and government education agencies that OP also has dealings with. 3. Joint owner of an avocado orchard. Unlikely to involve OP directly although OP offers horticulture qualifications and training.
Peter COOLBEAR	16-11-16	1. Co-owner and director: Coolbear Ltd - Information Management and Tertiary Education Consulting 2. Member, NZQA Consistency Review Panel	

Kathy GRANT	04-09-18	1. Dunedin City Holdings Ltd (Director) 2. Trustee of numerous private trusts 3. Gallaway Cook Allan (Associate) 4. Dunedin City Treasury Limited (Director) 5. SDHB (Commissioner) 6. Dunedin Stadium Property Limited Spouse: 1. Gallaway Cook Allan (Consultant) 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 (Chair) 10. Trustee of numerous private trusts	
Michael HORNE	02-02-18	1. Deloitte Limited 2. Best View Limited 3. City Forests Limited 4. Greenbriar Limited 5. Palmer & Son Limited 6. Palmer Resources Limited 7. Palmer MH Limited 8. Palmers Mechanical Limited 9. PDS (Computer Services) Limited 10. Prospectus Nominees 11. Prospectus Nominees Services Limited 12. Rawhiti Road Investments Limited 13. Viblock Limited 14. Ashburn Hall	1. Potential supplier Others: Nil

Council member	Updated	Interest Disclosed	Nature of Potential Interest with the Otago Polytechnic
Bill MORAN	02/07/18	1. Director, Pioneer Energy 2. Chair and Director, Sport and Recreation New Zealand 3. Chair and Director, High Performance Sport New Zealand 4. Director, Youthtown 5. Trustee, New Zealand Dementia Prevention Trust 6. Trustee, New Zealand Football Foundation 7. Trustee, Olive Leaf Centre Trust 8. Advisory Trustee, School of Government, Victoria University of Wellington 9. Advisory Trustee, Play It Strange Trust 10. Director, Aspen Initiative New Zealand Other 1. Independent Chair, Parliamentary Appropriations Review Committee (Mar-Aug 2018) 2. Independent adviser, Crest Hotel, Queenstown	Nil
Megan POTIKI	26/06/17	1. Member of Te Runanga o Ōtākou 2. Employee of the University of Otago 3. Director of Arataki Associates Ltd – contracting entity involved in a wide range of Māori education, health and business.	3. Potential supplier

MINUTES (in Review)
OTAGO POLYTECHNIC COUNCIL - OPEN

Name:	Otago Polytechnic Council
Date:	Friday, February 1, 2019
Time:	11:00 AM to 11:35 AM
Location:	Puna Kawa, Level 2, Mason Centre Otago Polytechnic Forth Street Dunedin
Board Members:	Kathy Grant (Chair), Megan Potiki, Mike Horne, Neil Barns, Paul Allison, Peter Coolbear, Jamie Adamson
Apologies:	Bill Moran
Guests/Notes:	In Attendance: Jono Aldridge (Convenor, Staff Subcommittee), Jo Brady (Deputy Chief Executive People, Performance and Development), Jeanette Corson (Secretary to Council), Philip Cullen (Deputy Chief Executive Corporate Services), Megan Gibbons (Acting Deputy Chief Executive Learner Experience), Janine Kapa (Deputy Chief Executive Māori Development/Kaitohutohu, Phil Ker (Chief Executive), Oonagh McGirr (Deputy Chief Executive Learning and Teaching Services)

1.   PROCEDURAL

1.1   Apologies

An apology had been received from Mr Moran for the open section of the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That Mr Moran's apology be accepted.

AGREED.

1.2   Conflict of interest

Mr Horne noted that he would be withdrawing several interests from the Register.

No further interests were disclosed.

1.3   Confirm Minutes

> **Otago Polytechnic Council - Open Friday, November 2, 2018,** the minutes were confirmed as presented.

RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the open section of the meeting held on 2 November 2018 be approved as a true and correct record.

AGREED.

1.4   Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

1.5   Action Sheet

Date	Action	To be completed by	By when
03/07/2015	Naming of buildings	Phil Ker	Progressive reporting

2.   REPORTS

2.1   Chair (verbal)

Mrs Grant reminded Council members of the Māori pre-graduation to be held on 7 March and Graduation on 8 March.

2.2   Chief Executive

Applications
It was noted that information on applications in the report was incorrect as comparatives of 2017 data had been used instead of 2018.

Summarised Finance Report for the period ended 30 November 2018
A table provided an overview of Otago Polytechnic's 2018 financial performance to 30 November 2018 compared against forecast with variances.

Key points:

- Net operating profit of $7,260k favourable to forecast by $551k

- Capex lower than forecast to date by a net $1.004k

- EFTS enrolments at 5,536 exceeding YTD forecast of 5,529

Media Report
A report was attached from Shane Gilchrist, Media Liaison.

External Liaison
Mr Ker had met with a number of groups and individuals since the November meeting.

3.   POLICIES FOR APPROVAL

4.   MATTERS FOR NOTING

4.1   Council Calendar

Noted.

4.2   Executive Leadership Team Interests Register

Noted.

4.3   Academic Board Minutes

The minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 9 October were noted.

5.   CLOSE MEETING

5.1   Meeting Closed

Next meeting: No date for the next meeting has been set.

Signature:_____   **Date:**_____

Otago Polytechnic Submission on the Reform of Vocational Education

This submission is provided from Otago Polytechnic as a joint submission from Otago Polytechnic Council and Management, with significant input from staff.

The submission addresses:
- **Learning and Teaching Issues**
- **Applied Research**
- **Industry Skills Bodies (ISB)**
- **Investing in System Capability**
- **Funding**
- **Transition Issues**
- **The structure of the VE system**

Summary of Recommendations
To be inserted

Introduction
To be inserted – will likely transfer the introduction from the alternative structural model

Learning and Teaching

Shared curriculum services
Otago Polytechnic supports the establishment of a shared services approach to programme and curriculum development, but with serious concerns as to the nature and scope of such services, and for the preservation of academic freedom.

We believe that a shared curriculum service as part of the VE System could be located anywhere in New Zealand. It would have the following scope:
- Provide a central repository for all approved programme documents, which will be accessible to all providers in the system.
- Design and develop new programmes for approval, and over time reduce programme duplication through programme revision.
- Develop learning resources which are beyond the scope or means of individual providers and which significantly enhance student learning e.g. simulation resources, VR/AR resources.

1

- Provide a central repository for learning materials at all levels of delivery: programme, course, unit. These would be quality assured resources provided by individual providers and available to all providers.

Out of scope is detailed course and assessment design and individual lesson development, which remains with individual providers and which is protected by their academic freedom (see below for further comment).

For the sake of clarity, Otago Polytechnic does not support a shared curriculum development process that fully standardizes detailed course design and that requires delivery through prepackaged lessons.

A shared curriculum service would have the following features:
- Staffed by quality specialists who ensure documentation meets educational quality requirements and works alongside NZQA.
- Staffed by specialists in learning, instructional and assessment design who write programme documents inclusive of learning outcomes and assessment guidelines, and who develop specialist learning resources.
- Works with subject matter experts drawn from the provider network and industry as appropriate
- Works alongside a market development team and the ISBs to ensure industry, community and learner needs are met and that programmes are fit for future needs. This may involve national, regional or local research.
- Works with iwi and hapu as appropriate to ensure that mātauranga Māori and Māori perspectives are embedded into all programmes of study,
- Works with NZQA to ensure quality standards are met.

A shared curriculum service would have overall responsibility for programme document development to meet the Graduate Profile Outcomes which comprise particular qualifications. The Industry Skills Bodies would mandate the minimum required hours in work placement, capabilities that enhance work readiness for the industry, and any compulsory industry requirements to enable students to meet the GPO.

Providers would have the right to request areas for programme development to occur due to a perceived need, noting however that programmes belong to the system and therefore all institutions would have access.

2

The shared service entity may be accessed by individual providers for specialist assistance with detailed course or learning resource design, subject to an agreed prioritization process.

The unit may have a monitoring role and oversee matters such as assessment, moderation and annual programme review processes in each provider institution, as well as coordinating monitor visits for degree and post graduate programmes across the country and working with the ISB for the consistency review meetings for sub-degree programmes.

Academic freedom

Otago Polytechnic believes it is essential that the current legislated provision for academic freedom be preserved within the new VE system:

Education Act 1989; S161 Academic freedom

(1) It is declared to be the intention of Parliament in enacting the provisions of this Act relating to institutions that academic freedom and the autonomy of institutions are to be preserved and enhanced.

*(2) For the purposes of this section, **academic freedom**, in relation to an institution, means—*

(a) the freedom of academic staff and students, within the law, to question and test received wisdom, to put forward new ideas and to state controversial or unpopular opinions:

(b) the freedom of academic staff and students to engage in research:

(c) the freedom of the institution and its staff to regulate the subject matter of courses taught at the institution:

(d) the freedom of the institution and its staff to teach and assess students in the manner they consider best promotes learning:

(e) the freedom of the institution through its chief executive to appoint its own staff.

(3) In exercising their academic freedom and autonomy, institutions shall act in a manner that is consistent with—

3

(a) the need for the maintenance by institutions of the highest ethical standards and the need to permit public scrutiny to ensure the maintenance of those standards; and
(b) the need for accountability by institutions and the proper use by institutions of resources allocated to them.

(4) In the performance of their functions the Councils and chief executives of institutions, Ministers, and authorities and agencies of the Crown shall act in all respects so as to give effect to the intention of Parliament as expressed in this section.

Academic freedom lies at the heart of creativity and innovation in our current system and is the essential underpinning of teacher professionalism. Academic freedom allows educators to be agile in meeting the immediate needs of their communities and learners. Academic freedom also allows our teachers to model critical thinking, to question and challenge the dominant pedagogic logic of their respective disciplines, and at times, the sector more broadly.

On-line Learning
Otago Polytechnic beleives that on-line learning will and must be an integral component of a fit- for-purpose vocational education system in the future, noting that effective services must be provided for wholly on-line learning as well as for the on-line component of blended learning.

We note that there are at least four providers of wholly on-line learning serving New Zealand currently, each with particular strengths, and that most if not all ITPs currently operate their own delivery platforms to support blended learning.

We note also that the delivery of effective on-line learning requires more than a technology platform, although most attention seems to have been given to whether or not New Zealand's on-line learners should be served through a single Learning Management System (LMS). Rather, an effective service to on-line learners requires best in class learning design and learner support and both need to be informed by a sophisticated learning analytics system.

For these reasons we do not support the proposal that Open Polytechnic be mandated as a matter of preference as New Zealand's sole provider of on-line learning. Rather, we strongly recommend that no decision is taken by government to mandate a single provider, if indeed there is only to be one, but

4

instead to require as a priority action the new System Head Office to conduct an arms length evaluation of the current providers with a view to establishing a world class integrated on-line service.

Definition of vocational education

Otago Polytechnic does not support the proposed definition of vocational education, which we see as too narrow and which fails to recognise that many professions require degree level education for entry to the profession.

We beleive it is essential that the definition of vocational education embraces the notion of advanced vocational practice at both degree and post graduate level, recognising that applied vocational degrees are qualitatively different from most degrees offered in the university sector. We note that universities do offer a range of vocational degrees, some directly competitive with those offered by ITPs.

Teaching of degrees and post-graduate programmes

The proposals for reform lack clarity on the issue of degree and post-graduate provision by the ITP sector. As stated above, vocational education must include education for advanced practice and consequently a fit for purpose vocational education system must offer applied degrees and applied post-graduate learning.

We strongly recommend that this issue is clarified when government makes its decisions on the reforms.

Centres of Vocational Excellence

Otago Polytechnic strongly supports the establishment of Centres of Vocational Excellence (CoVE)and recommends that these may take a variety of forms and serve a range of purposes as follows:

- Centres of applied research, to provide leadership in applied research generally or for particular purposes, or as specialist applied research facilities
- Centres of teaching expertise, to provide leadership in a vocational field, in aspects of teaching and learning practice or in particular approaches to learning.
- Centres which are granted a specific mandate to deliver training and education nation-wide because the volume of learners will not support more than a single provider. We believe that an EFTS volume of less than

5

100 per annum nationwide is an appropriate indicator of the need to establish a CoVE for sole delivery.

CoVEs may be exclusive in their application, but do not necessarily need to be so, with the exception of centres that have been provided with a specific mandate to teach or research as a sole provider.

Otago Polytechnic has significant strengths in several curriculum and research areas and is interested in hosting several CoVE.

Applied Research

Otago Polytechnic supports a degree of centralisation of Applied Research as part of the reformed VE system. We envisage that the System Head Office champions applied research through a network of national industry partnerships and by coordinating extensive projects with a national or international reach.

However individual ITP providers will ensure applied research informs programmes and underpins teaching. Individual providers will negotiate regional collaborations, contribute to national and international projects championed by System Head Office and support staff and student development for applied research.

Currently, ITP research has a distinct character. It is practically oriented and centred on the needs and issues of communitites, professions and employers. It provides opportunities for staff and students to engage in experiential learning on marae, in workplaces, businesses, industries, community centres, cultural institutions and within built and natural environments. It forms an integral part of the fabric and practice of applied tertiary education.

ITP applied research needs to be driven by individual providers as researchers are located in the regions and are responsive to the needs of their local industries and communities, including Maori communities. Industry research is often focused on new products/prototypes, process improvements and problem solving.

Industry Skills Bodies (ISB)

Otago Polytechnic supports the proposal that ISBs be the agency that determines the skills needed by graduates, in consultation with industry to meet industry

6

needs. However, we have two areas of significant concern. First, a tendency for employers to want graduates who are trained to meet current needs, not necessarily future needs. It is essential that ISBs are tasked to ensure qualifications are always fit for future needs.

Second, there is a tendency for employers to privilege technical/specialist skills with a narrow range of transferable skills that will not necessarily serve well the careers of individual learners. Therefore, the definition of skills must include transferable skills as set out in the future of work research, in order to ensure graduates are equipped to be part of a future focused workforce for New Zealand.

We do not support the proposal that ISBs set assessments and undertake moderation. These roles are in direct conflict with the core work of teachers within the system and undermine academic freedom as set out in the Education act 1989 – please refer to the section on Academic Freedom set out earlier in this submission. For the same reasons we do not support the proposal that ISBs have an active role in curriculum development. We are comfortable with ISBs being consulted as part of programme design, as is currently the case with ITOs.

We do not support the proposal that ISBs approve or co-approve programmes of learning. The key role of the ISB is to ensure that qualifications are appropriately defined through the Graduate Profile Outcome (GPO) statements i.e. ensure that qualifications meet industry and learner needs and are fit for the future. It is the specialist role of NZQA to evaluate that programmes of learning are fit for the purpose of ensuring graduates meet the GPO statement. We are comfortable with NZQA consulting ISBs as part of the approval process, and even perhaps including ISB representatives as part of an approval panel.

Who might be ISBs?
ISBs might be established from existing ITOs, or may be existing registration bodies such as the Nursing Council. The important consideration is that there not be more than one ISB for a defined field of vocational practice.

We propose that each ISB be specific to the qualification grouping for each industry, and not omnibus bodies as is the case with most ITOs at present. It is essential that ISBs be able to represent adequately the industry specific to the qualifications. It is important that there is clear legislative guidance for the

7

establishment of ISBs and to ensure that there is no duplication of that role for any particular industry. Existing structures that are in place (e.g. Nursing Council, NZ Association of Counsellors) must be acknowledged and not duplicated nor replaced.

We recommend that ISBs operate in a way that is similar to organisations like the Occupational Therapy Board of NZ (OTBNZ) around approval and accreditation of qualifications. Below is an example from Occupational Therapy. Although a degree example we believe the process can apply equally as well to pre-degree programmes.

Bachelor of Occupational Therapy: current practice:
The OTBNZ sets the competencies that the graduate must meet to reach the minimum level for registration. This includes the hours of fieldwork practice (broken down into "real" and simulation), content required, soft skills eg critical thinking and problem solving and integration of things like tikanga Maori. The education provider then develops/modifies the programme of learning to ensure that they have all the minimum competencies and submits the programme document (including course and assessment outlines) to both OTBNZ and NZQA. Before the programme is accredited for delivery there is a combined panel meeting with selected members from OTBNZ and NZQA where questions are asked around the normal NZQA site visit assessment and include specific industry questions to ensure that learners receive a range of experiences and meet the minimum requirements for registration. Each year there is a liaison visit from OTBNZ to raise any concerns they have heard about with the programme, alert to changes in industry and generally check how things are going for the learners and the education provider.

We believe that a priority role for ISBs once established will be to review progressively the Graduate Profiles of existing qualifications on the NZQF, noting that the targeted review of qualifications has resulted in standardized qualifications up to level 4 for all industries. Priority for review should be qualifications in rapidly changing vocations and where there is currently inadequate expectations for the development of transferable skills. The outcomes of these reviews may result in programme redesign, which would be the responsibility of the shared curriculum services entity established as part of the new VE system.

8

We envisage that every two years there would be consistency meetings to ensure that delivery across the country meets the minimum standards as set by the ISB, the education requirements as set by NZQA and to enable providers to demonstrate the regional needs (including iwi/hapū needs) and how they work with their local industry to meet their needs.

Changes in minimum requirements would be reviewed every 5 years, unless there was a major industry or legislative requirement that required an immediate change, eg introduction of the vulnerable child act which required a change to entry criteria in health degrees.

Investing in System Capability

Otago Polytechnic notes that the reform proposals are largely silent about investing in the capability of the VE system to ensure it truly becomes world class. Accordingly, we are proposing the establishment of two professional development centres: an institute for leadership and an institute for teacher education. The former will be fully funded whilst the latter will also have an export education role and therefore be partially self funded.

Institute for Leadership for Tertiary Education.

We propose that there is a fully funded dedicated Institute for Leadership (IfL) to support training and development of current and future generations of administrative and academic leaders in order to ensure that New Zealand has an appropriately skilled and credentialed pool of staff, given the acknowledged need for improved management and leadership of our ITPs.

The core activity of the IfL would be on developing the necessary skills and knowledge for executive leader and manager roles in our institutions (typically tier one to tier three leaders).

The Institute will draw staff from around the country, and from international networks to facilitate training and development in specific areas of leadership such as financial management, leading people, business planning, change management, coaching and mentoring, organisational culture and fostering innovation and excellence.

9

Global Teacher Training Institute

Similarly, in order to provide ongoing training and development for our tertiary educators, we propose the establishment of a Global Teacher Training Institute (GTTI).

The mission of the GTTI will focus on preparing educators of the future, ensuring that academic staff have the requisite knowledge and skills to facilitate the most effective learning and the best possible learner experience. Graduates of the GTTI will be recognised as competent, confident and current in their practice.

The domestic client base for the GTTI will comprise staff engaged in the delivery and facilitation of learning at ITPS, including for micro-credentials, certificates, diplomas, degrees and post-graduate learning. The Institute will complement the work led by Ako Aotearoa by providing practical teacher training to ensure benchmarked development for tertiary practitioners in New Zealand, the Asia Pacific region and beyond.

Training and development will cover a wide range of themes and topics which inform staff capability, including but not limited to Education technology, Programme Development, Learning Design, Pedagogy for Tertiary Education, Assessment and Moderation, Employability, Research and Scholarship.

The GTTI will benchmark its delivery portfolio by ensuring global accreditation of its programmes, reward and recognition of its graduates (international fellowship and excellence awards) and endorsement from national quality bodies.

The GTTI will also have a role in export education, working closely with Education NZ to service the myriad opportunities for teacher education and upskilling across the globe, focusing particularly on the strong networks and relationships already established in the Asia Pacific region, with a view to growing our reach in the extended Pacific region of the Americas. The template for such work draws on successful exemplars, such as the Sino-NZ model hosted by Wintec in collaboration with Otago Polytechnic and Toi Ohomai.

A key feature of the GTTI will be its ability to deliver off and onshore and to provide follow-up services for international educators in their country of delivery, providing an holistic development and education service to clients and extensive

10

opportunities for tertiary educators in New Zealand to gain international teaching experience across a global community of practice

Funding

Otago Polytechnic applauds the commitment to improve the vocational education funding system and recognises that putting in place a fit for purpose funding regime is a complex exercise, and one which will require careful modelling.

However, we believe the following should be features of the new funding regime:

- A base grant for infrastructure. This will apply to each recognised main campus and sub-campus or learning centre
- A population dispersal grant. This will recognise those regions which have a relatively low population density spread over a significant geographic area
- A social index grant. This will recognise the socio-economic makeup of the region being served, taking into account factors such as levels of unemployment and average incomes.

In addition, we would like to draw attention to the following cost drivers which are not recognised in the current funding levels.

- Support for students with mental health issues. There has been a significant growth in the number of students enrolling in tertiary institutions who have mental health issues and the need for ongoing support. This is in fact a worldwide issue and presents a challenge for learner support services, given that other learner support needs remain undiminished.
- Support for Maori and Pacific Island learners. Research has established that in order to secure higher retention and achievement rates for Maori and Pacific learners, especially at pre-degree level, a much higher level of pastoral care is required. This support often needs to be individualised.

  Two options present for funding this additional support: a per capita grant based on the prior year headcount of learners, with an end of year wash up or an increase in the level of SAC funding. Our estimates are that an increase of at least $1000 per learner requiring support will be needed.

Transition Issues

The proposed restructuring of the VE sector will be complex to implement, even if the refined model as proposed later in this submission were to be adopted.

11

Otago Polytechnic has major concerns with the transition to a new system generally, and specifically with the transfer of industry training and apprenticeships to the ITP sector. We also are concerned to see much more consideration given to the future of on-line learning and the establishment of shared curriculum services.

The general transition to a new system has significant potential for overstressing the sector and the wide range of unresolved issues has high potential to create uncertainty for learners and employers, which may negatively impact on enrolments and industry training. We therefore recommend that at the very least a one year status quo period is adopted with regard to the business as usual activities of current providers. This would mean retaining existing employment arrangements for both management and staff and also the retention of current governance arrangements.

This 12 month period will provide the time for new systems and processes to be established in a considered and orderly way and for new employment arrangements to be agreed, thereby diminishing impacts on learners, staff and employers. It will also allow for new system wide services to be set up and staffed appropriately.

With regard to the transfer of industry training/apprenticeships we recommend that a three year transition period is adopted. We propose that in the first year ITPs take on all new apprentices in the vocational areas in which they currently have expertise, for example but not limited to, carpentry, automotive, mechanical engineering, agriculture and horticulture.

In the second year ITPs would take on all new apprentices in vocational areas which are new to their portfolios. In the third year, all apprentices in the system will transfer.

An approach such as this will ensure an orderly transition in which learners are appropriately supported and employer needs met.

With regard to on-line learning and the establishment of shared curriculum services we have earlier in this submission urged caution and for government to task the new System Head Office with undertaking further consultation and due

12

diligence before making final decisions. It is our view that with regard to these two matters the consultation period has been far too short.

The Structure of the VE System
Updated model to be inserted

... NATIONAL HEAD OFFICE (Polytechnic New Zealand)

GOVERNANCE
Chair + Board Members representative of all stakeholder groups

CHARTER

NATIONAL HEAD OFFICE

WHOLE OF INDUSTRY LIAISON
- Single point of communication
- Verification of impact
- Coordinated communication with each provider

STRATEGIC PLANNING & POLICY
- Enviro scanning
- Long term plan
- Delivery portfolios
- Regional parity

FINANCE & FUNDING
- Provider funding
- Strategic asset mgt. and capital needs
- Capital projects approval
- Major capital projects fund
- Innovation fund

SYSTEM ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS
- Operating standards
- Academic board
- Best practice sharing
- ISB liaison
- Innovation
- Impact
- Collaboration

PERFORMANCE EXCELLENCE
- Monitoring
- Improvement
- Cross-collaboration
- Intervention
- Proactive support (including supplementary funding)

NATIONAL ADVOCACY & MARKETING
- International collaboration and marketing
- Nationally coordinated career guidance

BACK OF HOUSE SYSTEMS & SERVICES
Common standardised systems & processes:
- Finance
- IT
- HR
- Payroll
- Student management

Shared Educational Services

LEARNER SUPPORT SERVICE CENTRE
- Shared service centre (call centre and online supporting on-campus)
  * Career advice and programme guidelines
  * Learner support

INNOVATION HUB
- Research and development
- Sharing successful innovations
- Contestable funding

APPLIED RESEARCH
- Industry partnerships & coordination
- Common research platform
- R&D partnerships

SHARED CURRICULUM SERVICES
- Shared programme portfolio available to all providers
- Programme rationalisation (over time)
- Embedded mātauranga Māori (with iwi)
- New curriculum design for learning in/out workplace
- Clearer standards / better design

TRAINING & DEVELOPMENT
- Sector training and development for teachers and management
- Establishing a baseline of capabilities for all academic staff
- Embedding benchmark R&R for professional capability building

Centralised decision-making | Mandate action | Coordination | System productivity

SYSTEM REGIONAL CENTRES (Individual Providers)

REGIONAL CENTRE DELIVERER
Centre Leader (appointed by Governance Board)

CHARTER

DELIVERY OPERATIONS
- Funded for approved delivery
- Local maintenance of systems, services & learning environment
- Local improvement & innovation empowerment
- Detail level budgeting
- Local hiring (to System T&Cs)
- Local identity and reputation mgt.

INNOVATION HUB
- Research and development
- Innovation culture
- Funding & support

LEARNING & TEACHING
- Academic freedom
- What and how to teach, assess and research (including online and blended)
- Integration of learning in/out of work
- Fee for service (local, regional, and national participation)

CENTRE OF VOCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
- Responding to national training needs by agreement, part of a network of provision and mandated centrally
- National lead in a particular area of expertise (and maybe sole provider)

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT RECRUITMENT & PARTNERSHIPS
- Subject to system level national advocacy

LOCAL LIAISON & CONSULTATION
- With industry
- With iwi
- With communities

FUNDRAISING TRUSTS & ALUMNI

GOVERNANCE BOARD
(Small 4-6 members)

Establish robust processes for engaging with regional/local employers through a *Local Advisory Committee* comprised of employers, community and learners

Collaboration

NATIONAL IMPACT | REGIONAL FOCUS | DELIVERY EXCELLENCE | LEARNER CENTRIC

NEW FUNDING MODEL

25

Restructuring Vocational Education – a fit for future system model

The proposals for the reform of the vocational education sector in New Zealand have much to be commended, i.e. the consolidation of all public sector delivery to Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics, the focus on better serving learners who are in work and the commitment to a funding system which addresses the complexity of delivery in New Zealand and the inadequacy of current levels of funding.

However, the proposal to merge the current 16 ITPs into a single institution will not as is serve New Zealand communities, employers and learners as well as it might. The model as it stands is in the nature of a head office-branch structure with very high levels of centralised decision making over not only what is taught but also over operational and capital decision making and staffing matters. The inevitable bureaucracy inherent in head office-branch models will seriously compromise flexibility and responsiveness of the "branches" as well as the motivation and abilities of the "branches" to innovate.

The proposal to consolidate the ITP sector in this way is so radical that it begs the question as to what problems is the Minister trying to solve and the further question as to whether or not such problems can indeed be solved through organisational structure. Implicit in the proposals are the following problems:

- Financial failure of individual institutions
- Inconsistent quality across the ITP sector, including some failures of quality
- Rigid cost structures and low economies of scale for ITP providers, limiting their ability to respond to changes in market cycles
- An ITP sector that is too slow in responding to learner and industry needs, especially in the face of technological change and disruption
- "Unhealthy" competition amongst providers resulting in overlapping and duplicating provision

Without excusing the financial management issues which have characterised the ITP sector, in significant part the solution to the above problems lies in a fit-for-purpose funding system. A fit-for-purpose funding system is one which recognises different and complex cost structures across the nation and which also provides adequate funding for efficient providers to run core operations at at least break even, but preferably with a small surplus (3%-5%). Providers which are appropriately funded are no longer incentivised to engage in duplicative provision and are able to invest in the development necessary to be responsive to changing needs.

However, there is potential over time for economies of scale to be achieved through a more centralised approach to back of house services and to curriculum development. Problems of under provision and provider failure can be addressed in part through clearer standards, better planning and closer monitoring – all of which can be achieved through an appropriate degree of centralisation. The problems of variable quality can be addressed through clearer standards, better learning design and through the upskilling of academic staff.

The challenge, therefore, is to arrive at a structural model for the sector which has an appropriate level of centralisation of decision making and which is also empowering of

1

c:\users\michelle\desktop\restructuring vocational education alternative model (v5 pk).docx

flexibility, regional responsiveness and innovation at the point of delivery. The structural model as proposed does not achieve this.

Therefore, this document outlines a development of the model proposed by Minister Hipkins. It is more akin to a "parent-subsidiary" model rather than the "head office-branch" model as proposed. This refined model sees the establishment of an entity charged with planning, coordinating, oversight of the vocational education sector as a system with powers to intervene in the event of failure of either providers or of provision. The system will comprise of individual provider institutions responsible for educational delivery that meets the needs of learners and employers in their region, or nationally if mandated to do so – perhaps using the CoVE mechanism.

The refined model will see the establishment of a system head office with responsibility and decision making authority embedded in a charter/constitution which itself is legislated. The individual providers will also have a charter/constitution clearly delineating their areas of decision making authority. The charter/constitution for individual providers will have common provisions but may also be tailored to reflect particular regional needs.

The refined model focuses on the establishment of a vocational education system rather than a single vocational education institution, although the system will have a head office identity. There is considerable merit in having a sector which plans and behaves as a system in the interests of New Zealand as whole, at the same time strengthening individual providers through centralised support and thereby strengthened educational provision in the regions of New Zealand.

This refined model also provides the opportunity for the best of the high performing of the current institutions to be replicated across all of the providers in the system. Whilst it is true that there are only a few current providers performing well across all dimensions this is not an argument that supports the proposition that others cannot also perform to the same level, given appropriate levels of guidance and support.

Characteristics of the model and underpinning principles.

- The system comprises a central office (System Head Office) and a number of regional providers (System Regional Centres), each with decision rights over specific matters. The functions of the System Head Office may be distributed to different geographical locations
  Note: decision rights will not automatically apply to all current ITP providers. In the transition, financial and scale issues of some current providers will need to be addressed.
- The model embraces the concept of 'earned autonomy' i.e. the System Regional Centres are provided with full decision rights based on educational and financial performance. A System Regional Centre subject to intervention from the System Head Office will have reduced decision rights in relation to the matters which triggered the intervention.
  Conversely the model also embraces "learned responsibility", i.e. responsibility to share best practice with less well performing System Regional Centres.

2

- The system is charged with meeting the full range of vocational needs for NZ, including advanced vocational practice which is typically delivered through degree and post-graduate programmes.
- Teaching is underpinned by applied research which is both discipline based and responsive to regional/local needs.
- The academic freedom of staff and institutions as currently provided in the Education Act 1989 is maintained.
- The system is underpinned by a fit-for-purpose funding model that funds independently the System Head office and which funds provision taking into not only the regional context (socio-economic makeup and population dispersal) but also the full range of delivery approaches (on campus, on-line, in work).

The System Head Office – Polytechnics New Zealand (working title)

Polytechnics New Zealand will have a governance board which is skills based and also reflective of key stakeholders. i.e. industry/employers, students, staff/unions, individual providers. It is envisaged that Government will appoint an independent Chair.

Polytechnics New Zealand will be funded directly to enable it to discharge the functions outlined below.

Polytechnics New Zealand will have decision rights in the following areas:

- System strategy and planning
    - o Doing the best for New Zealand learners in all regions
    - o Develop long term strategic plan for the sector
    - o Undertake periodic environment scanning with subsequent mandating of action to ensure system provision is fit for the future

- System quality standards and assurance
    - o Prescribing best practice operating standards for the individual provider institutions.
    - o Promoting performance excellence and supporting continuous improvement.
    - o Operating a common Academic Board for all nationally shared programme approvals and Type 2 changes, and establishing a common academic statute for all providers in the sector. The central Academic Board will be responsible for academic benchmarking and dissemination of best practice.

- Monitoring system performance with powers of intervention in the event of provider failure (individual institutions do not perform to expectations) or provision failure (communities and/or employers are not receiving access to the learner and skills development needed).
    - o Provide pro-active specialist assistance to improve individual provider performance. This may include supplementary funding.
    - o Provide proactive support for business improvement generally

- Whole of industry liaison with key industry bodies/employers and professional bodies
    - o A single point of communication.

3

c:\users\michelle\desktop\restructuring vocational education alternative model (v5 pk).docx

- o   Verification of impact of training and education.

- Liaison with industry skills bodies
  - o   A single point of communication on behalf of System Regional Centres.
  - o   System Head Office leads on quality of education delivery with ISBs leading on graduate profile outcomes which underpin qualification relevance.

- Advocate, drive and support collaborations both within the sector and with external parties

- Approval of funding for System Regional Centres, replacing TEC approval
  - o   Detailed budgets remain with individual providers

- Approval of delivery portfolio for System Regional Centres, replacing TEC approval
  - o   Monitor to prevent unnecessary duplication at regional level

- Capital planning for the sector
  - o   Strategic asset management including identification of capital needs for the system
  - o   Administering contestable capital funding for major projects
  - o   Approval of capital projects over $5M

- Supporting innovation
  - o   Provision of a contestable funding pool for innovation
  - o   Sharing successful innovations from within the system

- Advocating for and marketing vocational education nationally and internationally
  - o   Provision of career guidance services
  - o   System level international collaboration and marketing

- Standardise back of house systems and services, e.g. IT, Finance, HR, Payroll, Student Management, Learning Management. Note: a shared service approach is not envisaged, rather common systems and processes.
  - o   Individual providers continue to operate their business systems but
  - o   Achieving improved system efficiency through standardisation and rationalisation over time
  - o   Improving system effectiveness through improved information sharing and benchmarking

- Shared curriculum services
  - o   Establishing a shared programme portfolio of approved programmes available to all providers.
  - o   Rationalising the number of programmes over time
  - o   Developing curriculum for embedding transferable skills and Maori knowledge and perspectives, the latter with local iwi

4

Designing new curriculum where appropriate for the seamless integration of learning in the workplace with learning in institutions or on line. This is seen as a top priority for the first two/three years.

- Shared service centre for learner support to complement on-campus support services - call centre and on-line
  - Career advice and programme guidance.
  - Learning support

- Whole of sector training and development for teachers and management/leadership
  - Establishing a baseline of capabilities for all academic staff.
  - Embedding benchmark recognition and reward for professional capability building

- Coordinating and championing applied research
  - Foster formal partnerships with industry
  - Coordinate large scale multi party applied projects
  - Establish common research software management solutions
  - Manage R&D partnerships involving individual providers

The System Regional Centres – Individual Providers

Individual providers i.e. System Regional Centres, will be separate legal entities and will retain their current special character and identity. They will have a small (4-6 members) governance board which will employ the Centre Leader in consultation with the System Head Office. Centres will be required to establish robust processes for engaging with regional/local employers including an overarching local advisory committee. This committee will be appointed locally, including employer, community, staff and learner perspectives.

System Regional Centres will employ their own staffing, although standard terms and conditions of employment for staff will be established at system level. Centres will be responsible for preserving the academic freedom of staff as currently provided for in the Education Act 1989

System Regional Centres will have decision rights as below, noting that the extent to which these rights can be exercised depends on the financial and educational performance of each Centre. A well performing System Regional Centre will have decision rights in the following areas:

- All operational matters which are not the responsibility of the system office.
  - Centres will be directly funded for approved delivery and other approved activities.
  - Centres maintain their operating systems and services subject to a requirement to standardise as determined by the System Head Office.
  - Maintaining systems and processes for continuous improvement and for innovation
  - Sharing best practice and participating in benchmark exercises with the system as a whole

5

- Providing fit-for-service learning and teaching facilities and equipment including IT and buildings

- Engaging in applied research for the benefit of their communities and employers

- Delivering vocational training and education, including degree and post-graduate level education for advanced practice
  - Decisions about what and how to teach and what and how to assess
  - Delivery of on-line learning as part of a blended delivery mode
  - Integration of learning in work and out of work
  - Fee-for-service training for regional/local organisations and participating in national contracts arranged centrally.

- Responding to regional training, development, skill and applied research needs
  - Maintaining robust consultation processes with regional/local industry, employers and communities
  - Liaison with industry and employers
  - Liaison with iwi

- Responding to national training and education needs by agreement, and as part of a network of provision. A Centre may be mandated to deliver nation-wide in an area of specialisation or where overall trainee volumes are low. See also CoVEs, below.

- Managing international student recruitment and partnerships, subject to system level collaboration and marketing.

- Fund raising and establishment of trusts for receiving bequests. Establishing and maintaining systems for alumni.

- Operating Centres of Vocational Excellence (CoVEs), these being centres which take the lead nationally in their particular areas of expertise. A CoVE may be the sole provider for some training nationwide. CoVEs are part of the national network of provision, and are mandated centrally.

Alignment with the proposed outcomes for the VE Reforms:

This refined proposal represents a significant change from the status quo, meeting all of the outcomes being sought in the Minister's proposal but without any of the disadvantages of that proposal. The main outcomes for vocational education of this refined proposal are as follows:

- More consistent quality across the vocational education sector as a consequence of clear quality standards set by the System Head Office, monitoring of system performance and intervention by the System Head Office in the event of significant failure in performance relating to quality. In addition, each System Regional Centre will be supported by the System Head Office in their continuous improvement efforts.

- A more financially stable sector as a consequence of proactive monitoring of individual providers by the System Head Office with provision for early intervention – assuming

6

that the funding system is itself overhauled to reflect regional complexities and different modes of provision.

- A better planned and responsive vocational education sector at the macro level as a consequence of centralised strategic planning, environmental scanning and liaison with key stakeholders. Regular environmental scanning and improved communication with employers, professional bodies and Industry Standards Bodies, will also ensure improved responsiveness.

  The sector will function as a coordinated network of provision with individual providers focused on meeting regional/local needs and national needs when mandated specifically to do so.

- A more collaborative sector resulting from the pro-active role of the System Head Office to drive collaborative partnerships and to promulgate best practice, and the requirement of System Regional Centres to engage in bench marking and the sharing of best practice.

- Elimination of unhealthy competition amongst providers as a consequence of central approval of the delivery portfolio for individual providers.

- A more cost effective sector over time as the System Head Office secures common back of house systems and standardised processes.

- Better service for learners through improved programme design which integrates learning in work with learning through institutions and as a consequence of better training and development of teachers and managers/leaders, as well as enhanced learner support through a new shared service centre.

- A highly flexible and responsive sector at regional/local level resulting from the preservation of decision rights of individual providers with regard to operational planning, budgets and educational delivery.

- A sector which is empowered to innovate, again because of the preservation of decision rights for System Regional Centres to respond to changing needs and to raise revenues from sources outside of Government funding and student fees.

To be considered:

- The changed role of NZQA if the System Head Office is taking responsibility for quality standards and monitoring.
- The changed role of TEC if the System Head Office has intervention powers for provider or provision failure.
- The delivery of wholly on-line learning given that there are currently at least four wholly on-line providers, including the Open Polytechnic, each with different strengths.   An independent evaluation exercise is needed before considering rationalisation of this provision. As well, current developments using OER (Open Educational Resources) are

7

c:\users\michelle\desktop\restructuring vocational education alternative model (v5 pk).docx

challenging current conceptions of on-line delivery and promise to be game changers in a fit-for-future VE system.

- Solving the current instances of provider failure. Neither the model proposed by the Minister nor this refined proposal will address automatically the extreme financial failures of several current providers. This requires a separate intervention which may be one of the first tasks of the new system entity under the proposed intervention powers. However, it would be preferable to address these failures prior to a new system coming into existence.

8

c:\users\michelle\desktop\restructuring vocational education alternative model (v5 pk).docx

Notes from Academic Board Face-to-Face meetings: 28 February 2019 and 1 November 2018

Purpose of this paper

Attached **for information** are the summary notes of the last two Academic Board open forums. I believe these will provide useful insights for Council into current academic debate within the polytechnic.

Context

Council has already been provided with my summary of key points of the 28 February meeting on the proposed Reform of Vocational Education (appendix 1). I anticipate that the discussion here will inform individual submissions to the current consultation. I expect too that the conversation will continue and contribute to the ongoing debate as Cabinet decisions anticipated mid-year begin to be implemented.

The topic of the November meeting was about the nature of and further development of research At Otago Polytechnic, including a major exercise in employer engagement.

It is pleasing to see how the professoriate is beginning to take a collective leadership role in these discussions.

Peter Coolbear

6 March 2019

Academic Board

Notes from the academic issues forum held on

28 February 2019

Academic Board members present: Oonagh McGirr, Megan Gibbons, Lesley Smith, Marc Doesburg, Sally Baddock, Janine Kapa, Ron Bull, Alex McKegg, Leoni Schmidt, Sam Mann

In Attendance: Pam Thompson (Secretary), and members of the Professoriate: Jane Venis, Matt King, Jean Ross, Mary Butler, Caro McCaw, Tobias Danielmeier

Apologies: Phil Ker, Chris Morland, Leoni Schmidt, Sue Thompson, Trish Chaplin-Cheyne, Brayden Murray

---

1. Karakia – Ron Bull

2. Welcome and introduction - Dr Peter Coolbear, OP Council
    - Today's forum around sector reforms consultation seeking to provide advice to Council, ELT and Academic Board
    - Understand that the government proposal and decisions are political
    - OP proposals during the consultation period need to be framed to assist the whole system - to consider centralisation of services and back of house with one overarching institute but also a need to preserve delegated authority (autonomy) academic freedom and regional decision making
    - Don't focus on the vocational education definition – this will become important later on though
    - Focus on the real opportunities and how to support regional development – if done well
    (See Peter's notes *Appendix 1*)

3. **A013.19** Professoriate presentation paragraphs (attached in online team site 28 Feb meeting agenda) Members of our OP professoriate lead discussions of the following topics.

Topics	Prepared by	Presenter
Positive approach	Prof. Sam Mann	Prof. Sam Mann
Research CoVEs	Prof. Leoni Schmidt	Prof. Leoni Schmidt
"Lessons in a Box"	Assoc. Prof. Matt King	Assoc. Prof. Matt King
Ako Aotearoa Tertiary Teaching Awardees Response to proposed ITP sector changes	Prof. Jane Venis	Prof. Jane Venis
Learning continuum and learners affiliations with Otago Polytechnic: An example from the School of Nursing	Prof. Liz Ditzel, Assoc. Prof. Jean Ross and Assoc. Prof. Karole Hogarth	Assoc. Prof. Jean Ross
The relationships between education and regulatory bodies for health professions	Prof. Mary Butler, Prof. Sally Baddock, Assoc. Prof. Jean Patterson and Assoc. Prof. Margaret McKenzie	Prof. Mary Butler
Responding to community needs	Assoc. Prof. Caro McCaw	Assoc. Prof. Caro McCaw
Regional responsiveness to industry & employers	Assoc. Prof. Tobias Danielmeier	Assoc. Prof. Tobias Danielmeier
Cultural responsiveness	Assoc. Prof. Megan Gibbons in conjunction with KTO and Komiti Kawanataka	Assoc. Prof. Megan Gibbons
Successful models elsewhere including funding & Finnish model.	Prof. Richard Mitchell	Oonagh McGirr
Vocational professional advanced practice in degrees & postgrads from L&T perspective	Oonagh McGirr	Oonagh McGirr
Innovation and Curriculum Development	Prof. Sam Mann	Prof. Sam Mann

1. ***Purposely positive – from "whinger to ninja" – Professor Sam Mann***
   - **Solution and benefit focused approach to consultation submission**
   - **Format for feedback below – and responses to this format see** *Appendix 2*

   The problem identified by the minister is... (P)

   The solution is... (S)

   This will benefit our learners by...(B)

2. ***COVEs – Professor Leoni Schmidt***
   - Research and Postgraduate team preparing submission on Centres of Vocational Excellence (COVEs) to go to ELT by 18 March
   - If you have any feedback to be included please email to Leoni by Monday 4 March.
   - Sustainability, MSF, and other frameworks across all COVEs
   - Reposition - discipline based COVE expected to lead research, not research leading discipline.

3. ***Lessons in a box – Associate Professor Matt King***
   - Not intrinsically bad
   - Restrictive yes but doesn't have to be – use as a starting tool and not prescribed
   - Positive time saving with pre and post moderated approvals
   - Need to preserve academic freedom to development own material which can then get added to the 'box' via approval/moderation
   - If lessons in a box then what are our expectations?
     - Currency of material and resources
     - Online courses
     - Course material options for delivery rather than strictly structured
     - Sharing rather than dictated or prescribed
     - Augmented series to recognise disciplinary and interdisciplinary ways
   - Only some courses will work – what happens to studio and project based courses
   - Need to articulate the things that need to go in it
     - Open box with multiple options, all moderated materials and assessments
   - Not one size fits all – need various and multiple sizes/types

4. ***Ako Aotearoa – Professor Jane Venis***
   - The ability to critically respond to the specific needs of their learners and communities is inherent in all our National tertiary Teaching Excellence award winners and many more of our staff.
     - Innovative and learner centric
     - Flexible system recognising various pathways for learners
     - Teaching as profession with academic freedom at its core
     - Culturally and ethically responsive
   - Concern that centralised model may add another layer of complexity and stifle fledgling projects
   - Not limited to skills
   - Maintain the joy, the passion, the caring and value of teaching and learning.

5. ***Learning continuum – Associate Professor Jean Ross***
   - Providing learners from diverse educational backgrounds with opportunities
   - Career pathway options
   - Real and meaningful experiences

   Positioning – learner perspective
   - How is the reform and what we are putting forward in the consultation submissions(s) going to affect learners?
   - Differences across the country for success and retention and employment opportunities
   - We would like to be leading curriculum developers as our learners do come out with something different from other leaners across NZ and other Nursing schools

- Advocacy for learners
- Regional significance, identity and relationships
- Levels of regional decision making needs to be maintained

6. ***Relationship between education and regulatory bodies – Associate Professor Mary Butler***

Positioning – learner perspective
- Accredited at institution level – how will this work for one overall?
- Regulatory bodies approve the curriculum and accredit supervisors
- Qualifications recognised internationally
- Health programmes tailored to the needs of clinicians
- Practical hands on, and work ready
- Satellite campus collaboration and sharing already exists and works well

7. ***Responding to community needs – Associate Professor Caro McCaw***

If the problem is… tertiary education that responds to regional needs

The answer is embedding community outcomes in learning projects, setting goals together, learning together and exceeding industry expectation.

A regional approach to education and developing participation with local communities in learning allows for innovation to spread like seeds in the wind.

Context is recognised and responded to, in agile, relevant ways:

- Employers and stakeholders come to us with their needs
- OP is responsive and flexible to community desires and outcomes
- Often unexpected benefits for learners when industry and local stakeholders involved
    - o Sometimes outcomes not known until project is advanced
- Regional and local relationships strong
- Hyperlocal contexts – how do we make this known and maintain the relationships
- Role model learning and teaching
- Facilitory role – how to embed literacy and numeracy
- Culture of learning that embraces alternative ways of learning
- Challenges secondary school engagement and outcomes.

    Benefits for learners
- Exceeding the outcomes and expectations of industry partners

8. ***Industry and Employers, regional responsiveness – Associate Professor Tobias Danielmeier***
- OP currently does this well so why is this one of the sector problems – why are others failing in this aspect?
- Need to understand the regional differences and how these are to be incorporated into the national programme and 'lessons in a box'
- More work based experiences – how will this be provided from a centralised perspective?
- Industry pledge to individual institutions – how will this work for one national institution?
- Proposal is vague in this area
- Regional leadership advisory but has no power or authority – propose delegated authority to the regions
- Opportunities for COVEs supporting best practice in VE and research coming behind it
- Will bureaucracy stifle regional responsiveness? Not necessarily the what but certainly the how.

9. ***Cultural responsiveness – Associate Professor Megan Gibbons***
Currently we have a system that has allowed us to develop strong relationships with papatipu runaka, this allows us to respond to local needs, report on Maori success and support our learners for the best possible outcomes. In 2019, Maori make up 8% of the Otago population, but 16% of domestic EFTs at Otago Polytechnic.

- Success and retention of Māori and Pasifika
- What we currently have and what will we have moving forward
- Te Reo and Tikaka – regional differences
- Community support from local runaka/iwi/whanau
- Learner supportr is a significant point of difference
- Representation for local community.

10. ***Alternative models – Oonagh McGirr***
Basque Country

- Co-creation and rooted in industry
- Focus on learner outcomes
- Personalised paths of study
- Problem based learning
- Enhances skills and knowledge

Problem: not responsive enough

Solution(s):

- continuous enrolment (? what impact on loans, lifetime study and end dates)
- As and when delivery
- Stackable credits
- Easily transferable
- Build your own degree – cross credit electives
- Micro credentials – treat as part of a qualification, cross credit limited number and/or RPL

Highlands and Islands

- Central functions
- Programmes unique to each area
- Industry and regional reactive

11. ***Value of vocational education , advanced practice – Oonagh McGirr***
   - Model to our learners as we engage with industry
   - OP degrees do meet skills deficiencies and incremental demand
   - Practical skills develop to meet industry needs
   - Linked to industry and professional bodies

OP is already doing what is proposed – we are not the problem.

Do not diminish the investment and value of ongoing staff training and development that goes to value passion and caring of learners and the learner's success.
- This is potentially what will be put at risk if you <u>over centralise</u>

We are hearing from some of our learners that they want an OP qualification not a national one.

12. ***Innovation and Curriculum development – Professor Sam Mann***
   - Educate for a future that doesn't exist yet – trust in the unknown
   - Self determination
   - Process based degree e.g. Bachelor of Leadership for Change.

Appendix 1

Key points from the meeting of Academic Board on the proposed reform of vocational education.

28 February 2019 – Peter Coolbear

These notes tabled at the OP Council meeting Friday 1 March

Context

- Open meeting of Academic Board led by the professoriate designed to develop internal thinking about responses to the reforms and provide advice to Council.
- Great collective effort at short notice, supported by Oonagh and Pam Holland.
- Short presentations on a range of topics related to the reforms, many accompanied by first draft papers. Inevitably, focus tended to be on degree level delivery rather than pre-degree VE, but several good case studies where good, innovative practice by teams of expert practitioners at OP could be put at risk if the reforms lead to loss of delegated authority at local campuses.
- Noted that presentations prepared at short notice and not yet written for an audience of officials / Minister. It is important not to assume that what we take for granted is understood by policy analysts who have no understanding of VE and who will filter feedback to the Minister.
- Fuller notes will be available shortly.

Key points:

- 'Lessons in a box' are valuable if they are a starting point to help educators get started and understand expectations. Need academic freedom to develop own material to meet the needs of learners and meet regional needs. Done right there may be real opportunities to share continually developing good practice and international marketing opportunities for resources thus developed. However, requires continuing investment to remain leading edge. Risk that what is proposed is framed on a simplistic policy understanding of VE as a transmission model of education.
- Noted that some disciplines are more amenable to levering off centralised resource development than others.
- Regional responsiveness requires the decision-making authority (and discretionary resource) at the local level to respond quickly. It is difficult to see how the proposed Regional Leadership Groups can be truly effective if they only have an advisory role.
- The lack of ability to pursue partnerships with other local providers may seriously impair our responsiveness to the educational needs of Māori, Pasifika and other under-served groups.
- Treaty obligations require local providers to be accountable to Mana Whenua – OP meets these obligations through MoU with Papatipu Rūnaka – how can these obligations be met effectively (and further enhanced) if everything is controlled through a central national body?
- OP has demonstrable strengths in being able to be flexible enough (and resourced well enough) to respond to opportunities to work with other organisations (great example by Caro McCaw about work with local schools in outdoor education).
- Jane Venis talked about the opportunity to lever off the nationally acknowledged expertise of OP's 20 Tertiary Teaching Excellence Award winners. Academic freedom allows educators to gain joy from what they do … in turn this creates passion for learning by students.
- [Expanded on by others] … risk reforms may devalue the practice of vocational education. If done right opportunity that it may enhance it.
- CoVEs provide opportunities to promote good practice underpinned by applied research – some discussion about how to pitch this in the context of the current debate which focusses on pre-degree level.
- Point made more than once that exemplary provision under the auspices of national professional bodies requires exemplary regional relationships and mutual trust that supports innovative practice – with some excellent examples *e.g.* leadership in rural health care; effective pathways into higher level study because meet local needs and have community trust.
- Several international models could be explored which allow a level of regional autonomy (noting this is a word to be avoided!): University of California; Basque model in Spain; Finland; University of the Highlands and Islands.
- Would the Bachelor of Leadership for Change be developed under the centralised model proposed in these reforms?
- In the end the test for success of the reforms will be: what's the benefit to learners or will existing good, innovative VE practice be put at risk?

Peter Coolbear, 28 Feb 2019

Academic Board

Summary notes from face to face discussion meetings held on

1 November 2018, G106

Thursday 1 November 2018

Academic Board members in attendance: Peter Coolbear (OP Council representative) Chair, Oonagh McGirr, Leoni Schmidt, Marc Doesburg, Sue Thompson, Janine Kapa, Linda Kinniburgh, Ian Crabtree, Lesley Smith, Megan Gibbons, Trish Chaplin-Cheyne (alternate to David McMaster), Pam Thompson

Apologies from AcBd members: Phil Ker, David McMaster, Chris Morland, Sally Baddock, Ron Bull

Additional OP staff attended and meeting open via skype for business to offsite staff: Gayle Reihana, Bhanu Amballa, Vasanth Boraiyan, Richard Mitchell, Adrian Woodhouse, Trish Chaplin Cheyne and Colin Armstrong (IT support)

➢ Janine Kapa opened with a Karakia
➢ Oonagh McGirr and Peter Coolbear welcomed presenters/discussion leaders and participants

Session 1: **A97/18 Professor Leoni Schmidt - OP research Context and Research for Education**
(link to ppt)
Presentation focused on:
- Research at OP
- Related to teaching
- Networks national and international and strong links
- Unicef sustainable goals and research connections (refer slide X PowerPoint)
- OP doing well in research (refer slide x PowerPoint) some of these things do not exist in other institutions
- Research Capability – priorities for training and development (refer to slide x PowerPoint - based on recent workshop)
- Collaborative Research Projects – scaffold for projects (refer slide x)
  - Community of practice and international partners
  - Humber
  - Via
- Rhizome theory and arohonuhonu – overlap/intersecting pathways
- Research for Education, monthly seminar series – contact Leoni if interested in attending and/or presenting
- Learner Capability – employability research interviews involving 62 researchers
- Overall increase in research active staff at OP
- NZQA research requirements January 2018
  - clear guidelines to strengthen link between research and teaching (slide xx bullet 4.5)
  - Balance between pedagogical and discipline specific research
- Option for workshops PBRF and Learning and Teaching - Professoriate group mentors to help engage Learning and Teaching to go out to wider OP community
- Integrate portfolios in practice not only in theory

Notes:
1. *if you wish to get on the Research newsletter email list contact lesley.brook@op.ac.nz*
2. *contact leoni.schmidt@op.ac.nz if interested in attending and/or presenting at Research for Education seminar series in the future.*

Session 2: **A98/18 Doctor Peter Coolbear – (link to ppt tbc)**
Peter's working background in PBRF and Ako Aotearoa

Presentation focused on:
- Reiterate that OP is way ahead of the game, often ground-breaking
- Difference between University ad Polytechnic research
- Institutional imperatives

- Disconnected government model and NZQA frustrations around promises
- Greater stakeholder engagement required
    - Connections with employers, communities, iwi
- Tensions – PBRF, Institution, Discipline, Stakeholders (insert diagram)
- Education research
    - Still building expertise
    - Cross referencing problematic unresolved in PBRF panels
    - Focus of peer review vs learner/societal outcomes
    - Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) debate – what it means for OP in context of research strategy
- Needs to be about value to the leaner – user focused.

Session 3: **A99.18 Associate Professor Linda Robertson – Scholarship of Teaching and Learning** ([link to ppt](#))
Presenting within context of School of Occupational Therapy.

Presentation focused on:
- Divided loyalties where practice lags behind scholarship, e.g. Masters and PG in area of practice but not necessarily teaching practice
- Currently second order of research but it is highly valuable research for education
    - Comments - Oonagh: Recent changes to policy AP0403 Professorial Appointments to equally recognise research inside and outside discipline, and include leadership in learning and teaching and research activity
- Evaluation of courses and student feedback facilitates changes to the course however often changed back the following year based on the next batch of feedback – cyclical changes
- 'Feel good' learning – 4-6 week placements, the experience but not necessarily strict learning
- 'viva' - value of oral assessments, a very useful tool for assessment and understanding practice, however it is not well liked by learners due to the anxiety it produces
- Credibility of research and real life topics
    - Dyslexia affected learners project about disappearing art of handwritten reports – collaborative project OT and Learner Success
    - Secondary School and higher education transition – understanding the anxiety
    - Literacy and numeracy
- Types of scholarship
    - diversity and difference in teaching – cultural, international – often disconnect where learner is form and what curriculum requires
    - Scholarship and Teaching – collaborative project with Humber and Via
    Action: volunteers to be involved in this project = Marc Doesburg, Janine Kapa, Linda Robertson, Trish Chaplin-Cheyne

Joint workshop questions posed, discussion and feedback:

- How can we improve research at OP?
    - Encourage staff not to undervalue what already doing – all is valuable
    - Convert conference presentations to publications along the way
    - Replace full blown thesis with journal article and literature review – present for publication. Note: if learners choose not to publish then the supervisory staff can take the option to publish – change to supervision model to create better engagement
    - Internal Scope journal – co-author, collaboration, paper, thought piece, provocative space, but a safe space especially useful for novice researchers
    - Current writing workshop in OT for beginning researchers
    - Web publications – understand what these other options might be, other storytelling ways
    - Difference between disciplines
    - Recognition of creative work – status has been elevated through PBRF
    - Peer review / Quality Assured – different things
    - AKO HEA fellowships
- How can we engage all academic degree-teaching staff at OP in research?
- How can we find a balance between research for education and discipline-specific research?
- What makes for effective teaching in higher education, and for teaching that helps all students to thrive?
- How can we support staff to better understand the theoretical underpinnings of their programmes and their related research?

- o More than just PG study and one theory in discipline – broad scope of educational theories around
- o Use aspects of GDTE – adult pedagogy. Refocus GDTE to engage and motivate – start with unpacking personal pedagogy through reflection process.
- o Drive micro-credentialing in research skill space to provide portability and lift confidence
- o Trades education under-researched -often researched on but not within, make community space – real world projects for trades
- o Build confidence in research – what level are our researchers currently at? Provide mentoring and workshops
- How can we support staff to better connect with external communities of research & teaching practice?
- Who at OP is interested in forging research links with our new partner Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning:
  1. new learning methods and technologies; and
  2. success and retention of students –ethnicity and other indicators of diversity?

Session 4: A93.18 Academic Board engagement and meeting format for 2019 - Oonagh McGirr

Refocus 2019 meetings – continue or change format?
- Need agile responses to e-meetings, still a compliance element but requires engagement to read and discuss some items.
- Where e-meeting contains item for discussion how best to engage all members? Consider Microsoft teams to replace current Insite (sharepoint site) for forum discussions/replies.
- Consensus to maintain face to face academic discussion meetings/presentation/workshops
- Need also face to face discussion meetings to cover topics raised in of ED insider, compliance and enhancement discussions, and other general academic matters
- Food for thought sessions – hold 2 step process for discussion meetings to close the loop
  1. Presentation, followed by
  2. Workshop.
     Already two good topics for follow-up *Academic Freedom* and *Research*
- Identifying codes for items requiring discussion vs straight approvals?
- procedural/ debate/advisory
- working group to discuss new format model = *Oonagh McGirr, Lesley Smith, Sue Thompson, Anna James*

Background notes for working group:
- o current policy *AP0101 Academic Board*
  https://www.op.ac.nz/assets/policies/AP0101.11-Academic-Board.pdf
- o **2018 format** - 10 electronic meetings February to November plus 5 (initiated May held 3 from July) face to face presentation/workshops/discussions.
- o **2017 format** – 10 meetings per year with every second meeting face to face, separating out standard approvals (type 1, type 2, CoP)
- o **2016 format** – 10 face to face meeting per year, with additional e-meeting for additional urgent approvals.

Previous feedback received from email sent 6 September 2018.

2018 workplan/schedule

Background notes for working group:
- o current policy *AP0101 Academic Board*
  https://www.op.ac.nz/assets/policies/AP0101.11-Academic-Board.pdf
- o **2018 format** - 10 electronic meetings February to November plus 5 (initiated May held 3 from July) face to face presentation/workshops/discussions.
- o **2017 format** – 10 meetings per year with every second meeting face to face, separating out standard approvals (type 1, type 2, CoP)
- o **2016 format** – 10 face to face meeting per year, with additional e-meeting for additional urgent approvals.

OTAGO POLYTECHNIC ACADEMIC POLICY		Number: AP0101.12
Title:	**Academic Board**	
Classification:	**Leadership**	
Chief Executive Approval:	Effective Date: **12 February 2019**	Review Date: **12 February 2022**
Previous Policy No:	**AP0102, AP0103, AP0106, AP0107, AP1101**	Status: Current
Contact Authority:	**Chief Executive**	

Purpose

To set out the constitution, terms of reference, membership and operational procedures of Academic Board and its Standing Committees

Statutory Compliance

The Education Act 1989 and all subsequent amendments

Section 182 of the Education Act 1989, "Determination of Policy", vests Councils of tertiary institutions with a statutory requirement to establish an Academic Board.

Policy

1. **Role of Academic Board**

1.1. The main roles and functions of Academic Board are to:

1.1.1. Provide Council with independent advice on academic matters, which shall include but not be limited to any matters pertaining to teaching, learning and research as it affects Otago Polytechnic, for example:

- The teaching, learning, research and knowledge transfer strategies and activities of the Polytechnic
- The Polytechnic's quality systems and processes
- Academic, Management, and Council policies
- The educational performance of the Polytechnic, and of the programmes offered by the Polytechnic

1.1.2. Approve programmes of study offered by Otago Polytechnic, including changes to such programmes, pursuant to and consistent with the requirements of NZQA and delegations for approval by NZQA to Otago Polytechnic.

1.1.3. Advise the Chief Executive on academic matters of a management nature which shall include but not be limited to:

- The teaching, learning and research and knowledge transfer strategies and activities of the Polytechnic
- The Polytechnic's quality systems and processes
- Academic and Management policies
- The educational performance of the Polytechnic, and of the programmes offered by the Polytechnic.

2. **Powers of Academic Board**

2.1. No powers have been delegated to Academic Board by the Otago Polytechnic Council.

2.2. The Chief Executive has delegated authority to Academic Board to approve new and revised courses and programmes.

3. Membership of Academic Board

3.1. That Academic Board shall comprise up to 2~~10~~ members as follows:

- Chief Executive (CE) (ex officio)
- Deputy Chief Executive Learner Experience (ex officio)
- Deputy Chief Executive Learning and Teaching Services (ex officio)
- Deputy Chief Executive Maori Development/Kaitohutohu (ex officio)
- Director Learning and Teaching Development (ex officio)
- OPAIC Executive Director – Academic (ex officio)
- Te Kaihāpai (ex officio)
- Director Learner Services (ex officio)
- Director Global Engagement~~Internationalisation~~ (ex officio)
- Director Research and Postgraduate Studies (ex officio)
- Tumaki: Whakaako (ex officio)
- Associate Director Quality
- Chair Research and Postgraduate Committee (ex officio)
- Chair Programme Approvals Committee (ex officio)
- Three~~wo~~ student representatives
  > OPAIC student representative (positional appointment)
  > the Convenor of the Student Council (positional appointment)
  > the President of Otago Polytechnic Students Association (OPSA) (positional appointment)
- Two full professors   Note 1 (elected)
- Two Heads of School/College   Note 1 (elected)
- One co-opted member   (co-opted)

Note 1 *Elected members shall be for an initial term of 2 years, with a right to serve additional terms following re-election.*

3.1.1. The election process will be managed by the Chair of the respective committee as per *standard operating procedure AP0101a Academic Board SOP001*~~Procedures, Clause 1~~

3.1.2. Appropriate staff may be in attendance as necessary and shall have speaking rights only.

3.1.3. Academic Board may establish working parties/ad hoc sub committees of members or other staff for specific purposes.

3.2. Members will identify an appropriate alternate who is notified to Academic Board. This alternate will attend when the member is unavailable and will have full speaking and voting rights.

3.3. When the appointed Chair of a Standing Committee should be an ex officio member of Academic Board or any of its standing committees because of their role, or the positional appointment for student representative holds multiple positions, they will only be counted in the membership once.

3.4. Academic Board may co-opt one additional member from time to time. A co-opted member has the same rights as full members. Any person requested to attend an Academic Board meeting who is neither a Board member nor a co-opted Board member is 'in attendance' and as such has speaking rights, but no voting rights.

3.5. Academic Board is an open meeting enabling any person who wishes to attend to do so. They have no speaking or voting rights, but may be granted speaking rights by the Chair.

3.6. Members of Academic Board and its standing committees are expected to prioritise meetings and attend regularly. Absence from more than two meetings in succession, or from more than 20% of the meetings in any academic year without due cause may result in forfeiture of membership, at the discretion of the CE.

AP0101.12 Academic Board

4. Chair

4.1. Academic Board will be chaired by the Chief Executive or his/her nominee.

4.2. The Chair of Academic Board has a deliberative vote, and in the case of an equality of votes, also has a casting vote.

5. Length of Service

5.1. Elected members of Academic Board serve a two-year term but may be re-elected for additional terms.

5.2. Elected members filling casual vacancies will continue for the balance of the original term of office.

5.3. The President of the OPSAtago Polytechnic Students' Association and the Convenor of the Student Sub Committee will serve annually, for a calendar year.

6. Meetings

6.1. Academic Board will conduct up to 2615 meetings from February to November each year.

    6.1.1. Face to face discussion mMeetings will be held every month from February to November with an additional electronic meeting alongside for standard approvals. will be conducted electronically every month from February to November, with Tthe option of additional electronic approval meetings as required for urgent approval requests is also retained.

    6.1.1.6.1.2. Iin addition to the electronic monthly meetings up to five six (65) face to face academic issues open meetingsforums will be held, with discussion lead by members of the Otago Polytechnic Professoriate. each alternate month.

    6.1.2.6.1.3. Where a member identifies that an electronic meeting item requires discussion the item will be referred to the next face to face meeting, or if urgent, a special meeting will be called.

6.2. A meeting quorum is defined as one more than half of the total actual membership, inclusive of alternates, and must include the Chair or nominee.

6.3. An annual work plan will be established for Academic Board and meetings will be scheduled to meet the demand in the work plan.

6.4. Academic Board will on an annual basis review educational performance including progress against Otago Polytechnic strategic objectives.

6.5. The Chair or the Chair's nominee may convene an extraordinary meeting of Academic Board as necessary. This may occur through face to face or electronic means.

6.6. The Chief Executive or the Chair of Academic Board may determine that a paper or papers will be discussed in closed session for reasons of privacy or commercial sensitivity. These papers and their minutes will not be distributed outside of Academic Board without the written permission of the Chief Executive or the Chair of Academic Board.

6.7. Board Secretary: The Deputy Chief Executive: Learning and Teaching Services office will ensure full secretarial services for the Board.

7. Standing Committees

Academic Board shall have three standing committees, each with its own terms of reference:

- Research and Postgraduate Committee (incorporates Research Ethics Committee)
- Programme Approvals Committee
- Otago Polytechnic Auckland International Campus (OPAIC) Academic

AP0101.12 Academic Board

Committee.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                  Academic Board                      │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
   ┌──────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐  ┌──────────────┐
   │  Programme   │  │ Research and │  │  OPAIC       │
   │  Approvals   │  │ Postgraduate │  │  Academic    │
   │  Committee   │  │  Committee   │  │  Committee   │
   └──────────────┘  └──────────────┘  └──────────────┘
                     ┌──────────────┐
                     │Research Ethics│
                     │  Committee   │
                     └──────────────┘
```

7.1. **Research and Postgraduate Committee (incorporating the Research Ethics Committee)**

7.1.1. As a reporting committee to Academic Board the Research and Postgraduate Committee will provide a summary report on committee activities pertinent to research (including Research Ethics Committee approvals), knowledge creation and knowledge transfer, and postgraduate programmes at Otago Polytechnic.

7.1.2. The Research and Postgraduate Committee will also provide advice to Academic Board as required.

7.1.3. Any and all research conducted by Otago Polytechnic staff and students must be notified to Research Ethics Committee for documentation and approval.

The **Research Ethics Committee** is an institutional (i.e. not an accredited) committee and as such **does not approve** any invasive research on humans, or research on animals.

    a.   Approval for research on animals is, by arrangement, the responsibility of the University of Otago Animal Ethics Committee. Before applications for animal research are referred to UoO, the researcher will first consult with the Otago Polytechnic School of Veterinary Nursing.

    b.   The decision of the University of Otago Animal Ethics Committee is deemed to be the decision of the Research Ethics Committee and documented accordingly.

7.1.4. The terms of reference of these committees are attached in **Appendix 1a and 1b.**

7.1.5. Complaints regarding Research and Postgraduate Committee and Research Ethics Committee.

  The Committee shall:

    a.   Receive complaints about research undertaken within the Polytechnic. (It is expected that complaints should be dealt with at the lowest level possible and that resolution between the parties should be sought.) Complaints may come from researchers, participants, colleagues or any other involved or concerned person

    b.   Draw the complaint to the attention of the researcher, supervisor, and/or manager

    c.   Advise on actions to be taken to resolve the complaint

    d.   The supervisor and/or manager shall advise Research Ethics Committee of the outcome.

    e.   After each complaint, the Research Ethics Committee shall review its processes and documentation and identify whether there is an opportunity for amendments to process or policy.

AP0101.12 Academic Board

f. The Research Ethics Committee shall report the outcome of all complaints through the Research and Postgraduate Committee on an annual basis.
    Note: The Committee is a peer review process and, as such, has no structural authority related to a staff member's employment, performance, or remuneration. It is appropriate for any such aspects to be dealt with through the staff member's own manager.

g. Complaints about research which are unresolved at Research Ethics Committee level and complaints about the Committee's decisions or processes shall be made in the first instance to the Committee with a request for the issue to be reconsidered. Dissatisfaction with such a second review, outcome or response should be then referred to the Director Quality Services and arrangements be made to resolve the complaint following the guidelines in *AP0603 Resolution of ~~Student~~ Learner Complaints.*

7.2. **Programme Approvals Committee**

7.2.1. As a reporting committee to Academic Board the Programme Approvals Committee will report on committee activities pertinent to new and changed programme applications and approvals, from which advice will be released to Council, Leadership Team or other parties as appropriate.

7.2.2. The Programme Approvals Committee will also provide advice to Academic Board as required.

7.2.3. The terms of reference of this committee are attached in **Appendix 2**.

7.3. **Otago Polytechnic Auckland International Campus (OPAIC) Academic Committee**

7.3.1. As a reporting committee to Academic Board the ~~Otago Polytechnic Auckland International Campus (~~OPAIC~~)~~ Academic Committee will report on committee activities pertinent to quality processes including self assessment, programme review, programme monitoring and moderation, and research.

7.3.2. The OPAIC Academic Committee will also provide advice to Academic Board as required.

7.3.3. The terms of reference of this committee is attached in **Appendix 3**.

~~Procedures~~   ~~1.   Election of Academic Staff Representatives~~

> **Commented [PT1]:** Move to procedural document AP0101a Academic Board_SOP001

~~Academic staff representatives for Academic Board and its Standing Committees will be elected by the relevant groups.~~

~~*Note: Academic Board and its Standing Committees will endeavour to ensure that there is continuity of expertise as part of the nomination and election processes to manage the risk with all elections falling due at the same time.*~~

~~1.1   Nominations to replace current elected academic staff representatives on Academic Board and its Standing Committees will be called for on 1 October of the year prior to completion of the two-year term of office.~~

~~1.2   The call for nominations will be advertised by appropriate means such as postings on staff noticeboards and e-mail.~~

~~1.3   Nominations are to be made on the standard form (**Appendix 4**); and signed and dated by both the nominator and the nominee. Nominations should be accompanied by a statement of up to 200 words from the nominee, explaining his or her interest in serving on Academic Board, together with the skills he or she would bring to the role.~~

~~1.4   Nominations close with the Secretary to Academic Board or Secretary to the Standing Committee on 20 October in any year.~~

1.5   Nominees' statements are to be included in the voting papers made available to staff.

1.6   Voting papers for the academic staff representatives will be distributed at the end of October to all eligible academic staff. Electronic voting will be made available. Voting papers to be returned to the Secretary, Academic Board, or the Standing Committee, by 30 November.

1.7   Each academic staff member is able to vote for one candidate only. The highest polling candidates will be elected.

1.8   Eligibility is defined as all permanent full time and proportional academic staff.

    1.8.1   "permanent", in relation to the academic or general staff of an institution, means a member of that staff

        a.   who is employed, either on a full-time or part-time basis:

- For a period ending, unless sooner terminated, on his or her reaching a specified age; or
- Until he or she retires or resigns; or

        b.   who has been employed, whether under a contract for a specified period or otherwise, and either on a full-time or part-time basis, for at least 3 months; or

        c.   who has been employed, whether under a contract for a specified period or otherwise, and either on a full-time or part-time basis, for less than 3 months and whose employment is, in the opinion of the chief executive of the institution, likely to continue for at least 3 months from the date of commencement of that employment.

Note: If insufficient candidates stand for election, the Chief Executive shall appoint a member from the relevant constituency.

2.   Format for Submission of Papers

2.1   Academic Board papers must be lodged with the Minute Secretary not less than five working days prior to the meeting. Standing Committees will determine timelines for their papers.

2.2   The Chair determines the agenda for Academic Board meetings. The Chair of each Standing Committee determines the agenda for Standing Committee meetings.

2.3   Academic Board papers must be received by members at least *two full days* prior to the meeting date to allow reading time. Any variation such as electronic meetings or extraordinary meeting may be approved by the Chair.

2.4   Papers must be signed by the person making the recommendation.

2.5   Careful wording of recommendations on Academic Board papers is required to ensure that the record of the meeting accurately reflects the decision intended. The following guidelines and clarification of terminology apply to all papers submitted to Academic Board.

    2.5.1   The word "recommend" should only be included in the actual motion when the decision the meeting will take is to recommend action by another group. For example, the recommendation could be that "Academic Board recommends that the Otago Polytechnic Council establish a … … Standing Committee".

    2.5.2   Recommendations may be for information only, in which case the recommendation is likely to begin with the word "note". For example … recommends that Academic Board "notes that the Chair of Programme and Approvals Committee will forward an application for accreditation". This recommendation, if passed, will record quite clearly in the minutes that Board members have not seen the application, but accept that the appropriate person will forward it in

AP0101.12 Academic Board

49

due course.

2.5.3   "Approve" should be used when the Committee has the authority to give permission for the action to occur. For example…recommends that "Academic Board approve the submission of an accreditation application to NZQA". "Approve" should *not* be used when the authority to make the decision lies with another body. If Academic Board supports the decision, then it should recommend the action to Council or to the body with the authority to make the decision.

2.5.4   All decisions will be made on the understanding that sufficient information is available to justify the particular action or decision taken. For example:

a.   "To approve" implies that the alternatives of seeking further information or not approving the item have been explored, and that sufficient information is believed to be at hand to justify approval.

b.   "To note" implies receipt of information. Because no action is required, little background information is necessary.

c.   "To recommend" is to advise another body or committee, or implies that in weighing up information both for and against the recommendation, Academic Board members believe a decision in favour should be made.

2.5.5   Recommendations should make a distinction between definite and indefinite articles. "The" refers to a specific person, committee or agency; "a" refers to any person, committee or agency.

2.5.6   Each recommendation should, in itself, contain all necessary information for implementation. For example, a recommendation should state: "That the plan to move the Tennyson Street campus be approved", rather than "That the removal be approved".

3.   Action Sheets

3.1   Action Sheets are to form part of the minutes of Academic Board meetings.

3.2   Items from Action Sheets will be discussed under "Matters Arising" on the agenda. This discussion will be recorded in the minutes and carried forward on the Action Sheet arising from the meeting.

3.3   The Action Sheet will not duplicate material from Academic Board Standing Committees' compliance papers.

4.   Confirmation of Minutes

4.1   Academic Board meeting minutes will be confirmed as a true and accurate record, at the next meeting.

5.   Availability of papers and Minutes

5.1   The minutes and papers of Academic Board will be available to staff on the Otago Polytechnic intranet.

5.2   Papers and minutes of any closed sessions will not be so available and copies should be kept confidential.

Approved by Chief Executive
Date   14 May 2018

Page 7 of 15
AP0101.12 Academic Board

Appendix 1a

Research and Postgraduate Committee
Terms of Reference

Purpose	To provide leadership and advice in relation to research, knowledge creation, knowledge transfer, and postgraduate programmes at Otago Polytechnic. The Committee's leadership will be instrumental in positioning Otago Polytechnic as a credible and leading research polytechnic, and will promote strong interfaces between research and teaching, especially for staff teaching on degrees and postgraduate qualifications.
Membership	• Director Research & Postgraduate Studies (Chairperson) (appointed by CE) • Chief Executive (ex officio) • Deputy Chief Executive Learning and Teaching Services (ex officio) • Deputy Chief Executive Learner Experience (ex officio) • Deputy Chief Executive Maori Development/Kaitohutohu (ex officio) • Te Kaihāpai (ex officio) • OPAIC Head of Department Postgraduate and Research (ex officio) • Head of School CapableNZ • Two (2) members of the professoriate (elected by the professoriate) • Two (2) researchers (elected by those staff who are research active and eligible for Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) • Six (6) members of Postgraduate Programmes • Up to two (2) co-opted members, at the Committee's discretion, provided that the total membership of the Committee, inclusive of the ex-officio members, may not exceed 16 members. Co-opted members will usually be active and successful researchers or research leaders in their own right. **In attendance** • The Chair of the Research Ethics Committee may be present at Research and Postgraduate Committee meetings and shall have full speaking rights • Research Office staff to be in attendance at all meetings with speaking rights only to report as required. • Any member of Academic Board may attend meetings of the Committee with full speaking rights.
Roles and Functions	• Lead the development of the strategic focus and direction for applied research and knowledge creation and knowledge transfer, and for postgraduate study at Otago Polytechnic • Maintain the Polytechnic's 'Research Strategic Framework' (RSF), which will include strategic goals, priorities, key performance indicators (KPIs), with regard to building a research culture, supporting established and emerging researchers and those undertaking postgraduate supervision • Ensure that processes exist within Otago Polytechnic to maintain the quality provision of postgraduate programmes including issues of intellectual property, research proposal, approval, supervision, learning and teaching, examination and thesis requirements • Develop, provide oversight and manage the assessment process for the doctoral degree • Advise on policy relating to research, postgraduate study and intellectual property • Establish and maintain guidelines for the allocation of central funds for research support, publications and conference attendance • Review annually the effectiveness of research throughout the Polytechnic • Oversee the Research Ethics Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Research and Postgraduate Committee • Review annually the effectiveness of the committee.

AP0101.12 Academic Board

51

	Note 1 -The members of the Committee are expected to be conversant with the broader educational context, both nationally and internationally, and to bring these understandings to bear when advising the Polytechnic. Note 2 - Any new Postgraduate Programmes will have a representative.
Committee Secretary	The Office of the Director Research and Postgraduate Studies will provide full secretarial services for the Committee.
Meetings	Meetings will be held at least bi-monthly, to synchronise with the Academic Board meeting cycle, and may include electronic meetings and additional workshops.
Reporting	The Committee has a key initiating role in relation to research and postgraduate studies, as well as responding to matters that may be referred from Academic Board. The Committee will report to Academic Board from which advice will be released to Council, Leadership Team or other parties as appropriate.

51

Appendix 1b

Research Ethics Committee
Terms of Reference

Purpose	To provide: • Assurance of safety to participants in research projects that their rights have been considered and respected, including establishing informed consent, confidentiality and the storage and use of data. • To advise and protect researchers regarding their rights and duties. • To protect those who may be affected by research results or outcomes. • Ensure methodologies are appropriate. • Ensure ethics approval is obtained from all institutions before commencing the project, when joint research is being undertaken between two or more institutions.
Membership	• Chairperson (appointed by CE) • An academic staff member/researcher from each Academic group • Two members representing local iwi (nominated by Ngai Tahu through the Arai-Te-Uru Papatipu Runaka) • Student representative (nominated by the Student Sub Committee of Council) • Two persons not involved in research on human or animal subjects and who are not members of the Otago Polytechnic academic staff • Up to three co-opted members, at the Committee's discretion • Invite expressions of interest from appropriately qualified people according to vacancies. Notes: The Chair will be appointed by the Chief Executive and may attend the Research and Postgraduate Committee with full speaking rights. If the Chair is absent, the Chair may delegate all authorities that the Chair holds to another Committee member for a period. The Chair will notify the CE, the Research Ethics Committee members, and the Chair of the Research and Postgraduate Committee of any such delegations With exception of the Chair, the Research and Postgraduate Committee will appoint members, following recommendation from the Research Ethics Committee. In making these appointments, the Research and Postgraduate Committee should consider: • Committee expertise in ethics and law • Gender balance and cultural representation Range of research conventions in different disciplines.
Roles and Functions	• Ensure that all research within the Polytechnic, or under the auspices of the Polytechnic, which involves human participants or the use of personal information is carried out in accordance with this policy and ethics guidelines. • Review and update Otago Polytechnic Ethics Guidelines yearly a. Foster an awareness of those procedures and of ethical principles in general within the Polytechnic b. Ensure practices are consistent with national tertiary research ethics standards and guidelines • Ensure researchers have written approval from the Research Ethics Committee before commencing activities as required by Otago Polytechnic Guidelines on Ethical Practices in Research • Enable and facilitate best practice by providing detailed instructions and suggested processes for meeting ethics approval. The Committee should provide constructive feedback to staff within four weeks of receiving their application • Withdraw approval for any research project that does not comply with guidelines, and notify the project leader and Academic Board in writing. • Consider any matter of ethical concern relating to the involvement of human

AP0101.12 Academic Board

53

	participants in research which any student or member of staff of the Polytechnic raises with the Committee • Refer any research involving animals to Head of School Veterinary Nursing as this is covered by a<u>n</u> ~~contractual~~ agreement with the University of Otago. Refer point 7.1.3 above. • Ensure that research proposals are carried out in accordance with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, with the currently applicable National Standard for Ethics Committees, and other relevant professional codes relating to research • Ensure systems are in place that ensure best practice is addressed for the purposes of self-assessment and external evaluation and review of ethical processes • Recommend and review policy and procedures and advise Academic Board through the Research and Postgraduate Committee on issues relating to ethics in research • From time to time, in cases where it is not possible to convene the Committee and such requests are reasonable, the Chair may make decisions on ethical matters. In these cases, the Chair will advise the Committee at its next meeting. The Chair may seek advice on such decisions as is deemed necessary • Review annually the effectiveness of the committee.
Committee Secretary	The Research Office will provide full secretarial services for the Committee.
Meetings	Meetings will be held at least eight times per year and may include electronic meetings.
Reporting	The Research Ethics Committee reports to Academic Board through the Research and Postgraduate Committee.

AP0101.12 Academic Board

Appendix 2

Programme Approvals Committee
Terms of Reference

Purpose	To provide leadership and advice in relation to all aspects of programme approvals and accreditation to ensure that Otago Polytechnic qualifications, programmes and accreditations are current and educationally sound, are aligned to the Polytechnic's strategies and requirements, and meet external quality requirements.
Membership	• Chairperson (appointed by CE) • Chief Executive (ex officio) • Deputy Chief Executive Learning and Teaching Services (ex officio) • Deputy Chief Executive Learner Experience (ex officio) • Associate Director Quality (ex officio) • Te Kaihāpai (ex officio) • Director: Learning and Teaching Services (ex officio) • Deputy Chief Executive Maori Development/Kaitohutohu (ex officio) • Manager Quality Enhancement Centre (ex officio) • Quality Specialist OPAIC (ex officio) • Two Heads of School/College (elected by the Heads of School) • Two Principal Lecturers who have a successful track record in programme and curriculum development (elected by Principal Lecturers) • Co-opted members, at the Committee's discretion, provided that the total membership of the Committee, inclusive of ex officio members, may not exceed 15 members. Co-opted members must be experienced curriculum developers or leaders in their own right. Note: Any member of Academic Board may attend meetings of the Committee with full speaking rights.
Roles and Functions	• Evaluate qualifications and new and revised programmes prior to recommending to Academic Board for approval • Provide advice on programme development • Review annually the effectiveness of the committee. Note: The members of the Committee are expected to be conversant with the broader educational context, both nationally and internationally, and to bring these understandings to bear when advising the Polytechnic.
Committee Secretary	The Quality Enhancement Centre will provide full secretarial services for the Programme Approvals Committee.
Meetings	Meetings will be held monthly, to synchronise with the Academic Board meeting cycle, and may include electronic meetings.
Reporting	The Committee has a key role in relation to programme approvals and accreditation processes, as well as responding to matters that may be referred from Academic Board. The Committee will report to Academic Board from which advice will be released to Council, Leadership Team or other parties as appropriate.

AP0101.12 Academic Board

Appendix 3

Otago Polytechnic Auckland International Campus (OPAIC)
Academic Committee Terms of Reference

Purpose	To provide the Board of OPAIC and the OP Academic Board with independent advice on academic matters and new initiatives relating to the delivery of quality education to international students in the areas of teaching, learning, assessment and research as it affects Otago Polytechnic and the OPAICAuckland International Campus. To lead and support the harmonization of academic standards, facilitate communication and working relationships between campuses and stimulate the sharing of new ideas in a time-effective manner. To ensure that all aspects of institutional quality are maintained, aligned to Otago Polytechnic's strategies and requirements and to external quality requirements.
Membership	• Chair – Leader: Quality AIC • OPAIC Quality Specialistaist – Chair • OPAIC Executive Director Academic (ex officio) • OPAIC Executive Director Student Success and Employability (ex officio) • OPAIC Learning and Development Specialist (ex officio) • Five (5) OPAIC Head of Departments (ex officio) • Te Kaihāpai (Dunedin) (ex officio) • Associate Director Quality (Dunedin) (ex officio) • Director Learning and Teaching, AIC • Associate Director Learning and Teaching, AIC • Director Learning and Curriculum Innovation, AIC • Two (2)One Head of Schools/CentreCollege, OP – appointed by Board of OPAIC on recommendation of OP Chief Executive • Two OPAIC academic staff* –for a minimum of two years and can be re-elected. To be elected by OPAIC academic staff once 10 full-time academic staff have been appointed to the campus. **Co-opted Members** – Academic Committee may co-opt up to two (2) additional members from time to time for specific purposes. Co-opted members have the same rights as full members. **In attendance** Academic Committee is an open meeting enabling any person who wishes to attend to do so. They have no speaking or voting rights, but may be granted speaking rights by the Chair. **Working parties/ad hoc sub-committees** The Academic Committee may, when considered necessary, establish working parties and/or ad hoc sub-committees comprising committee members or other staff for specific purposes.
Roles and Functions	• To enhance educational innovation, rigour and excellence in such a manner as to support the evolution of the campus as New Zealand's premier destination for international students and the development of globally capable graduates who are in demand by employers. • Evaluate and endorse/approve recommend new and revised programmes of study offered atfor OPAIC, including changes to such programmes, to forward to Progrmame Approvals Committee (PAC) and Academic Board for approval consistent with the requirements of Otago Polytechnic and the NZ Qualifications Authority. • Advise OP Academic Board on OPAIC quality matters • Advise the OPAIC Board on academic matters of a management nature

AP0101.12 Academic Board

	including
	- *the teaching, learning, research and knowledge transfer strategies and activities of Otago Polytechnic and OPAIC*
	- *the AIC quality systems and processes*
	- *academic and management policies*
	- *educational performance of AIC and of theits programmes offered*
	- *harmonization of academic policies and practices with those of OP*
	• Evaluate the effectiveness of quality processes, including self-assessment and programme review
	• Ensure that learning and teaching activity reflects innovation, latest international practice and effectiveness, and highest educational standards.
	• Undertake the role and functions of an assessment committee to monitor and implement Otago Polytechnic assessment policies including primarily
	- *AP0910 Assessment Committee*
	- *AP0900 Assessment*
	- *AP0908 Moderation of Assessment*
	- *AP0501 Recognition of Prior Learning*
	- *AP0607 Cheating*
	- *AP1008 Student Results*
	• Monitor the quality and congruence of assessment processes within courses to ensure
	- *validity, reliability and usability of assessments*
	- *assessments enable learners to meet the learning outcomes*
	- *range of assessment minimizes opportunities for cheating*
	• Take overall responsibility for academic quality processes at Auckland International Campus.
Committee Secretary	A member of the An OPAIC Academic Services administratorion team will provide full secretarial services for the Committee.
Meetings	Meetings will be held at least bi-monthlysix-weekly to synchronise with Programme Approvals Committee (PAC) Academic Board and may include face-to-face, online and/or electronic attendance.
Reporting	The OPAIC Academic Committee has a key initiating role in relation to programme development, revision and quality matters at OPAIC. The OPAIC Academic Committee will report to Academic Board of Otago Polytechnic and the OPAIC Board of AIC and the Academic Board of Otago Polytechnic – through the Chief Executive. Collaborate with the AIC Research Committee with reporting between the two committees.
Referral Documents	AP0910 Assessment Committee Policy to be read in conjunction with these Terms of Reference.

Appendix 4

Nomination Form for Academic Board and its Standing Committees

I, ...,………………wish to nominate

....for the position of **(please select one)**

Professorial ☐

Head of School/College ☐

Representative from each cluster of Postgraduate programme ☐
(i.e. Applied Management/CapableNZ/Design/Fine Art/Visual Art/Midwifery/Occupational Therapy)

Principal Lecturer ☐

Academic Staff Member ☐

PBRF Eligible Staff Member ☐

representative on **(please select one)**

Academic Board ☐

Research and Postgraduate Committee ☐

Programme Approvals Committee ☐

....
Signature of Nominator   Date

I, ...,…………… accept the above nomination.

....
Signature of Nominee   Date

Note: Nominations should be accompanied by a statement to a maximum of 200 words from nominees explaining their interest in serving on the Academic Board, together with the skills they would bring to the role.

Please return to: Secretary, Academic Board / Standing Committee
                         Otago Polytechnic
                         Private Bag 1910, Dunedin 9054
To be received by this office on or before: 20 October [Year]

57

Standard Operating Procedure
Academic Board
(February 2019)

In relation to policy AP0101 Academic Board the following standard operating procedures should be followed:

1. Election of Academic Staff Representatives

Academic staff representatives for Academic Board and its Standing Committees will be elected by the relevant groups.

Note: Academic Board and its Standing Committees will endeavour to ensure that there is continuity of expertise as part of the nomination and election processes to manage the risk with all elections falling due at the same time.

1.1   Nominations to replace current elected academic staff representatives on Academic Board and its Standing Committees will be called for on 1 October of the year prior to completion of the two-year term of office.

1.2   The call for nominations will be advertised by appropriate means such as postings on <u>intranet,</u> staff noticeboards and e-mail.

1.3   Nominations are to be made on the standard form; and signed and dated by both the nominator and the nominee. Nominations should be accompanied by a statement of up to 200 words from the nominee, explaining his or her interest in serving on Academic Board, together with the skills he or she would bring to the role.

1.4   Nominations close with the Secretary to Academic Board or Secretary to the Standing Committee on 20 October in any year.

1.5   Nominees' statements are to be included in the voting papers made available to staff.

1.6   Voting papers for the academic staff representatives will be distributed at the end of October to all eligible academic staff. Electronic voting will be made available. Voting papers to be returned to the Secretary, Academic Board, or the Standing Committee, by 30 November.

1.7   Each academic staff member is able to vote for one candidate only. The highest polling candidates will be elected.

1.8   Eligibility is defined as all permanent full time and proportional academic staff.

     1.8.1 "permanent", in relation to the academic or general staff of an institution, means a member of that staff

         a.   who is employed, either on a full-time or part-time basis:
- For a period ending, unless sooner terminated, on his or her reaching a specified age; or
- Until he or she retires or resigns; or

         b.   who has been employed, whether under a contract for a specified period or otherwise, and either on a full-time or part-time basis, for at least 3 months; or

         c.   who has been employed, whether under a contract for a specified period or otherwise, and either on a full-time or part-time basis, for less than 3 months and whose employment is, in the opinion of the chief executive of the institution, likely to continue for at least 3 months from the date of commencement of that employment.

Note: If insufficient candidates stand for election, the Chief Executive shall appoint a member from the relevant constituency.

2. Format for Submission of Papers

2.1   Academic Board papers must be lodged with the Minute Secretary not less than five working days prior to the meeting. Standing Committees will determine timelines for their papers.

2.2   The Chair determines the agenda for Academic Board meetings. The Chair of each Standing Committee determines the agenda for Standing Committee meetings.

2.3 Academic Board papers must be received by members at least *two full days* prior to the meeting date to allow reading time. Any variation such as electronic meetings or extraordinary meeting may be approved by the Chair.

2.4 Papers must be signed by the person making the recommendation.

2.5 Careful wording of recommendations on Academic Board papers is required to ensure that the record of the meeting accurately reflects the decision intended. The following guidelines and clarification of terminology apply to all papers submitted to Academic Board.

  2.5.1 The word "recommend" should only be included in the actual motion when the decision the meeting will take is to recommend action by another group. For example, the recommendation could be that "Academic Board recommends that the Otago Polytechnic Council establish a … … Standing Committee".

  2.5.2 Recommendations may be for information only, in which case the recommendation is likely to begin with the word "note". For example … recommends that Academic Board "notes that the Chair of Programme and Approvals Committee will forward an application for accreditation". This recommendation, if passed, will record quite clearly in the minutes that Board members have not seen the application, but accept that the appropriate person will forward it in due course.

  2.5.3 "Approve" should be used when the Committee has the authority to give permission for the action to occur. For example…recommends that "Academic Board approve the submission of an accreditation application to NZQA". "Approve" should *not* be used when the authority to make the decision lies with another body. If Academic Board supports the decision, then it should recommend the action to Council or to the body with the authority to make the decision.

  2.5.4 All decisions will be made on the understanding that sufficient information is available to justify the particular action or decision taken. For example:

    a. "To approve" implies that the alternatives of seeking further information or not approving the item have been explored, and that sufficient information is believed to be at hand to justify approval.

    b. "To note" implies receipt of information. Because no action is required, little background information is necessary.

    c. "To recommend" is to advise another body or committee, or implies that in weighing up information both for and against the recommendation, Academic Board members believe a decision in favour should be made.

  2.5.5 Recommendations should make a distinction between definite and indefinite articles. "The" refers to a specific person, committee or agency; "a" refers to any person, committee or agency.

  2.5.6 Each recommendation should, in itself, contain all necessary information for implementation. For example, a recommendation should state: "That the plan to move the Tennyson Street campus be approved", rather than "That the removal be approved".

3. Action Sheets

3.1 Action Sheets are to form part of the minutes of Academic Board meetings.

3.2 Items from Action Sheets will be discussed under "Matters Arising" on the agenda. This discussion will be recorded in the minutes and carried forward on the Action Sheet arising from the meeting.

3.3 The Action Sheet will not duplicate material from Academic Board Standing Committees' compliance papers.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

4.1 Academic Board meeting minutes will be confirmed as a true and accurate record, at the next meeting.

5. Availability of papers and Minutes

5.1 The minutes and papers of Academic Board will be available to staff on the Otago Polytechnic intranet.

5.2 Papers and minutes of any closed sessions will not be so available and copies should be kept confidential.

Nomination Form for Academic Board and its Standing Committees

I, ...,………………….wish to nominate

....for the position of (**please select one**)

Professorial	☐
Head of School/College	☐
Representative from each cluster of Postgraduate programme	☐
(i.e. Applied Management/CapableNZ/Design/Fine Art/Visual Art/Midwifery/Occupational Therapy)	
Principal Lecturer	☐
Academic Staff Member	☐
PBRF Eligible Staff Member	☐

representative on (**please select one**)

Academic Board	☐
Research and Postgraduate Committee	☐
Programme Approvals Committee	☐
OPAIC Academic Committee	☐

....
Signature of Nominator   *Date*

I, ...,…………… accept the above nomination.

....
Signature of Nominee   *Date*

Note: Nominations should be accompanied by a statement to a maximum of 200 words from nominees explaining their interest in serving on the Academic Board, together with the skills they would bring to the role.

Please return to: Secretary, Academic Board / Standing Committee
                                   Otago Polytechnic
                                   Private Bag 1910, Dunedin 9054
To be received by this office on or before: 20 October [Year]

OTAGO POLYTECHNIC COUNCIL POLICY		Number: CP0005.07
Title:	**Delegations from Council to the Chief Executive**	
Baldrige Criteria:	**Leadership**	
Chief Executive Approval:	Effective Date: ~~1 August 2018~~ **5 April 2019**	Review Date: ~~1 July 2019~~**1 March 2020**
Previous Policy No:	**n/a**	Status: **Current**
Contact Authority:	**Secretary to Council**	

Purpose
To set policy and procedures for the delegation of authority from the Council to the Chief Executive.

Background
The Council of Otago Polytechnic is responsible for the business and affairs of the Polytechnic. This policy sets out the delegations from the Council to the Chief Executive for the efficient and effective day to day management of the Polytechnic.

Statutory Compliance
Education Act 1989, and all subsequent amendments

State Sector Act 1988, and all subsequent amendments

Public Finance Act 1989, and all subsequent amendments

Health & Safety at Work Act 2015, and all subsequent amendments

Policy
1. The Council, as authorised by the Education Act 1989, delegates to the Chief Executive the following functions and powers:

    -   To provide courses of study or training;
    -   To admit students;
    -   To discipline students;
    -   To determine procedures as to the payment and refunding of fees in order to comply with Section 227 of the Education Act;
    -   To determine procedures in order to comply with Section 228 of the Education Act regarding classification of students as domestic or international;
    -   To apply, on behalf of Council, the relevant sections of the Education Act and the Student Allowance Regulations;
    -   To award scholarships, grants, prizes and other awards within the guidelines approved by Council;
    -   To waive tuition fees and levies on a case by case basis or more generally within guidelines approved by Council;
    -   To discount tuition fees and levies for prudent business reasons or to give effect to the following policies; *MP0461 Staff Development*, *MP0351 Withdrawal Transfer and Refund* and *MP0354 Student Fees;*
    -   To conduct examinations and confer results;
    -   To determine timetables and deadlines;
    -   To determine eligibility for graduation;
    -   To set fees for services;
    -   To develop and approve management and academic policies.

2. The following have specifically not been delegated to the Chief Executive:

    -   To set tuition fees;
    -   To borrow funds or raise capital;
    -   To approve the annual budget, investment plan and capital asset plan;
    -   To dispose of land and buildings or other assets with a value exceeding $50,000;
    -   To approve the Chief Executive's staff development, study leave and international travel outside Australasia.

3. The Chief Executive will act with integrity and in the best interests of the Polytechnic at all times.

4. The Chief Executive shall keep Council informed at all times, operating on a "no surprises" basis.

5. The Chief Executive will manage the Polytechnic's human, physical, and financial resources prudently and in the best interests of the institution.

CP0005 Delegations from Council to the Chief Executive.doc

6. Council approval is required for any transaction or contract exceeding the limits delegated to the Chief Executive.

7. The Council is responsible for reviewing and approving the annual budget, the reforecast, investment plan and capital asset plan of the Polytechnic.

8. All financial results shall be reported against the annual budget or the approved reforecast to Council through the Finance and Audit Committee each month, in accordance with the reporting guidelines approved by Council.

9. Progress against objectives in the Investment Plan shall be reported to Council on a quarterly, six monthly or annual basis as set by Council.

Procedures   **NON FINANCIAL**

1. **Human Resources**

    The Chief Executive has all of the usual authorities of an employer, as provided for in the State Services Act 1988. However, the Council records its expectation that in addition to HR decisions being consistent with employment legislation the Polytechnic will act as a "good employer".

2. **Academic Management**

    The Chief Executive has delegated authority to ~~establish an~~chair Academic Board to:

    2.1 approve new and revised courses and programmes;

    2.2 provide advice to Council and the Chief Executive on academic matters;

    2.3 provide advice on academic policies and recommends academic policies.

3. **Physical Resources**

    The Chief Executive has authority to manage, maintain and develop the physical resources of the Polytechnic within the parameters of the annual budget, investment plan, capital asset plan and relevant legislation.

4. **Use of Otago Polytechnic's Common Seal**

    The use of the common seal is governed by the Education Act 1989. The Chief Executive and an Executive Leadership Team member (refer Appendix 1) may apply and co-sign on behalf of the Polytechnic the Common Seal to execute:

    4.1 transactions approved by Council by formal resolution;

    4.2 contracts and other commitments relating to delegations;

    4.3 degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic awards.

    ~~The use of the common seal is governed by the Education Act 1989.~~

5. **Public Statements**

    The Chief Executive has the authority to issue public statements with respect to management and administrative matters and in relation to other matters in consultation with the Chair of Council.

    FINANCIAL

    All authorities are GST exclusive

6. **Signing Authorities**

    The Chief Executive has authority to co-sign all bank authorities, cheques and other transactions.

7. **Operating Expenditure**

    ~~7.1~~ The Chief Executive has authority to commit Polytechnic funds on operational expenditure within the approved annual budget or approved forecast ~~for business as usual~~ up to $650,000 per individual item with the exception of payments to OPAIC where the limit is $3M ~~(business as usual generally refers to items within budget/forecast)~~~~within the annual budget or approved reforecast~~

except where:

7.2   section 6.2 of this Policy applies;

7.37.1 an individual item of expenditure exceeds $650,000 within the financial year.

7.47.2 Operational expenditure outside business as usualthe annual budget or approved reforecast is permitted as follows:

> 7.4.17.2.1   where substitution1 is applicable and the expenditure is less than $125,000;

> 7.4.27.2.2   in an emergency and the expenditure is less than $75,000;

> 7.4.37.2.3   in either 7.2.1 or 7.2.2 above and the amount is less than $250,000 but greater than the amounts in 7.2.1 or 7.2.2 then:

>> a.   with the approval of the Chair and the Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee; and

>> b.   with disclosure as soon as practicable to the Finance and Audit Committee (e.g. email); and

>> c.   with disclosure to the Council at the next Council meeting.

> 7.4.47.2.4   where, there is matching, certain, associated revenue in excess of budgeted revenue, and the expenditure is less than $200,000. provided the revenue and expenditure both fall within the current financial year.

Authorities are GST exclusive.

8. Capital Expenditure

8.1 The Chief Executive has authority to commit Polytechnic funds on capital expenditure within the annual budget or approved reforecast except that:

> 8.1.1   Subject to 8.1.2, cCapital expenditure on any project in excess of $500,000 shall be subject to separate Council approval supported by a business case.

> 8.1.2   IT expenditure and building and property expenditure in excess of $250,000 shall be subject to separate Council approval supported by a business case.

8.2   Capital expenditure outside the annual budget or approved reforecast is permitted as follows:

> 8.2.1   where substitution is applicable and the expenditure is less than $125,000;

> 8.2.2   in an emergency and the expenditure is less than $75,000;

> 8.2.3   in either 8.2.1 or 8.2.2 above and the amount is less than $250,000 but greater than the amounts in 8.2.1 or 8.2.2 then:

>> a.   with the approval of the Chair and Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee; and

>> b.   with as disclosure as soon as practicable to the Finance and Audit Committee (e.g. email); and

>> c.   with disclosure to the Council at the next Council meeting.

Authorities are GST exclusive.

9. Investments

The investment of funds and the managing of such investments are governed by the Council's Treasury Policy.

10. Financial Integrity

The Chief Executive has authority to take the following action where it is necessary to

---

1 Definition- "Substitution" – where an approved budget authority is not used for its original purpose and is used elsewhere (one type of expenditure replaces another or is used to fund a different activity); provided it is within the goals and objectives set out in the charter/profile/business plan. Substitution is not permitted between operating and capital costs, unless with Council approval.

maintain the integrity of the Polytechnic's financial systems:

10.1   refuse to make any payment even when it has been duly authorised by a duly delegated manager;

10.2   cancel any order made in the Polytechnic's name;

10.3   cancel any financial delegation to another manager.

11. Contractual Agreements

Some contracts/agreements will span more than one year, with the result that commitments are for more than the amount budgeted on an annual basis. In this case:

11.1   Revenue: The Chief Executive has authority to roll over existing contracts and sign new contracts where:

     a.   new business contracts are less than $2,000,000 gross revenue and have a margin of 5% or more

     b.   new business contracts greater than $2,000,000 gross revenue have a margin of 5% or more and are supported by legal and/or specialist advice as appropriate.

11.2   Expenditure: The Chief Executive has authority to roll over existing contracts and sign new contracts where the contracts are less than $400,000 per annum gross expenditure and no more than 5 years duration.

11.3   Contracts which fall outside these parameters require Council approval.

11.4   The contracts register shall be reported monthly to Council and include all contracts in excess of $20,000.

~~Authorities are GST exclusive.~~

12. Bad Debts

The Chief Executive has authority to write off individual debts up to $25,000. Debts in excess of $25,000 may be written off with the prior approval of the Chair of ~~Council~~Finance and Audit Committee.

13. Donations

The Chief Executive has authority to make monetary donations to a maximum of $5,000 per year. Donations in excess of $5,000 may be made with the prior approval of the Chair of Council. For the sake of clarity the definition of monetary donations does not include sponsorships for advertising and promotional purposes (for example the Charity House, the Cancer Society Ball and the iD Dunedin Fashion week).

14. Asset Sales

The disposal of assets is governed by policy *MP0362 Asset Management (Operational – Acquisition and Disposal)*, and requires the consent of the Minister for the sale of land and buildings and assets with values in excess of the limits in section 192 of the Education Act 1989~~$50,000~~.

Referral Documents	OP Manual of Committee Structure and Delegations (June 2016) CP0008 Sensitive Expenditure CP0011 Treasury Policy CP0013 Procurement and Purchasing Policy MP0303 Authorities and Delegations from Chief Executive MP0304 Specific Financial Authorities and Delegations MP0362 Asset Management (Operational – Acquisition and DisposalMP0461 Staff Development, MP0351 Withdrawal, Transfer and Refund MP0354 Student Fees

Approved by Council
Date: ~~1 August 2018~~5 April 2019

Appendix 1

Authority to co-sign documents under the Common Seal of Otago Polytechnic

The Council of Otago Polytechnic hereby authorises the following designated signatories to co-sign documents, under seal, on behalf of the Otago Polytechnic, in accord with section 167 of the Education Act 1989, provided that the documents fall under the Chief Executive's delegation limits recorded in Otago Polytechnic policy CP005

1) The Chief Executive; and

2) Any other current Executive Leadership Team member of Otago Polytechnic

as co-signatories

Signed under the Seal of Otago Polytechnic pursuant to a resolution of Council of Otago Polytechnic

Date   1 June 2018

Signed   _K. E. Grant_

Name: Kathleen Enid Grant

Signed   _____

Name: MICHAEL CRAIG HORNE

OTAGO POLYTECHNIC COUNCIL POLICY		Number: CP0008.0~~3~~4
Title:	**Sensitive Expenditure**	
Baldrige Criteria:	**Operations**	
Chief Executive Approval:	Effective Date: ~~4 May 2018~~ 5 **April 2019**	Review Date: ~~1 March 2019~~ 1 **March 2020**
Previous Policy No:	**n/a**	Status: **Current**
Contact Authority:	**Secretary to Council**	

Purpose

To clearly identify the parameters within which Otago Polytechnic shall incur and authorise expenditure of a sensitive nature.

Otago Polytechnic spends public and private money, and all such spending must meet standards of probity that will enable it to withstand Parliamentary and public scrutiny.

Otago Polytechnic provides guidance to employees, contractors and council members by way of policies and expects that all expenditure is subject to proper authorisation and controls and that no individual will approve their own expenditure or expenditure they may have benefitted from.

Definitions

Sensitive expenditure is expenditure that provides, has the potential to provide, or is perceived to provide a private benefit to an employee, contractor or council member (or a party related to an employee, contractor or council member), that is additional to the business benefit to the Polytechnic of that expenditure. It also includes expenditure by the Polytechnic that could be considered unusual for the Polytechnic's purpose and/or functions.

Expenditure in this category has been broken down into four categories, as follows:

Category 1: Entertainment and hospitality related expenditure

Category 2: Travel and accommodation related expenditure

Category 3: Staff support and welfare related expenditure

Category 4: Goods and services related expenditure.

A **conflict of interest** refers to a situation in which private interests or personal considerations may affect an employee or council member's judgement and/or ability to act in the best interest of Otago Polytechnic.

Controls are the means to promote, direct, restrain, govern and check on various activities.

Credit Card has the normal meaning, but should also be read as applying to vehicle fleet cards, purchase cards and equivalent cards used to obtain goods and services before payment is made.

Probity is defined as uprightness, honesty, proper and ethical conduct.

Formal Leader refers to the staff member's Director or Head of School/College. For Directors and Heads of School/College the Formal Leader is the DCE in charge of their area. For DCE's the Formal Leader is the Chief Executive~~line manager, or a manager higher in the financial delegation approval hierarchy~~.

~~**Background**~~

~~**Key Principle**~~
~~Otago Polytechnic spends public and private money, and all such spending must meet standards of probity that will enable it to withstand Parliamentary and public scrutiny.~~

Otago Polytechnic provides guidance to employees, contractors and council members by way of policies and expects that all expenditure should be subject to proper authorisation and controls and that no individual should approve their own expenditure or expenditure they may have benefitted from.

Policy and Procedure

1. **Standards -** The standards applying to sensitive expenditure decisions require that the expenditure decision:
    a. has a justifiable and dominant business purpose
    b. preserves impartiality
    c. is made with integrity
    d. is moderate and conservative, having regard to the circumstances
    e. is transparent; and
    f. is appropriate in all respects.

2. **Approvals -** Sensitive expenditure should be approved:
    a. where it meets the standards described in this policy
    b. before the expenditure is incurred wherever practical
    c. in accordance with delegated authority and;
    d. by the person "one-up" from the person or persons perceived to benefit from the expenditure.

3. **Claims** – claims relating to sensitive expenditure must align with the expense claiming policy and:
    a. clearly state the business purpose
    b. be accompanied by original supporting documentation
    c. document the date, amount, description for items of minor expenditure where receipts are unavailable (amounts under $50)
    d. be submitted promptly after the expenditure is incurred.

4. **Credit Card or Charge Card Expenditure -** Refer to policy *MP0352 Otago Polytechnic Purchasing and Credit Cards.*
    4.1. Using credit cards or charge cards is not a type of sensitive expenditure, but is a common method of payment for such expenditure. Otago Polytechnic has a specific credit/charge card policy *MP0352 Otago Polytechnic Purchasing and Credit Cards.*
    4.2. Any expenditure charged to credit cards must be for business use only. No personal purchases are permitted.

5. **Chief Executive and Council Chair expenditure**
    5.1. Expenditure incurred by the Chief Executive must follow the standards and principles outlined in this policy and be approved by the Council Chair.
    3.1.5.2. Expenditure incurred by the Council Chair must follow the standards and principles outlined in this policy and be approved by the Chair of the Finance & Audit Committee.

Expenditure categories

4.6. **Category 1: Entertainment and Hospitality expenditure**
    4.1.6.1. Entertainment is defined as business expenditure for the purposes of:
    a. building relationships
    b. representation of the organisation
    c. reciprocity of hospitality
    d. recognition of significant business achievement
    e. hospitality.

CP0008 Sensitive Expenditure_Track Changes_FAC.DocxCP0008.03 Sensitive Expenditure.Docx

4.2.6.2.   Entertainment and hospitality expenditure must :
   a. ~~must~~ be based within a pre-approved budget with a pre-agreed purpose unless linked to incidental governance processes
   b. ~~must~~ wherever possible be approved before the event from the person holding delegated authority and if the person with delegated authority could be a perceived beneficiary, then the one-up principle for sign-off must apply
   c. ~~expenditure must~~ not be extravagant and must be appropriate for the occasion.

4.3.6.3.   **Alcohol Purchases -** Subject to a few exceptions, Otago Polytechnic does not pay for alcoholic beverages. As a guideline, the circumstances where spending on alcoholic beverages may be appropriate are;
   a. Where OP is hosting outside guests
   b. Where the expenditure is an OP wide staff function that falls under policy *MP0359 Staff Functions* ~~(in which case expenditure is limited by the dollar values specified in this policy)~~
   c. Where it is an OP function that employees, contractors, council members or related parties have been invited to attend and which includes alcohol.
   ~~c.~~d. Using the $100 per head annual team hospitality budget provided it is purchased with food

4.4.   **Gifts to external parties -** Otago Polytechnic gifts to external parties should be reasonable, appropriate to the occasion and recipient. They should be approved under the normal delegation rules contained in policies *MP0303 Authorities and Delegations from the Chief Executive* ~~and *MP0304 Specific Financial Authorities and Delegations.*~~

5.7.**Category 2:Travel and Accommodation expenditure:** Refer to Otago Polytechnic's *MP0446 Travel on Otago Polytechnic Business* policy.

5.1.7.1.   **Air Points and other loyalty points programmes -** Employees, contractors or council members are entitled to receive any air points or other loyalty points earned while travelling. However:
   a. any travel booked must be at the best and lowest cost to Otago Polytechnic ignoring any loyalty programme to which the employee, contractor or council member belongs;
   b. evidence may be required to show that travel is at the best and lowest cost to Otago Polytechnic;.
   ~~b.~~c. ~~u~~Use of Otago Polytechnic's approved travel supplier for making bookings is required whenever possible;
   ~~c.~~d. if an employee elects to use air points or loyalty points for work purposes, no reimbursement for the equivalent cost or any other type of reimbursement shall be made.

5.2.7.2. **Private Travel linked with Business Travel -** ~~Personal travel~~ may be allowed in conjunction with business travel provided there is no additional cost to Otago Polytechnic.
   5.2.1.7.2.1.   Any such additional costs incurred must be reimbursed by the employee or council member;.
   5.2.2.7.2.2.   The fact that private travel in conjunction with business travel is planned must be disclosed at the time of pre-approval of the business travel.

5.3.7.3.   **Travelling spouses, partners, or other family** - travel costs of accompanying family members should not be paid by Otago Polytechnic, unless the involvement of these parties contributes to the business purpose.

    5.3.1.7.3.1.   In these circumstances expenditure must be pre-approved by the Chief Executive or by the relevant member of Executive Leadership Team; or by the Chair of Council for Council members and Chief Executive., by the Council Chair.

6.8. **Category 3:** **Staff Support and Welfare Related Expenditure, and Miscellaneous Expenditure:**

6.1.8.1.   Such expenditure can include club memberships, motor vehicles, telephone reimbursements, professional memberships and papers/periodicals.

6.2.8.2.   The following principles shall apply:

    a.   Eligibility for payments of a remunerative nature shall be clearly identified within the employee's employment agreement.

    b.   If an item of expenditure is not covered by the employee's employment agreement, eligibility shall be determined on a case by case basis. Approval shall be obtained and clearly documented before the expenditure is incurred.

    c.   Business Services and/or People and Culture must be contacted prior to the expenditure being approved to ensure any relevant tax implications are appropriately addressed.

6.3.8.3.   **Staff Recognition, Team Building and Retreats** - expenditure must:

    a.   be within the pre-approved budget

    b.   be approved wherever possible before the event from the person holding delegated authority and if the person with delegated authority could be a perceived beneficiary, then the one-up principle for sign-off must apply

    c.   not be extravagant and must be appropriate for the occasion. Good judgment in line with the principles of this policy is expected to be exercised.

    d.   as a general guide, if meals or functions are involved, not exceed $50 per head. Associated accommodation costs should align to the travel policy limits. Any facilities hired for such events are expected to be moderate in nature.

6.4.8.4.   **Gifts given by OP to eEmployees (received by) of Otago Polytechnic** - This section of the policy applies to gifts made to Otago Polytechnic employees. The following limits apply:

    a.   gifts under $100 require Head of SchooloS/College/Department or Director approval

    b.   gifts over $100 require the relevant Executive Leadership Team member's approval

    c.   gifts over $500 require Chief Executive approval

    6.4.1.8.4.1.   For guidance on farewell gifts refer to policy *MP0359 Staff Functions*.

    6.4.2.Expenditure with any element of personal benefit for an Otago Polytechnic employee or contractor is covered by policy *MP0304 Specific Financial Authorities and Delegations.*

CP0008 Sensitive Expenditure_Track Changes_FAC.DocxCP0008.03 Sensitive Expenditure.Docx

6.5.8.5.　　**Sponsorship of staff -** Staff taking part in an event which is not directly related to their employment, such as a sporting event, may be sponsored by their school/college/department or service area through the provision of, or payment for, goods and services (for example, a t-shirt or entry fee).

6.5.1.8.5.1.　　　All such sponsorship should have a justified business purpose, which could include publicity for the event and its objectives or organisational recognition and development. The cost to the Otago Polytechnic should be moderate and conservative.

6.5.2.8.5.2.　　　If the event does not have a justified business purpose, the cost is deemed a gift and requires the approval specified in clause 7.410.

6.5.3.8.5.3.　　Sponsorship of staff is not classified under the entertainment classification in the delegation policy and requires specific approval as follows:
   a.　sponsorship under $200 requires Head of SchooleS/College/Department or Director approval
   b.　sponsorship over $200 requires the relevant Executive Leadership Team member's approval
   c.　sponsorship over $500 requires Chief Executive approval.

7.9. Category 4: Goods and Services related Expenditure

7.1.9.1.　　**Sale of Surplus Assets to Staff/Council Members – refer to policy** *MP0362 Asset Management (Operational - Acquisition and Disposal)* which contains the asset disposal process including the process for sales to employees, contractors or Council members (and their related parties).

7.1.1.9.1.1.　　　If doubt exists then any sale to employees, contractors or council members or parties related to employees, contractors or council members should not be authorised.

7.2.9.2.　　**Communications Technology** *– refer to policy MP0311 Use of Phone Policy*
7.2.1.9.2.1.　　　Communications technology such as cell-phones, telephones, and email and other access to the internet is widely used in Otago Polytechnic. While some level of access for personal use is allowable, excessive use and cost is not permitted. ~~The Otago Polytechnic's *MP0311 Use of Phone Policy* provides guidance in this regard.~~

7.2.2.9.2.2.　　　Where it is economically feasible, costs of personal use should be reimbursed. MAs guidance monthly costs per person exceeding $130 are scrutinised as part of standard authorisation procedures by the person's manager and reimbursement required.

9.3.　**Private use of suppliers -** The Otago Polytechnic from time to time allows staff to obtain a discount on personal purchases from suppliers to the Polytechnic. Such discounts shall be arranged on a cash sale basis only.

CP0008 Sensitive Expenditure_Track Changes_FAC.DocxCP0008.03 Sensitive Expenditure.Docx

~~9.~~ **Process for non-compliance**

~~8.~~ ~~If non-compliance with this policy is identified it should be referred in the first instance to the Formal Leader. Continued non-compliance should be referred to the Director of Business Services. Actions taken will depend on the specific circumstances and will be in accordance with the applicable terms and conditions of employment.~~

10. Where an instance of non-compliance with this policy is identified, it is to be referred to the Formal Leader. The ~~action taken will depend on the specific circumstances and will be in accordance with the applicable terms and conditions of employment.~~ The Formal Leader may consult with the appropriate DCE or the Director of Business Services if unsure of the appropriate action.

If more than one instance of non-compliance with this policy is identified, it is to be referred to the Director of Business Services. The action taken will depend on the specific circumstances and will be in accordance with the applicable terms and conditions of employment.
   ~~The first instance on non-compliance will be referred to the staff member's Formal Leader, any additional instances will be referred to the Director Business Services.~~

~~**9.** **CE & Chairs expenditure**~~

~~Expenditure incurred by the Chief Executive must follow the standards and principles outlined in this policy and be approved by the Council Chair.~~

~~Expenditure incurred by the Council Chair must follow the standards and principles outlined in this policy and be approved by the Chair of the Finance & Audit Committee.~~

Related Policy, Forms and Documents	Council - Code of Conduct MP0303 Authorities and Delegations from the Chief Executive MP0304 Specific Financial Authorities and Delegations MP0352 Otago Polytechnic Purchasing and Credit Cards MP0362 Asset Management (Operational - Acquisition and Disposal) MP0359 Staff Functions MP0446 Travel on Otago Polytechnic Business MP0311 Use of Phone Policy A Management Guide to Discretionary Expenditure, issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors NZ Inc, 1996. Standards of Integrity & Conduct, issued by the State Services Commission, June 2007. Controlling sensitive expenditure: Guidelines for public entities, issued by the Controller and Auditor-General, February 2007. http://www.oag.govt.nz/2007/sensitive-expenditure/

Approved by Council
Date: ~~4 May 2018~~

CP0008 Sensitive Expenditure_Track Changes_FAC.Docx~~CP0008.03 Sensitive Expenditure.Docx~~

COUNCIL CALENDAR 2019

Meeting/Event	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Feb 2020
Audit Process										
Interim										
Signoff										
Forecast										
Budget										
Council Meeting Fridays	5 April	2 May Auckland	7 June Placeholder	5 July	2 Aug	6 Sept Placeholder	4 Oct	1 Nov	6 Dec Placeholder	7 Feb
Departmental Visits										
Evaluation - Review - Report										
Function										
Photo	5 April									
Fees Set										
International				5 July						
Domestic							4 Oct			
Finance and Audit Ctee	4 April	2 May Auckland	6 June	4 July	1 Aug	5 Sept	3 Oct 31 Oct		5 Dec	5 Feb Wed
Graduation									13 Dec	
Maori Pre-Grad									12 Dec	
Komiti Kawanataka Thurs at 8am	4 April	2 May	6 June	4 July	1 Aug	5 Sept	3 Oct 31 Oct		5 Dec	5 Feb

1

Meeting/Event	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Feb 2020
Investment Plan Draft										
Approval										
Report										
Risk Management Review Policy							Oct			
Safety, Health and Wellbeing walk around	5 April 1.30pm							1 Nov 1.30pm		
Strategy Workshop Approval										
OP Events						2 Sept OP Spring Breakfast				

2

OTAGO POLYTECHNIC INTERESTS REGISTER – EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP TEAM

Register to be maintained for the Executive Leadership Team and kept by the Chief Executive's office as per policy CP0012.02 Conflict of Interest.

Date Updated	Name	Interest Disclosed	Nature of Potential Conflict of Interest with Otago Polytechnic	Pecuniary or non-pecuniary	Agreed approach to manage
15 January 2019	Jo Brady	− Board Member, Te Au Turoa Dunedin Wildlife Hospital − Member, High Performance Sport NZ Advisory Group	None		
1 February 2019	Philip Cullen	Cliffs Road Trading Board Member: − OP Auckland International Campus Ltd	Potential only		
2 February 2018	Janine Kapa	Board Member: − Otago Boys' High School − Otago Youth Wellness Trust − A3 Kaitiaki Ltd − KUMA (Southern Māori Business Network) Member, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki (whānau)	Feeder school/possible competitor Potential only Potential for similar clientele Potential for bias	Pecuniary Non-pecuniary Pecuniary Non-pecuniary	Proceed with: • caution & sensitivity • honesty & integrity

Date Updated	Name	Interest Disclosed	Nature of Potential Conflict of Interest with Otago Polytechnic	Pecuniary or non-pecuniary	Agreed approach to manage
26 February 2018	Phil Ker	Board Member: – Malcam Trust – TANZ – TANZ eCampus Limited – OP Auckland International Campus Ltd – Postsecondary International Network – World Federation of Colleges and Polytechnics – JBA Limited OPAIC Limited Partnership (Chief Executive of OP as Partner) Convenor – selection panel for National Tertiary teaching Excellence Awards Glenys Ker, Programme Leader Capable NZ - spouse	Possible subcontractor Possible competitor Potential supplier and competitor to OP Possible bias Personal interests	Pecuniary Non-pecuniary Both	Transparency Non participation re OP candidates OP Policy
11 February 2019	Oonagh McGirr	Board Member: – Dunedin Fringe Arts Trust – The Malcam Trust – OERU Board			
2 February 2018	Chris Morland	SIGNAL ICT Grad School Ellen Morland, OP staff member spouse	Possible competitor Personal interest	Pecuniary Both	Transparency OP Policy

Staff Subcommittee of Council

Wednesday 3 October 2018
8.30 am - 9.30 am
F 215, Mason Centre, Forth Street, Dunedin

Present:	Michelle Watt (Chair)	Phil Osborne
	Sheena Roy	Barbara Dunn
		Philip Ballard
Apologies:	Jono Aldridge, Phil Edwards, Karole Hogarth, Kathryn van Beek, Jonathan Duncan, Mary Butler, Lisa Burton, Megan Potiki, Darren Evans, Jacquie Hayes, Stuart Terry, Kim Reay, Ian Barker.	
In attendance:	Andy Kilsby	
Minutes:	Paula Petley	

1. Apologies	Apologies accepted. Meeting date changed from 4 October due to Staff Development Day.
2. Minutes of last meeting	Approval of minutes. September: Moved Philip Ballard. Second: Phil Osborne. August: Moved Phil Osborne. Second: Sheena Roy.
3. Matters arising	Campus artwork Members would like information on the process for approval/installing artwork that in some cases people may find inappropriate in a public space i.e. the Hub. **Action:** Request further information
4. Employability Centre update	Andy Kilsby introduced himself and outlined three work streams (Secondary/Tertiary partnership, Learner Capability and Edubits) which now come under the Employability Centre. Edubits OP building scale in terms of micro credential opportunities. There has been a big take-up of Edubits and interest from corporates. Phil Ker sees an increased proportion of OP activity in that space. Edubits aligns with Learner Capability which provides more information for both employers and students. An I am Capable portfolio supports a CV and provides evidence-based facts on what someone can do. For businesses this helps to avoid the risk of a poor employment decision. Process is driven around market efficiency for employment and recognition of transferable skills. The programme has potential for primary and secondary schools to assist students with pathway decisions. For OP students the portfolio gives context to their degrees.

	It was commented that employer feedback showed they wanted youth who would turn up for work each day, were appropriately dressed, not affected by substances or hungover. These are life skills for responsible participation in the workforce. *Employability Centre* Model is very successful with the students who are engaged and interested. Unit standards used for students to gain NCEA credits. Next year will be a soft launch, will not include all programmes. Staff supportive of the programme philosophy.
5. Updates	Leadership updates were deferred to next meeting.
6. Other business	Electric vehicle charging University have set up a charging station in St. David Street. OP needs to investigate the feasibility and cost of having one here.
7. Next meeting	Next meeting 1 November.
Close	Meeting closed 9.30 am.

ACTIONS SUMMARY

Action	Person	Completion
Pass on information from previous sustainability work to Sarah and Ray.	Paula	asap
Investigate feasibility of charging station	Philip B	asap

Staff Subcommittee of Council

Thursday 1 November 2018
8.30 am - 9.30 am
F 215, Mason Centre, Forth Street, Dunedin

Present:	Michelle Watt (Chair)	Phil Osborne
	Sheena Roy	Barbara Dunn
	Ian Barker	Karole Hogarth
	Jonathan Duncan	Kathryn van Beek
	Mary Butler	
Apologies:	Phil Edwards, Kim Reay, Jono Aldridge, Philip Ballard	
In attendance:	Rebecca Hamid	
Minutes:	Paula Petley	

1. Apologies	Apologies accepted.
2. Minutes of last meeting	Approval of minutes of last meeting. Moved: Phil Osbourne Seconded: Sheena Roy.
3. Matters arising	Further discussion on campus artwork.
4. Leadership updates	Council and Central Services Leadership Team – no updates. December Council meeting yet to be confirmed. Leadership Council update – Kathryn van Beek • WES – high level results presented. Team reports due out by end of November. A video and PowerPoint are available on Tuhono. • Cromwell Campus - open day 1 December, staff invited to take the free bus going up. • EER – a work plan has been developed. • Online security – some suspicious emails have been received; staff are encouraged to take the IT Security online course (Moodle) • PESA - award ceremony was held yesterday and trophy presented to OP. • ITP restructure – outcome not known yet
5. General updates	Deferred to next meeting.
6. Campus artwork	Rebecca Hamid was welcomed to the meeting; members introduced themselves. Rebecca's work on OP strategic planning and asset management along with her background as an art gallery owner has led to her undertaking the role of art on campus coordinator. It was felt there is a need for more art at Forth Street campus which has very little compared to Albany Street. Rebecca facilitating this, it is intended that student

	artwork will be moved from Albany Street to the Hub so more people can see it which is not usually possible due to the physical dislocation of the Art School. A recent issue was discussed around an art piece that was to be showcased in the Hub. The subcommittee agreed following Rebecca's discussion that a response would be drafted to highlight our thoughts in the form of recommendations that she may wish to share with ELT. *Commissioned work* 'Nga Kete' is the first commissioned piece to be installed. The selection panel included outside experts. There was information on Tuhono to enable staff to vote for their preferred piece, but many people didn't see it.
7. People, Culture and Development portfolio update - TBC	Deferred to December meeting, along with a sector update on the TEC ITP Roadmap project (TBC).
8. Any other business	Staff sick bay – it was advised that this had been repurposed. Details to be discussed at next meeting.
9. Next meeting and agenda items	Next meeting 6 December. Agenda items: People and Culture update / TEC ITP Sector update. End of year wrap-up.
Close	Meeting closed 9.49 am.

ACTIONS SUMMARY

Action	Person	Completion
Pass on information from previous sustainability work to Sarah and Ray.	Paula	asap
Investigate feasibility of charging station	Philip B	asap
Staff sick bay information	Kathryn	Next meeting
Committee to draft response to Rebecca	TBC	Next meeting

Staff Subcommittee of Council

Thursday 6 December 2018
8.30 am - 9.30 am
F 215, Mason Centre, Forth Street, Dunedin

Present:	Michelle Watt	Phil Osborne
	Jono Aldridge (Chair)	Barbara Dunn
	Stuart Terry	Karole Hogarth
	Ian Barker	Kathryn van Beek
	Jonathan Duncan	Lisa Burton

Apologies:	Phil Edwards, Jacquie Hayes, Darren Evans.
In attendance:	Andy Westgate
Minutes:	Paula Petley

1. Apologies	Apologies accepted.
2. Health and Safety Update (Andy Westgate)	Andy updated the meeting on results of Health and Safety audit, requested by OP Council and carried out by Crowe Horwath. The report looked at the latest international standards and standards used in ACC audits. The Health, Safety and Wellbeing strategy 2018-2021 has been developed, approved by ELT and delivered to Leadership Council. HSW objectives will tie in with TPP so we can track KPIs to completion e.g. for area safety audits. HSW Strategy Feedback • Suitable measures need to be devised for the "Measures" column. Suggested that Business Improvement team could assist. • A member raised problems with the current digitalized process for logging and reporting incidents, which will be raised in a H&S committee meeting Sick bay room – Phil Ker requested a sick bay be re-established in OP. Andy looking for a suitable space. Breastfeeding room – Concerns were raised that the room needs to have suitable sterilization and refrigeration facilities. It was recommended a statement be prepared to the effect that SSCC recognises the importance of this issue. **Action** Jono to investigate concerns and compose a statement re SSCC support regarding breastfeeding room facilities and circulate to committee for feedback.
3. Minutes of last meeting	Approval of minutes deferred to next meeting.
4. Leadership updates	• No open Leadership Council meeting in December. • ITP Sector review updates likely now in 2019 • Māori Future Collective – a speaker from Ngai Tahu attended last Leadership Council meeting. Discussion on Māori at high risk for jobs disappearing through technology and automation. Information on Tokona Te Raki www.maorifutures.co.nz

5. Any other business	• Staff sick bay – discussed under Health and Safety update. • Art Recommendation update. Rebecca Hamid discussed the recommendation with Phil Ker, which was duly acted on. • Project Accelerate at AIC – refer https://www.op.ac.nz/hub/news/item/3601. This is under way. • OP Priorities including WES - https://www.op.ac.nz/hub/news/item/3732. Refer blog on Tuhono "Key initiatives for 2019". Five priorities identified. Workload still the major issue in WES. Some measures to assist are proposed. Lisa noted that moderation is a huge workload. • Electric vehicle charger – update. This was initially raised by Philip B. Tracey Howell looking into possible locations for a 'fast charger' on campus. Discussion on whether it should be free or user pays. The commitee felt OP should not have to pay for power for a publicly available charger although some organisations offer theirs free. Suggested a possible partnership e.g. Chargenet. Jono to follow up. • Team performance rewards – now a day off. Academic staff do not see this as a 'reward'. If staff wish to raise this with Phil Ker use communication channels "korero with ELT" or "talk to OP" on Tuhono.
6. Matters arising	Covered under Any Other Business.
7. Meeting schedule 2019& agenda items	First meeting of next year will be Thursday 28 February. Appointments for the year will be sent.
8. End of year wrap up	Jono thanked members for their attendance and contributions this year.
Close	Meeting closed 9.39 am.

ACTIONS SUMMARY

Action	Person	Completion
Appointments 2019	Paula	Jan 2019
Draft statement re breastfeeding room facilities	Jono	Feb 2019
EV charger on campus – Who will it be open to Staff, Staff and Students or Public and will there be a cost?	Jono	Feb 2019

Otago Polytechnic Council

BOARD PACK

for

Otago Polytechnic Council - Closed

05 Apr 2019 09:00 AM

Held at:

Puna Kawa

Level 2, Mason Centre
Otago Polytechnic
Forth Street
Dunedin

Version 3
Generated: 29 Mar 2019 05:53 PM

INDEX

Cover Page

Index

Agenda

Attached Documents:

AGENDA

OTAGO POLYTECHNIC COUNCIL - CLOSED

Name:	Otago Polytechnic Council
Date:	Friday, April 5, 2019
Time:	9:00 AM
Location:	Puna Kawa, Level 2, Mason Centre Otago Polytechnic Forth Street Dunedin
Board Members:	Kathy Grant (Chair), Jamie Adamson, Paul Allison, Neil Barns, Peter Coolbear, Bill Moran, Megan Potiki
Apologies:	Mike Horne
Guests:	In Attendance:
	Jono Aldridge (Convenor, Staff Subcommittee), Jo Brady (Deputy Chief Executive People, Performance and Development), Jeanette Corson (Secretary to Council), Philip Cullen (Deputy Chief Executive Corporate Services), Jordan Dargaville (Convenor, Student Council), Megan Gibbons (Acting Deputy Chief Executive Learner Experience), Janine Kapa (Deputy Chief Executive Māori Development/Kaitohutohu, Phil Ker (Chief Executive), Gagan Sachdeva (Chief Executive, Otago Polytechnic Auckland International Campus)
Notes:	8am Council only
	10.30am Lesley Smith, Assoc Director Quality Services will present the Educational Performance Indicators
	11.00am Kelly Gay, Manager, Central Otago Campus - first impressions

1. PROCEDURAL

1.1 Resolution to Exclude the Public

Under Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, move that with the exception of the Executive Leadership Team members and the convenors of the Student Council and the Staff Subcommittee, the public be excluded from the meeting.

1.2 Conflict of Interest

Members are asked to declare any potential conflict of interest.

1.3 Confirm Minutes

RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the closed section of the meeting held on 7 December 2018 be approved as a true and correct record.

Supporting Documents:

1.3.a   Minutes : Otago Polytechnic Council - Closed - 01 Mar, 2019   8

1.4 Matters arising

1.5   Action Item List

Supporting Documents:

1.6   Reporting Timeframes

Supporting Documents:

2.   REPORTS

2.1   Chair (verbal)

2.2   Chief Executive

Supporting Documents:

2.3   Finance and Audit Committee (verbal)

2.4   Finance Reports

- EFTS Reports
- Rolling Cash Flow

Supporting Documents:

2.5   Executive Leadership Team

- Janine Kapa, Deputy Chief Executive Maori/Kaitohutohu
- Megan Gibbons, Acting Deputy Chief Executive Learner Services

Supporting Documents:

2.6   Safety and Wellbeing

- February 2019 report

Supporting Documents:

2.7   Educational Performance Indicators

Supporting Documents:

2.8   OPAIC

This report will be sent separately.

3.   FOR APPROVAL

3.1   2018 Annual Report

Supporting Documents:

4.   RISK

4.1   Governance Risk Management Framework

Supporting Documents:

4.2   Critical Risk Audit Update

Supporting Documents:

5.   MATTERS FOR NOTING

5.1   Council Correspondence

- Hon Chris Hipkins re Otago Polytechnic involvement in the New Dunedin Hospital project
- Controller and Auditor General re new audit contract 2019 - 2021

Supporting Documents:

5.2   Finance and Audit Committee Minutes

- 31 January 2019
- 28 February 2019

Supporting Documents:

5.3 Contracts Signed

Supporting Documents:

5.4 Use of the Common Seal

The Common Seal has been applied to one document since last reported - a lease for 179 Albany Street (see attached).

Supporting Documents:

5.5 Safety and Wellbeing Minutes

Supporting Documents:

6. CLOSE MEETING

6.1 Meeting Closed

Next meeting: Otago Polytechnic Council - Closed - Thursday, 2 May 2019, 10:30 AM