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ABSTRACT

In November 1995, The Auckland Institute of Technology (AIT) applied to the Minister of Education to be disestablished as a polytechnic and to be established as a university. This was the first time such an application had taken place in New Zealand. It caused ripples throughout the New Zealand tertiary sector and provoked widespread debate throughout the country.

This thesis is a case study of the impact, implications, and ramifications of AIT’s quest for university status.

Changes took place within the institution itself. Over the years 1995-1998, the institution changed its student enrolment profile, moving to higher percentages of students in degree and postgraduate programmes. At the same time it revised its research strategies and policies, increased its research activity, and improved its research reporting.

Exploration of institutional amalgamations also occurred. During the years 1995-98, AIT entered into merger negotiations with two other institutions including another polytechnic and a college of education. While a merger did not result, the effect was to prompt at least two other mergers to take place, not involving AIT, and to lead AIT to explore the wider possibilities of linkages with institutions in other countries.

There was an effect on the other Auckland institutions. AIT’s application for university status prompted one other polytechnic in Auckland (UNITEC) to make a similar application, and prompted the third Auckland polytechnic (Manukau) to establish an alliance with the University of Auckland.

There were ramifications for the wider New Zealand tertiary sector. Within the polytechnics, attention was focused on the parity of esteem ascribed to the various classes of institution, and to the qualifications they awarded. Proposals for the
establishment of a New Zealand University of Technology were advanced as a result of this and as a consequence of AIT’s quest to become a university.

There were policy issues raised at Government level. AIT’s quest for university status initiated a debate about the interpretation of the 1989 Education Amendment Act which sets out the characteristics of universities and polytechnics. The New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) took two years (1996-97) to propose, take submissions on, and establish guidelines for interpretation of the Act.

The broader debate about the interpretation of the Act opened up the wider issues of the meaning of a university in the late 1990s, what the boundaries between polytechnics and universities were, how many universities and polytechnics a country like New Zealand should have, and whether the ability of some tertiary institutions in New Zealand to compete in the international marketplace had been eroded by the elimination in the late 1980s and early 1990s of the binary systems for higher education in Australia and the UK.
ACRONYMS

ACE The Auckland College of Education

AIT The Auckland Institute of Technology

APNZ The Association of Polytechnics in New Zealand

ATI The Auckland Technical Institute

AVCC The Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee
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MOE The Ministry of Education
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Chapter 1

The Auckland Institute of Technology

In this chapter, a brief description of the Auckland Institute of Technology is followed by a review of the events leading to the decision to apply for university status, a background description of the tertiary policies that had to be addressed, the consequences of AIT’s application for university status, and an overview of the issues and research questions raised.

In 1995, AIT was New Zealand’s largest polytechnic and had a well-documented history which included a change of name on a number of occasions (Nicol, 1940; Clark, 1966; Caradus, 1975; Turner, 1983; Venables, 1985; Trenwith, 1997).

The Institute was founded in 1895 on its current Wellesley St site as the Auckland Technical School for the purpose of training apprentices. In 1903 it became the financial responsibility of the Auckland Education Board with a technical curriculum developed to meet the training needs of the local industry. A day school was established alongside the technical school in 1906, and in 1914 the combined school, which incorporated technical evening classes, was renamed the Seddon Memorial Technical College (SMTC) after Richard John Seddon, an eminent New Zealand Prime Minister of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

SMTC grew significantly over the next 40 years, and by the mid 1950s had outgrown the facilities available. By 1957, two-thirds of the staff were involved in teaching the night classes, and a decision was made to separate the College into two separate organisations: a secondary school (established as the Seddon High School, and later renamed as the Western Springs High School) and the Auckland Technical Institute (ATTI), which was established in 1963 and remained on the Wellesley St site in central Auckland.
This was an action that at the time was marked by controversy. Government policy had been to establish a single national Technical Institute based near Wellington, but pressure from Auckland interests was brought to bear so that two Technical Institutes would be established, ATI and the Central Institute of Technology, CIT. In the event, policy changed, and by the mid 1960s, Technical Institutes had been established in all of the main cities. Over the following decade a network of Technical Institutes (some bearing the title of Polytechnic, and some the title of Community College) were established in each of the regional cities.

ATI was always larger than the others as a result of its situation at the centre of the country’s largest metropolitan area. Growth in its range of programmes and student numbers consistently exceeded that of any other Technical Institute and, under the direct control of the Department of Education, ATI was directed to split on two occasions - in 1970 to form the Manukau Technical Institute (now Manukau Institute of Technology), and in 1976 to form the Carrington Technical Institute (now UNITEC Institute of Technology).

These divisions changed the profile of ATI, as they had the effect of taking the bulk of trade training away from the central Auckland site, leaving ATI with a range of technician and paraprofessional programmes, mostly related to the needs of the central business district of Auckland city, but including some (e.g. Printing and Physiotherapy) national courses. In 1978 with the merging of the North Shore Teachers’ College and the Auckland Teachers’ College to form the Auckland College of Education, ATI took over the vacated North Shore Teachers’ College campus on which it relocated its Nursing and Physiotherapy programmes.

By 1983 the Department of Education was again pressing to divide the Institute by removing the North Shore campus from it in order to form a fourth Technical Institute in Auckland. This time, however, ATI resisted, gathering political support for an independent review which concluded that the provision of Higher Education on the North Shore would be stronger if ATI was allowed to remain as a two campus institution.
The continued growth of para-professional programmes and changes in the overall profile of the institution meant that ATI more and more resembled an Australian College of Advanced Education (CAE), notwithstanding the fact that it was still unable to award degrees. A submission in 1986 to change ATI's name to Auckland Institute of Technology met considerable opposition, and it was only after more than two years of debate and submissions to the Minister of Education that the decision to allow ATI to change its name to the Auckland Institute of Technology (AIT) was made in 1989.

This change of name was important. It happened at about the same time as degrees were being introduced for the first time in New Zealand outside of the universities. This was a direct consequence of the 1989 Education Amendment Act which established the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). The Hawke report (1988), which had been commissioned by Government to recommend legislative change for the tertiary sector, recommended that a national education qualifications authority be given the responsibility to approve national qualifications and degrees in order to enable New Zealand's competitive edge to be maintained and in recognition that a number of professional bodies (the accounting and health professions in particular) were demanding degree credentials for graduates in line with trends in Australia.

While ATI's change of name to AIT did not signal any real functional transformation other than those changes that would inevitably arise from a newly acquired power to award degrees, it was also coincidental with the relaxing of the regulations which until then had precluded tertiary institutions in New Zealand from enrolling full fee paying international students. Until that time, the only international students permitted were those who had been awarded government scholarships. This deregulation can be linked directly to the economic changes that were occurring in the 1980s and which are described in chapter 4 of this dissertation. Deregulation was a strong theme in Government policy of the time, as was the drive to improve export earnings, including the export of educational services.
It is argued in this dissertation that AIT's ability to award degrees and its ventures into the international marketplace had a compelling influence on its decision to seek university status.

The change of name from ATI to AIT was also controversial. It took over two years to achieve because it was so strongly opposed by the rest of the Technical Institutes, Polytechnics, and Community Colleges throughout New Zealand, all of whom had agreed to the title of Polytechnic as well as to being generically classified as polytechnics. ATI, however, while accepting the generic description of polytechnic, believed that the title "polytechnic" would never be well understood outside New Zealand, and noted that the British polytechnics were becoming universities.

The 1989 Education Amendment Act legislated for four types of tertiary institution in New Zealand, viz., Universities, Polytechnics, Colleges of Education, and Wananga (Maori institutions of higher learning), each with its own defined characteristics. In spite of the fact that AIT's success in achieving its name change in 1989 was followed soon afterwards by its Auckland opponents doing likewise (Manukau Technical Institute changing to Manukau Polytechnic and later again to Manukau Institute of Technology; Carrington Technical Institute changing to Carrington Polytechnic, and later again to UNITEC Institute of Technology), all such institutions were still classified as Polytechnics.

This dissertation deals in some detail with these classifications, for it is a case study of AIT challenging the definitions of the Act both through seeking a reclassification to university, and through seeking to merge with an institution from another sector (a college of education). It is interesting to note, incidentally, that the issues raised by AIT's actions would not have happened in Australia or the UK, for neither of these countries has legislation which has attempted to prescribe such distinct sectors for tertiary education.

The desire to further change the name of the institution was also the issue that set in motion the application by AIT to be established as a university, the matter that is the substance of this dissertation.
AIT'S APPLICATION TO BE ESTABLISHED AS A UNIVERSITY

The detail of how AIT came to make this application is discussed in chapter 5. During a lunchtime meeting at AIT in 1993, the then Minister of Education (Dr. The Hon. Lockwood Smith) was asked if the institution could change its name to the Auckland University of Technology. It was noted that a number of CAEs in Australia appeared to have done this without any immediate change to the range and type of programmes offered. The Queensland University of Technology (formerly Queensland Institute of Technology), University of Technology Sydney (formerly New South Wales Institute of Technology), Curtin University of Technology (formerly West Australia Institute of Technology), and Victoria University of Technology (formerly Victoria Institute of Technology) were all cited as examples.

The conversation made it clear to the Minister that this was not intended to signal any major shift in AIT's commitment to the type of education it currently offered, and indeed the institution was happy to remain classified as a polytechnic, but it needed the word "university" associated with its name if it was to be competitive in the international arena.

The Minister said he would be pleased to consider the matter, and in the absence of the Director a few days later, one of the Deputy Directors of AIT and the Council Chairman wrote and co-signed a brief letter asking the Minister to agree to the name change. The Minister wrote a sequence of conflicting replies, but in the end concluded that on legal advice he could not in fact agree to the name change. An institution using the word university in its name must be a university, and to be a university it must have all of the characteristics of a university set out in the Act.

Considerable debate ensued within the Council and Executive of AIT as to whether or not AIT should pursue the matter further and seek university status. The Academic Board was strongly supportive of the move, the Executive was unanimously in favour, and the Council voted with about a two-thirds majority to
support the initiative provided that the essential character of the institution would not change; that its equity objectives would remain, and that its commitment to "lower level courses" would not be abated.

In 1995 a case was developed, and submitted to the Minister in November of that year. The case was written jointly by the author of this dissertation and the Institute’s legal advisors, but after extensive consultation with senior staff and some members of the Institute’s Council. The process and issues raised by AIT’s application for university status are discussed in chapters 5-8 of this dissertation.

This was the first occasion on which such a request had been made in New Zealand. It has been controversial, and has attracted strong opposition from the University of Auckland, and some polytechnics. It has been perceived by some as weakening the polytechnic sector through the loss of its largest institution which also contributed 13% of the funding for the Association of Polytechnics in New Zealand (APNZ), and interpreted by others as a sign that AIT wanted to move away from its roots. It caused the UNITEC Institute of Technology to also make a premature application for reclassification through fear of being disadvantaged in a competitive environment, and it precipitated the Wellington Polytechnic to enter into a merger agreement with Massey University, an action that was opposed in the High Court by the Manawatu Polytechnic and APNZ on the grounds that a polytechnic cannot decide to merge with a university under the provisions of the Act. These issues are discussed in chapter 9 of this dissertation.

The controversy surrounding AIT’s quest for university status has been the catalyst for many tertiary institutions and education policy makers in New Zealand to consider the nature of a university, and how the broad characteristics of universities as set out in the Education Act should be interpreted. It has also raised questions about the boundaries between the sectors in New Zealand’s tertiary system, and questions about how many tertiary institutions, including universities, a city like Auckland and a country like New Zealand should have. These issues are discussed in chapter 11 of this dissertation.
POLICY BACKGROUND

AIT's application for university status raised the question of how a university was to be defined in the New Zealand context and within New Zealand legislation. It focused attention on the status of universities in relation to other tertiary institutions, particularly polytechnics and colleges of education, all of which have the right to seek approval and accreditation to offer degrees.

The legislation pertaining to tertiary institutions in New Zealand (and in particular, section 162 of the Education Amendment Act, 1989) is pivotal to this dissertation. It is also unique. For while it prescribes the characteristics of four distinct types of tertiary institution (universities, polytechnics, colleges of education, and wananga), the reality is that there are considerable overlaps between them, and the boundaries have become increasingly blurred since the passing of the legislation. This is discussed in chapter 2 and expanded on throughout this thesis.

For tertiary institutions, one of the most significant effects of the Education Amendment Act, 1989 was that it disestablished the Department of Education which had had a management role with tertiary institutions, and replaced it with a Ministry of Education responsible for policy development. Far greater autonomy resulted as the management responsibility was passed from the Department of Education to the institutional councils.

A second significant change was that the Ministry established a system of funding parity for all state funded tertiary institutions, based on the type of courses being offered rather than the status of the institution offering it. Thus, commerce and language programmes were funded at lower rates than science and engineering, but at the same level per equivalent full-time student (EFTS) regardless of whether the student was enrolled in a polytechnic or a university. The universities retained an average funding per EFTS that was higher than polytechnics, however, due to formulae which provided higher funding for postgraduate than undergraduate students.
A third significant change arising from the 1989 legislation was the establishment of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), which had the function of establishing a National Qualifications Framework (NQF), and was charged with approving and accrediting institutions (including private providers) outside of the universities to offer degrees and national qualifications. This was the first time that any institution other than a university had been enabled to offer a degree in New Zealand.

Fourthly, the 1989 legislation established the Education and Training Support Agency which was responsible for funding of the Industry Training Organisations. The effect of this was that the funding of trade and industry training which had previously gone to polytechnics from the Department of Education was increasingly placed in the hands of industry and private providers, reducing the polytechnics' involvement in trade training.

A fifth but less immediate change arose from the enabling of all tertiary institutions to enrol full fee paying international students. This prompted a parallel process of internationalisation to begin.

These changes all had a marked influence on the pedagogical processes in AIT, and indeed in all polytechnics. Funding had previously been based on a set of complex funding formulae related to student class contact hours. This encouraged polytechnics to keep students in class for as long as possible, and to run courses for as long as possible in the year. The funding system of the 1980s effectively penalised self-directed learning, and libraries in polytechnics were, as a result, a low priority for funding, poorly resourced, and under-utilised. Teaching staff typically taught for up to 30 hours per week, and research accordingly was almost non-existent.

Almost overnight, programme development and resourcing decisions had to change. Staff and student class contact hours were dramatically reduced, curricula were changed to encourage greater levels of self-directed learning, and programmes became modularised in conformity with the National Qualifications Framework. It can be argued that these things probably had to happen anyway if
degrees (which required staff to engage in research and students to develop higher levels of intellectual independence) were to be offered in polytechnics, but there is little doubt that the changes were only enabled by the new funding mechanisms.

AIT was the first New Zealand polytechnic to have a degree approved (Physiotherapy in 1991), and degree development dominated the academic directions of the Institute through the early and mid 1990s. This, together with a significant international thrust by AIT, and a competitive marketing environment both domestically and internationally, set the scene for the university status application, albeit with much of the pre-1990 culture of low research activity and inadequate library resources still needing to be changed.

**CONSEQUENCES OF AIT’S APPLICATION FOR UNIVERSITY STATUS**

While section 162 of the 1989 Education Amendment Act describes broadly the respective characteristics of universities, polytechnics, colleges of education, and wananga, it does not provide quantifiable means of distinguishing between them. Further, while the Act makes provision for the Minister of Education to recommend the establishment of an institution as a university, it also requires him or her to take advice from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA).

Thus, as a consequence of AIT’s November 1995 application to be established as a university, it became necessary to examine the issues concerning the nature of a university, and how this is defined within the Act.

The NZQA in 1996 established an independent “panel of repute” comprising academic and community leaders from within New Zealand, Australia, and the United Kingdom to recommend benchmarks, consistent with the provisions of the Act, for the establishment of a university, and to advise on the extent to which AIT met these benchmarks.

In May 1996, the panel recommended “guidelines” for interpretation of the Act (as opposed to “benchmarks”), but the Board of the NZQA did not agree to a set of guidelines until 18 months later in December 1997 and after wide consultation.
The panel’s evaluation of AIT in 1996 was that it did not at that time meet all of the guidelines as a result of inadequate enrolments in degree programmes and deficiencies in its management and reporting of research, but it concluded that AIT was on a trajectory to meet the requirements. Chapter 7 includes a full discussion on the guidelines and their development.

The process of making a detailed application and providing substantial information about itself to the panel in itself had a marked effect on AIT. Much of the information required had never been collected previously, and the need to satisfy the guidelines relating to research outputs in particular, catalysed a major change in the research culture of the institution during 1996-98.

In addition, the application by AIT also provoked a number of merger and affiliation discussions between itself and other institutions, two of which (with the Auckland College of Education, ACE, and the Central Institute of Technology, CIT) were hoped to lead to a full merger in 1998. This is discussed in chapter 8. The failure of this merger, however, led directly to other amalgamations in the New Zealand tertiary sector (discussed in chapter 9), notably involving Massey University.

The processes and outcomes of these merger negotiations with ACE and CIT themselves opened new issues surrounding the strategic directions of AIT, and brought about further changes within the organisation.

The causal linkages arising from AIT's application to be established as a university have been summarised diagrammatically in figure 1 below.
FIGURE 1: CAUSAL LINKS ARISING FROM AIT'S APPLICATION FOR UNIVERSITY STATUS
Research Issues

AIT's application to be established as a university has opened up the key questions of how a university is to be understood and defined in the New Zealand context, and how an application for university status from an existing institution should be dealt with. In order to study these questions, a case study of AIT has been conducted over the period of four years from 1995-98, with reference to its transition from a polytechnic to a university.

The major changes within AIT during this time have included the development of a research culture, improvements to the funding, management, co-ordination, and reporting of research, the development of a wider range of postgraduate programmes, and a broader appreciation amongst staff generally of the importance of university status to the internationalisation and future of the institution. These changes have coincided with a period of fiscal stringency where growth in student numbers has been required by Government in order to retain current funding levels, and by major capital works which the institution has had to finance by borrowing.

This case study makes particular reference to changes within the organisation, to changes in Government's tertiary education policy during that period, and to the failed merger negotiations between AIT, CIT, and ACE, which were consequential to AIT's university application, but foundered because university status had not already been achieved.

All of the above issues are linked by a complex matrix of causes and effects as described in figure 1.

In summary, it is asserted in this dissertation that:

- if the Australian colleges of advanced education (CAEs), and British polytechnics had not become universities in the 1980s and 1990s, AIT would not have sought to become a university; and

if AIT had not sought to become a university:
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• it would not have been so focused during the years 1996-1998 on strengthening its research and postgraduate capabilities;

• the merger between the Auckland College of Education and Massey University would not have taken place;

• a merger between AIT and the Central Institute of Technology would have taken place;

• the proposal for a New Zealand University of Technology would not have arisen;

• the UNITEC Institute of Technology would not have sought university status in 1996;

• the merger between the Wellington Polytechnic and Massey University and the consequential High Court litigation would not have taken place;

• the New Zealand Qualifications Authority would not have developed guidelines for interpretation of the sections of the Education Act which describe the characteristics of the various types of tertiary institution in New Zealand, and

• the Government’s 1997 Green paper on the future of tertiary education would not have included discussion on the issue of “protected terms” (which include the word “university”).

This case study of AIT in transition from 1995-98 therefore moves well beyond the boundaries of the organisation itself. It is also a study of the impact and interaction that the institute engaged in with its own political context.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The issues addressed in this thesis help to illuminate the decision by AIT to seek university status, the processes involved in the application and consequent changes within the organisation, and the processes of the merger negotiations. This leads to a consideration of the implications for New Zealand tertiary education with the emergence of at least one new university and the merging of some of its other tertiary institutions.

The following research questions relate to the context of the New Zealand tertiary sector, and particularly concern both the culture and function of a
university in the 1990s, and the relevant provisions of the Education Amendment Act, 1989:

1 What is a university, and how is it to be distinguished from any other tertiary institution?

2 How did AIT in 1995 match up against the characteristics of a university set out in the Education Act, and what changes did AIT have to make in order to demonstrate conformity to these characteristics?

3 What challenges did AIT's application present to the traditional concept of a university in New Zealand, and how did the other New Zealand tertiary institutions respond to this challenge?

4 What were the factors that led AIT to consider a merger with CIT and ACI?, and why did the merger fail?

5 What are the implications of impending university status for AIT and its strategic options for the future?

In order to address these questions, this case study has involved:

1 An interpretive analysis of the context of tertiary education in New Zealand leading up to the passing of the Education Amendment Act, 1989, and during the 1990s leading to the Tertiary Review and the Government’s Green and White Papers of 1997/98;

2 An interpretive analysis of the particular context leading to AIT’s decision to seek university status in 1995;

3 A study of the legislative processes involved for an institution seeking to be established as a university in New Zealand, including the development of guidelines for interpretation of the relevant sections of the Education Amendment Act;
4 An interpretive analysis of the impact that making the application and seeking to meet the requirements of the Act had on AIT, both in terms of its internal decision making and its merger negotiations with ACE and CIT in 1996/97; and

5 An analysis of the effects that AIT’s application had on other institutions and organisations in the New Zealand tertiary education sector.

The final discussion in this dissertation (chapter 11) provides a synthesis of the answers to the research questions and concludes that there are a number of deficiencies in the Act, which has attempted to legislate for boundaries between tertiary institutions in an environment where these boundaries have become increasingly blurred. It will be suggested that this environment will lead to considerable institutional rationalisation as a result.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

This literature review focuses on the nature and meaning of a university, the definition of a university in New Zealand, mergers and changes to the university systems in Australia and the UK, 1987-93, previous amalgamations in New Zealand, and the development of research in new universities.

These topics were chosen for literature review because they highlight the issues that AIT faced in seeking university status. The changes to the higher education system in Australia during the late 1980s, for example, brought about changes within the CAEs, whether or not they merged with existing universities. The literature review has therefore been conducted to provide research-based information able to be used by AIT in predicting future trends and reviewing its strategic decision making during the process of becoming a university.

THE NATURE AND MEANING OF A UNIVERSITY

The seminal work of John Henry Newman, The Idea of A University, published in 1850 (Ker (ed), 1976) described a university as a community in which scholars critically examined and shared insights from different disciplines. This traditional view of a university is of “a place detached from society, uncontaminated by its worldly values, and undistracted by pursuits other than the search for greater knowledge and understanding” (Bok, 1990: 7-8). In this view, the purpose of a university is the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake rather than for any particular end or goal. It implies that a university is not concerned with subjects intended to prepare students for specific vocations, but offers subjects such as philosophy and the classics which seek knowledge for the sake of knowledge and are exclusively to train the mind.
The Newmanesque model of a cloistered university, however, does not reflect a university with the vocational requirements imposed on it by governments in the present day, nor even in much earlier days. The very early universities in Europe were established mostly for vocational purposes. Patterson (1997: 134) claims that about three-quarters of all university students in the 17th century were pursuing careers in the church, and this tradition of vocational enterprise was expanded over the next two centuries as medicine, and law were introduced. The multidisciplinary university has its roots in France in the 1890s, and it was in Germany that the idea of the university as a research institution with scholarly dedication to the wissenschaft (broad view) of education emerged.

Notwithstanding, the traditional view of the university described by Newman still persists. Advocates of this view perceive vocational education to be of lower status than that of the university, leading to labels such as “ivory tower” and the dichotomy of “town and gown”.

Perusal of the academic profiles of New Zealand polytechnics, along with the colleges of advanced education in Australia, and the British polytechnics in the 1980s reveals that successive educational policy makers in New Zealand as well as Australia and the UK in previous years felt it proper for courses such as teaching and nursing to be placed in institutions that were not universities while medicine and law (albeit highly vocational subjects) were deemed to be more appropriate for a university. Presumably this was because the body of knowledge required for teaching and nursing was not considered to have a sufficiently theoretical basis to make it “degree worthy”.

This devaluation of vocational education seems to be the result of a particularly English approach to structuring tertiary education. It is not a tradition found in either the USA where the oldest and most prestigious universities, the Land Grant Universities, were established to enhance agriculture and engineering, or in Germany where science and technology formed the core curriculum in the early 19th century universities and polytechnics from 1851. These polytechnics had the status and character of universities.
"Technological education could be, and must be, of the highest status. It required special institutions of university rank that would not just specialise in science and technology but would see them as the centre of a whole education and culture. But the new development was not just a matter of organisation or status. The German universities ... taught a different kind of learning. That was wissenschaf ... the 'objective and critical approach to all knowledge'" (Nuttgens, 1983:179)

In the UK, by contrast, different forms of institutions were developed for technological training. The mechanics institutes were the forerunners of the polytechnics in the mid 20th century. These later became the "new" universities in the 1990s.

Patterson (1997) describes universities entering the 20th century as highly developed organisms, their history during this century being marked by significant growth, especially since World War II, and by an "enormous proliferation of courses and subjects" (p. 222). The civic universities were established in the late 19th century in Britain, serving mostly "working class" students, and absorbing the concept of wissenschaf (Nuttgens, 1983: 182-183). At the time the high status universities remained aloof from such developments, but in the 20th century, even the universities of Oxford and Cambridge became more integrated in the mainstream of British education, mostly because of increasing dependence on funding from the Universities Grants Committee (Patterson, 1997: 213-231).

It was the English model of the mechanics institute, however, that gave rise in 1895 to the Auckland Technical School from which AIT traces its roots. The University across the road, in contrast, was always more prestigious, better housed, and better funded both as a College of the University of New Zealand and later (post 1960) as the autonomous University of Auckland.

Possible reasons for the differences in status between different types of tertiary study have been suggested (Bok, 1986:51) as being based on some inquiries lending themselves more readily to systematic experiment and verification; the quality of students and faculty; the status of professions in society; the status of alumni; history and tradition; time-honoured criteria for recognition and reward;
the academy's long-standing ambivalence toward attempts to solve the practical problems of society; and the academy's commitment to other aims such as the preservation and enhancement of past and present culture, and the continuing quest to comprehend nature and the human condition.

Change has been rapid in universities in the past 50 years, as it has in many aspects of society in the late twentieth century. Growth in student numbers has given rise to greater diversity of the student population (Marginson, 1993). A pluralism requiring responsiveness that transcends race, gender, social class, and philosophical beliefs has been a feature of the modern university. Universities have at the same time expanded their roles as leaders in research and development, and in the advancement of knowledge in a wider range of subjects. This has been as important as their traditional responsibility for the dissemination of knowledge. But fiscal restraints have become major obstacles to their continued expansion. And as western economies moved into monetarism, deregulation, privatisation, and liberalism, tertiary policies have focused on the broadening of access, the use of tertiary education as a resource to serve national economic needs and priorities, and accountability for operation and expenditure.

Thus the fully autonomous university of the 19th century has been replaced by a semi-autonomous university which has been modified and moulded by an increasingly powerful state, and by the prevailing social, political, and economic forces.

There is little in contemporary literature about how a university in the 1990s is to be distinguished from any other type of tertiary institution. Perhaps this is because the boundaries are increasingly blurred. Silver (1983) considers possible criteria for differentiating universities and polytechnics and concludes that for each one the overlap is too great to make sense or there is no reason why only one sector should have that characteristic. Thus, “It is impossible to discriminate between the university and other sectors of higher education on the basis of defensible criteria” (p. 225).
AIT in its 1995 application (AIT, 1995: 45-50) makes reference to these overlaps and the inconsistencies in course placement between universities and polytechnics, pointing out that some of its courses (physiotherapy and medical laboratory technology, for example) are only taught elsewhere in New Zealand in universities (to the accreditation requirements of the same professional bodies), that there seemed little logic in placing physiotherapy in AIT in the same year that optometry was placed in the University of Auckland, and that both AIT and the University of Auckland offer degrees in business, engineering, applied science and languages.

This is an inevitable result of the rapid increase in human knowledge in the twentieth century which has been marked by almost exponential technological change, the emergence of new “social” sciences such as psychology and sociology, and the development of new disciplines such as economics, business, marketing, and management.

Recent advances in knowledge make it clear that knowledge is not compartmentalised into discrete areas, but rather that links between previously unconnected fields have provided the basis for new fields such as bioethics, psycholinguistics, neuropsychology, and biomechanics to develop. These developments increasingly challenge the artificial distinctions between types of institution, for students are increasingly moving from what was previously considered to be mere vocational training into programmes requiring complex and demanding intellectual rigour. Nursing students in New Zealand’s polytechnics today learn more than simple health care techniques, for as graduates they are required to make professional judgements, and their education has had to reflect this requirement.

Williams (1992) argues that the best place for research to occur is in universities with a long research tradition, and that university standards are best protected by a tertiary system with clear sectoral boundaries.

The Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (AVCC) believed (AVCC, 1991) that “the use of the university title should be limited to those institutions which
have demonstrated their capacity to deliver and develop substantial and high quality research and postgraduate programmes” as well as to deliver national and international standards at a high level, courses which meet the criteria prescribed by relevant professional associations, the existence of academic staff with high qualifications and academic standing in the community, and the capacity to produce graduates with high employment acceptability.

Mahony (1990) claims that these factors were disputed by some and that the AVCC perception was deemed to be disappointing given that developing graduates for the employment market was not a necessary feature of a university. These views again reflect a view of the university in the traditional Newmanesque sense as outlined above and these AVCC statements could also apply to other institutions of learning that were not universities. The AVCC report, however, discusses the danger of giving too much emphasis to this definition, and claims that the role of a university is much broader than this.

In the UK, the report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (Dearing, 1997) states (section 16.21) that the important defining characteristic of a university is the power to award taught and research degrees, and that it was the granting of this power to the Polytechnics in 1992 that enabled them to acquire the title and status of universities. Prior to this time, degrees gained from Polytechnics were awarded by the Council for National Academic Awards, CNAA.

This, however, is not the situation in New Zealand. The NZQA from the time of its inception in 1990 did not ever seek to routinely award the degrees it approved to be taught in institutions, and any organisation holding degree approval and accreditation from the NZQA is entitled to award the relevant degree under its own name. Further, New Zealand has not yet seen any organisation, including the universities, given the power to autonomously approve its own degrees, and while degrees are awarded by many organisations, the term “degree” is protected in the Act and may only be used after approval to do so by either the Vice-Chancellors’ Committee for University Academic Programmes (CUAP) in the case of the universities, or the NZQA in all other cases.
A paper produced for the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (Scott & Smelt, 1995) argues that the fundamental role of a university is to be a critic and conscience of society, and to develop a philosophical vision "which would lead to a focus on sound pedagogy and methodology which might be managed and evaluated as might the implications of a research vision" (p.7). Thus, a university should seek to pursue research, engage in a joint ontological quest with students, and provide credentials for the job market. This latter emphasis on the relationship to graduate employment is taken up by Pratt (1992) who also suggests that the economy requires universities to place a greater emphasis on vocationalisation.

In Australia and the UK, the criteria developed for the recognition of a new university seem to be more concerned with quantitative issues such as how much research and teaching is occurring, rather than with what is being researched and taught, or how well these are being done.

The Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee guidelines (1991) on the criteria for a recognised university suggested the following indicators:

- a student load in the order of 500 EFTSU in each of three broad fields of study;
- 3% of total student load allocated to postgraduate research students.

These guidelines also required a new university to be able to show its historical ability to secure external research funding, but in the event there is no evidence that the AVCC ever invoked these guidelines in an attempt to exclude any of the new universities from participating in the Vice-Chancellors' Committee. Ramsey (Field notes, 1997) in fact believes that the guidelines were of no great consequence since the amalgamating institutions themselves were enabled to choose their own titles, and all in fact chose to be universities (though the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, RMIT, retained its traditional title).
In the UK, the Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC, 1994) also established quantitative criteria for institutions to be recognised as universities:

- a higher education enrolment of at least 4,000 equivalent full-time (EFT) students;
- at least 3,000 EFT students on degree level courses;
- at least 300 EFT students enrolled in degree level programmes in each of five different academic subject categories; and
- power to award their own degrees, and a record of having awarded postgraduate degrees for a period of three years.

Similarly, the Association of Commonwealth Universities (Christodoulou, 1995a) sets quantitative measures for its criteria to give recognition to new members:

- not less than 50% of equivalent full-time students being enrolled in degrees, and
- at least some of those 50% being enrolled in postgraduate including doctoral level programmes, and
- firm evidence of significant research being carried out within the institution.

In these criteria, no attempt has been made to define “some” or “significant”. In a follow-up letter (Christodoulou, 1995b), the Secretary-General of the Association of Commonwealth Universities further clarified that the Association intended the inclusion of doctoral students to be linked to the stipulation about the institution being able to show “firm evidence” of involvement in “significant research activity”. He also voiced “a personal view” that the existing membership was worried about the emergence of many different kinds of institution in a number of countries that are given degree awarding powers without the resources and/or infrastructure to deliver qualitatively to the generally accepted standards of a traditional Commonwealth university.

To summarise, all of these sets of quantitative guidelines indicate that the credibility of an institution seeking university status will depend on its having the characteristics of carrying out most of its teaching at degree or higher level, having a level of diversity in its programmes, having a “critical mass” of academic activity at the higher level, and having a measurable quantum of research-based teaching and learning.
The Dearing (1997) report states (section 16.23) that the award of university status is directly bound to the power to award degrees bearing the institute’s name, and in recommending a period of relative stability in the number of universities believes (section 16.24) that “the award of university status should be related less to the achievement of the present numerical criteria and more in recognition of a distinctive role and characteristics.” What these distinctive roles and characteristics are, however, is not made clear.

More recently, the West report (1998: 46) in Australia has summarised its own assessment of the purpose of universities as follows:

“The threefold purpose of universities has ever been to preserve, transmit, and expand the domain of human knowledge. Universities have been the living repositories of the accumulated knowledge of the ages, as well as places in which each new generation can be inducted into the processes of constructive dialogue with the best that has been thought throughout history. However, the explosion of knowledge has made impossible any continuing consensus as to the task of the university in relation to some presumed canon of privileged knowledge. There is just too much to choose from. The purpose of the modern university, therefore, must be to open the mind, to strengthen and discipline the cognitive powers and sensibilities of the mind, to refine the mind, and to create efficient and effective independent learners and knowledge builders.”

While quantitative considerations are crucial to the final decisions on AIT’s application, the philosophical debate about what a university is lies at the heart of the issues surrounding AIT’s application to be reclassified as one. The decision in New Zealand to allow an institution to attain university status will be unlikely to be made on the basis of numbers but rather on the political will to diversify the New Zealand university sector.
THE DEFINITION OF A UNIVERSITY IN NEW ZEALAND

The report of the Working Group on Post Compulsory Education and Training (July, 1988), commonly referred to as the Hawke Report, was the basis of much of the legislation pertaining to tertiary institutions which became enshrined in the Education Amendment Act, 1989.

Chapter 4 of this thesis points out that the characteristics of universities and polytechnics set out in the Hawke Report were reproduced almost verbatim in section 162(4) of the Act which effectively prescribes a definition of a university. The Act also sets out the processes involved for an institution seeking to be established as a university.

Sections 160, 162, and 164 of the Act are especially relevant to this thesis and are reproduced in full in appendix I. Reference is made to these sections in chapters 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11.

These sections of the Act have been appended in full because they are crucial to AIT’s university status application.

Section 162(2) means that the decision to establish an institution as a university rests with the Minister of Education and will of necessity be a political decision.

Section 162(3) means that the NZQA has a critical role in advising the Minister, and that broad consultation seeking the views of other institutions has to take place.

Section 162(4) sets out the characteristics of a university that AIT must conform to.

Section 164 means that before AIT can be established as a university, it must first be disestablished as a polytechnic, again requiring consultation and the contrary views of AIT’s opponents to be taken into account.
Finally, the reasons for the disestablishment have to be tabled in Parliament, meaning that any political opposition can again be raised.

Section 162(4)(a) of the Act establishes five characteristics all of which are to be possessed by universities, but only some of which need to be possessed by a polytechnic, while sub-paragraphs (ii) and (iii) of this section indicate that some other points of distinction might be noted:

1. There is no reference in the listed characteristics of a university to providing a continuing education function (though in fact all New Zealand universities do this),

2. Vocational training is characteristic of a polytechnic but there is no reference to vocational training in the characteristics of a university (though in fact there is no definition of vocational training, and much of what is taught in any university could be classed as vocational training),

3. The reference to “teaching and research at a higher level” (sub-para. iii) could be deemed to mean “higher than the level offered in a polytechnic according to the previous sub-para. ii” (though in fact there is nothing elsewhere in the Act or in practice to prevent either a university or a polytechnic teaching at any level),

4. The research in polytechnics is expected to be focussed on applied and technological research (though this is not the sole preserve of polytechnics, and neither are polytechnics to be confined to such research),

5. There is no reference to polytechnics developing intellectual independence, even though they are enabled to offer degrees, approval for which requires demonstration that the student will be engaged in “a course of advanced learning that is taught mainly by people engaged in research and which emphasises general principles and basic knowledge as the basis for self-directed work and learning” (NZQA, 1992).
In short, the Act, while attempting to distinguish between universities and polytechnics, does not establish either the qualitative or quantitative means to make this distinction. While even a perfunctory comparison of any of the universities with most of the small polytechnics in New Zealand would show clearly that there was such a distinction, the differences become less distinct when comparing a large and diverse polytechnic, such as AIT had become by the late 1990s, with some of the younger and smaller universities.

AIT’s decision to seek disestablishment as a polytechnic and establishment as a university, the subject of this dissertation, would lead it to be the first institution to test these sections of the Act.

**MERGERS AND CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS IN AUSTRALIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, 1987-93**

a. Amalgamations in Australia and the UK

There have been widespread changes in the higher education systems in these countries over the last ten years (Marginson, 1993; 1996; Wilson, 1995). Wilson (p. 149) argues that in Australia they were greater than for most countries, while Marginson (1993: 117) asserts that few of the established social institutions have proved to be more responsive to outside influences than the universities. The Australian universities, while still very dominated by the British model of a university, are now more open, accessible, and complex. Marginson argues too that the universities have been timid in developing their own style and national or regional identity, though conceding that trying to replicate best practice from US models of universities is too generic, and may be counterproductive to producing standardised practices in matters such as quality assurance that have become more important in the deregulated environment of the 1990s where accountability has become the buzz word for governments.
Amalgamation as a form of institutional development has been widely reported in many countries (Boberg, 1979; Cantor, 1988; Harman & Meek, 1988; Millett, 1991; Goodbeguure, Lysons, & Meek, 1993). The Australian amalgamations of the late 1980s and 1990 were reported on by Harman (1983), Meek (1988), Harman and Meek (ed.) (1988), Karmel (1989), and Moses (1990).

But what drove the changes that resulted in amalgamations? In Australia, the White Paper (Dawkins, 1988) was designed to force the higher education system to expand in a context of governmental policy which embraced a market-driven philosophy. This policy was intended to encourage an expansion of educational opportunities with little increase in expenditure, to make institutions become more accountable and transparent, and to stimulate academic quality control and educational mission enhancement.

Martin and Samels (1994) argue that where amalgamations are planned as a part of a mutual growth concept, multi-purpose campuses, affiliations, and federations can develop. Mergers, it is posited (Baldwin, 1991; Bradley, 1993; Marginson, 1993; 1996), were expected to lead to a more diverse and healthy range of higher education provisions, though Mahony (1994) argues that mergers were almost inevitable due to inequitable funding, and the difficulties experienced by the CAE sector in accessing research funding.

The literature shows that the concept of diversity, however is a confused one. There is some evidence that the new universities in Australia were forced to accept the old university styles of operation as a parameter for measuring their success. But this was not necessarily the objective established in the white paper (Bradley, 1993). Karmel (1990) describes colleges beginning to mimic universities, and universities beginning to move into the traditional areas of the colleges.

The collapse of the binary system in the UK has been described as restricting student access and leading to greater "vocationalisation" - negative effects of market-driven privatisation policies (Campbell, 1992). Dwyer (1992) alerts students to the move to provide prestigious courses rather than those that had
been developed in the past to meet community needs - a clear reference to academic credential inflation, and a consequence of the competitive market place in which the tertiary sector found itself.

Marginson (1993) believes that the reforms were dominated by three interacting domains:

- economic - issues relating to scarcity, competition for students including international students, and research funding. The average student:staff ratios rose by 25% in the 1980s and while this was felt mostly in undergraduate classes, it is also expected to continue and extend into postgraduate programmes,

- knowledge - issues involving the linking of power in the modernising globally competitive universities. The dominant systems of economic rationalism and management theory are in many ways seen as incompatible with educational and social objectives which defy quantification, and

- power - issues arising from the requirement that universities comply with government funding systems and accountability in achieving the specific objectives of their political masters through the receiving of targeted funding.

These issues have resulted in changes to the employment relations in universities, more managers, and changes in the culture of the institutions (p.121). Marginson argues that these changes *per se* have created more transparency, public responsibility and accountability, and destruction of the "ivory tower". But narrow systems and lack of debate is an ongoing issue. Efforts to be globally competitive have led to standardisation of research. He believes that it is necessary to create universities that can combine social responsibility and transparency, political and social democracy, and cultural heterogeneity and internationalisation. Universities should become "sites of difference" (p.122).

The Australian Taskforce on Amalgamations (NBEET, 1989) was established to ensure that within the amalgamations, programmes from associate diploma
upwards were preserved, that there would continue to be programmes for disadvantaged groups, and that links with professional bodies, employers, and community organisations would be maintained. The latter point was strongly argued to be a crucial issue as the CAEs had made a valuable contribution to this area in the past. It is not clear, however, whether this issue contributed to creating a more diverse system, or whether it was a factor in the further blurring of the distinctions between higher education institutions.

Management issues were also a concern in the amalgamations. Different traditions relating to quality as a subjective or a performance measure, the role of central management versus devolved management, and internal versus external review processes (Goulter & Zimmer, 1994) were all a part of the institutional cultures that had to be blended.

Another concern was the size and location of institutions (Bradley, 1993; Dwyer, 1992). The issue here was the prevention of proximity overlaps, and the maintenance of provision in rural areas. Size became an exacerbated issue. Bradley claims that the dissociation of the University of New England was in part a result of there having been no prior articulation of a university mission, and of change having been forced without time for adequate consultation and establishment of a code for co-operation. Other issues included the rationalisation of courses, pressure on facilities such as libraries which were unable to cope with increased student numbers, and the development of new courses which were under-resourced.

Other researchers (Goedegebuure, Lysons, & Meek, 1993), however, claim that the size of an institution is an important factor in establishing its mission and determining its ability to compete - smaller institutions are in a weakened position, having fewer resources to invest in development.

It has been argued that loss of innovation in teaching should be another concern, though Karmel (1992) has argued that the assertion that the CAEs had a monopoly on teaching innovation was not established, and that innovation was more related to the age of the institution rather than its size.
The debate appears to have offered little to issues of gender equity, e.g. in terms of the effect on programmes such as nursing and teacher education which have had traditional links to the professions concerned, and which have always attracted women students in greater numbers. Such programmes themselves have been the subject of some research in the context of amalgamations, however (Nance & Fawnes, 1991; Williams et. al., 1995), particularly with respect to the public perception of them. Bradley (1993) argues that these programmes were mostly based in the CAEs before the unification, and as a result did not have a strong research culture. The amalgamations provided opportunity for research to develop, and as a result, for a broader knowledge base to be developed and expanded.

Moses' (1991) study showed that there were in fact no clear differences in an analysis of teaching staff profiles between the old and the new universities. She concluded, therefore, that the ending of the binary system presented a challenge to the privileged status held by the academics in the old universities. There is an argument, however, that the distinctions between the two sectors were in fact very blurred (Bradley, 1993), and that before the Dawkins reforms, the CAEs had in many cases been already getting “bigger and stronger” (though it is not clear what “stronger” means in this context). Notwithstanding, while institutions became more diverse, they also demonstrated much less consistency across the range of performance indicators used to measure their success (Stanley & Reynolds, 1994).

It is nevertheless arguable that the controversy surrounding the Dawkins reforms in fact affected and contributed to the outcomes. There is some evidence to show that many of the amalgamations were planned and coordinated, and that where staff were significantly involved in the planning and decision making, the outcomes were more beneficial (Mahony, 1994; 1995; Martin and Samels, 1994).
Some of the Benefits of Amalgamations

The establishment of some of the new universities in Australia was accompanied by a conscious effort to address the concerns of disadvantaged groups and their communities. Their mission statements argue that these issues are as important as scholarly research.

The University of South Australia statement (1991) is a good example:

*It represents one of the new breed of universities and must carve a niche in the higher education sector at a time when the role of universities in Australia is being reconceptualised as a result of the elimination of the binary system and when issues such as equity of access to education and the broadening of course offerings are of equal importance to the traditional university values of excellence in scholarship and research.*

(p. 1)

This new university, as with most of the new universities, was building on the strengths of the Colleges of Advanced Education.

This “massification” of higher education and the establishment of larger institutional units was leading to some universities taking a more influential role in the wider community. This was not without debate either, as the alternative view that universities should be elite in order to set and maintain the standards, be places where values are created, and have goals that create a better society and offer a high level of intellectualism was also expressed. This view of a university is contrary to the concept of a university as a place for professional training (Baldwin, 1991).

Course design and the role of the teacher as educator were perceived to be better in the Colleges of Advanced Education as a result of programmes being more highly structured, and the new universities set out to build on their previous strengths in applied research with strong links to the professions and industry rather than to compete on the same ground as the old universities (Gamage 1993, Mahony 1995).
This allowed the institutions to improve their marketability, encouraged growth in applied research for the private sector, and increased their autonomy in matters of accreditation. It also improved community relations and perceptions about them and made them more broadly attractive to both local and international students (Martin & Samels, 1994).

Gamage (1992a) also argues that the new universities enabled wider opportunities for students to progress from sub degree to postgraduate levels, that the development of more interfaculty courses enabled a combining of research energies and focus, and that being a university enabled the institutions to respond better to the demands of the professions for postgraduate qualifications. This was an important component in the "massification" of higher education which required the establishment of a level playing field for the institutions concerned (Lingard et al, 1994).

The establishment of centres of excellence for teaching and research led to advancements in science and technology in particular, and to changes in some of the established universities such as the University of Melbourne and Monash University which had amalgamated with colleges of advanced education (Maxwell & Shanahan, 1996).

The emergence of the professional doctorate degree has been a feature of the post-Dawkins reforms. The establishment of the Doctor of Education programmes for teachers and other professionals, for example, enabled greater innovation in applied research and research related to professional practice that had not so readily been accommodated in the traditional Ph.D. These were seen as a threat to the status of doctorates by some, but described by Cantor (1994) as part of the "wider debate reflecting the traditional tension between the two cultures of theory (academe) and practice" (cited in Maxwell & Shanahan, 1996: 8)

This trend towards professional doctorates, however, had already been established in North America where in a random month (May 1990), only 53% of doctorates granted in the USA were Ph.D.s (cited in Maxwell & Shanahan
1996:9 from the Dissertation Abstracts International). These doctorates differed only slightly in their requirements from Ph.D.s, and were an equivalent qualification, but were targeted at a different student population, which had a different orientation, and required different processes to reach the award.

This trend is an outcome of the enabling of new universities to be more entrepreneurial and proactive in advancing the quality and breadth of their services to the wider community, and not just for financial needs. Peters (1996) suggests that universities should also consider themselves as business units in order to blend the best of the innovation in research which occurs in universities so that the general population and business can both benefit.

There have been issues of status for vocational education as a result of the amalgamations (Bazely, 1994). There is evidence of greater overlap between university and non-university sectors with students having greater opportunity to follow on from TAFE courses into degree programmes in the same institution. Thus, the traditions of the “old polytechnics” have been melded with the new university models. An excellent example of this is provided in the Swinburn model where TAFE programmes were retained within the university (Mahony, 1995). Mahony also asserts that his study of the development of Swinburn challenged the government green and white papers which had argued that larger higher education institutions would be better than smaller ones. Amalgamation was to be a vital aid to institutional efficiency, but by maintaining a strong link with its TAFE commitments, Swinburn demonstrated an ability to enhance and improve the diversity of its courses, opportunities for staff, and staff satisfaction, while at the same time improving the quality of its courses. Swinburn’s argument was that institutions should not try to do everything, and that multiplication of courses was neither efficient nor necessary.

c Issues of Concern Surrounding Amalgamations

Most commentators agree that the universities dominated in the amalgamations (Alcorn, 1995; Bradley, 1993). Their values became the norm, and previous institutions lost their distinctive functions. It is also argued that this
distinctiveness had in fact been externally imposed to some extent as a result of
different funding arrangements and externally enforced status (Karmel, 1992).
Gamage (1992a) also cites evidence of hidden agendas which included campus
space, accommodation facilities, political agendas, staff titles and qualifications,
changes to which could all be threatening to the amalgamation processes.

There appears to be little in the Australian literature on the effects of the
amalgamations on the student experience. Little research has been conducted, and
few suggestions have been made as to the effects. What is evident, however, is
that the strong increase in student numbers cannot be attributed to the
amalgamations, but is probably more due to the increasing numbers of school
leavers entering the tertiary system. These have been accompanied by the
emergence of very large classes, pressure on facilities, new fee structures, student
loan schemes, and rising student discontent. All of these phenomena also exist in
New Zealand where amalgamations have not taken place, and where new
universities have not yet arisen.

The effects of amalgamations on staff in Australian universities were reported by
Hort & Oxley (1992) as reducing work satisfaction both in terms of the substance
and conditions of the workplace. The students were less satisfied, as was the
administration. Stress and tension were increased. Whether there was in fact a
causal relationship between amalgamations and these effects is not clear,
however, as it is likely that the same increase in stress and tension would have
been reported during these years in New Zealand institutions where
amalgamations did not take place, but where the pressures of reduced funding
and demands for greater accountability were imposed.

For staff in the new universities, the pressure to become academics in the
traditional university mould, to acquire higher degrees, to undertake research,
and to publish, have all been matters of internal concern. Staff have in many cases
found the aspects that have been most difficult to adapt to were research
methodology, data analysis, writing skills, and quantitative analysis (Alcorn,
1995; Bazely, 1994). For staff in the existing universities, the converse concerns
of having to share research funding with newcomers were also an issue, and in
fact were a major factor in protracting the unforced merger between the Lincoln Institute of Health Sciences and LaTrobe University (Gamage, 1992). Other issues for staff have included the need to identify barriers to research, collaborative networks, and research seminar opportunities.

d Implementation issues

It is acknowledged that all institutions of higher learning move slowly - they need to maintain a balance between industry and professional links, to give adequate consideration to issues of equity, and to provide transitional measures for students during periods of change while their profiles and research cultures are changing (Bradley, 1993; Gamage, 1993).

Amalgamation management also needs to consider the issues and factors that will add or detract from the new organisation (Gamage, 1992; 1993). These factors include mission and strategic goals, accommodation, academic staff profiles, status issues, and the focus of schools and faculties.

In the United Kingdom in 1992, most of the polytechnics being redesignated as universities did not seek radical name changes, except where an existing university already had claim to the obvious title, and adapted their names from the previous institution. In Australia, the names of some of the new universities bore no resemblance to that of their predecessor colleges (Goodegebuure, Lysons & Meek, 1993) particularly where the formation of the new university was from a conglomeration of former CAEs. Examples include Edith Cowan, Curtin, University of Western Sydney, Charles Sturt, and Southern Cross. Notwithstanding, the symbolism of a name is clearly an issue of at least local importance when amalgamation is taking place.

Naming, as pointed out in the introduction to this dissertation, was a key point of dissent between AIT and many other polytechnics in New Zealand in the late 1980s, and the trigger (see chapter 6) for AIT’s decision to seek university status.
AMALGAMATIONS IN NEW ZEALAND

Prior to 1990, the only tertiary amalgamations were between teachers' colleges. In Christchurch, the Christchurch Secondary Teachers' College merged with the Christchurch Primary Teachers' College in 1982, and in Auckland, the Ardmore Teachers' College merged with the Auckland Teachers' College in 1976, with the North Shore Teachers' College joining them in 1982. The Auckland Secondary Teachers' College and the Auckland Teachers' College, which shared the same campus in Epsom, completed this set of Auckland amalgamations in 1984, forming the Auckland College of Education.

McGrath (1988) appears to be the only author who has written anything about these amalgamations. This paper is essentially a discussion of the local issues involved in the merger between the primary and secondary colleges, but notes that the merger began as a resolution to "investigate the possible rationalisation of resources and administration on the Epsom campus" (p. 2) rather than from any philosophical belief that the merger might improve the quality of education offered at the two colleges.

Alcorn (1995) discussed the dilemmas and directions for the future of teacher education in the environment of possible mergers between the colleges of education and the universities, concluding that the Waikato experience highlighted a number of tensions that exist for teacher education being conducted within the context of a university (research v professional practice, theory v experience, skill development v independent learning, critiquing policy v being involved in it).

On 1 January 1991, the first amalgamation between different types of tertiary institution took place between the University of Waikato and the Hamilton Teachers' College. The process followed by these two institutions has been recorded by Smithells (1992).

Smithells also highlighted the paucity of the literature on tertiary amalgamations in New Zealand, and relied in large part on annual reports and similar documents.
for any background information. Her dissertation records in some detail the stages whereby the joint working party planned the amalgamation, but gives little background to the rationale for the merger, or any sense of the vision that gave rise to it. Since the two institutions were coexisting on the same site in the provincial city of Hamilton, and had already established a collaborative working relationship whereby the College managed teacher training and the University awarded a degree in education, it can be assumed that the merger was simply seen as an obvious path to follow. Smithells’ dissertation focused on the perceptions of staff about the amalgamation, and concluded that the process had been widely perceived as frustrating, with considerable criticism of the management of the process, and “while the joining of these two institutions will continue to be referred to as an amalgamation it is, in reality, a take-over or an absorption of the Hamilton Teachers’ College by the University of Waikato. The time ahead will, hopefully, heal any rifts and resolve issues” (p.82).

The second cross-sectoral amalgamation in New Zealand was between the Palmerston North College of Education and Massey University in April 1996 following resolution of a dispute between the Manawatu Polytechnic, the College, and the University over the ownership of shared buildings. The background to this amalgamation was published in the Proposal to Merge document of May 1995. As with the Waikato amalgamation, however, there is no evaluative report on the outcomes. And also, as with the Waikato amalgamation, no vision for the future is evident in the document which merely acknowledges that there had been a long-standing relationship between the institutions that had never been formalised, and that the respective councils of the two institutions were “firmly of the view that an amalgamation of the College and the University would be feasible and to the mutual advantage of the two institutions and the communities they serve” (p.3). The proposal is a detailed one setting out management arrangements, but like the Waikato amalgamation, essentially comprised a take-over of the College by the University while allowing the College to retain its identity as the College of Education within the University. No changes were intimated to the charter or vision documents of the University.
In both cases, these amalgamations resulted in the teacher education programmes being merged into a university faculty of education that had a traditional orientation toward the provision of programmes about education rather than an orientation towards the practice of teaching.

In summary, the New Zealand experience of amalgamations has been very limited. There is a paucity of literature and virtually no critical analysis of the issues they raised. There is little evidence that any of the mergers were pursued for reasons other than achieving economies of scale. No real debate appears to have taken place about the educational advantages of merging with other institutions, and no significant research has been carried out to assess the effects of the mergers.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH IN NEW UNIVERSITIES

The development of a research culture and the enhancement of research in an organisation have been the subjects of many researchers (Schweitzer, 1988; Neumann & Finaly-Neumann, 1990; Poole, 1991; Bazeley, 1994; Harman & Wood, 1990; Wood, 1990).

There is not any consensus about which factors are most important in the enhancement of research activity, but there are some common themes that emerge. These include:

- collegial interaction between researchers;
- the existence of strong role models;
- the existence of a research culture which gives stimulation from colleagues;
- personal motivation; and
- the existence of necessary basic resources (time, library and laboratory space etc.).
These factors would seem to identify the essential issues that need to be attended to in any attempt to plan for an infrastructure in which a research culture can be developed.

The challenges therefore are extensive, and include the following:

a. Research skills development (the provision of training and development programmes that address specific individual and discipline needs together with skills in research leadership, project management, marketing, publishing, and technology use);

b. Human resource support for research development (assessing the current and potential contribution of the administrative units of the institution to contribute to the research profile, and introducing more flexible staffing procedures that will enable administrative staff to be released for research activity where funding is available);

c. Developing research centres (through encouraging collaborative ventures by promoting research capabilities to external agencies, providing seeding funding, providing funding for major conference and dissemination activities, and the targeting of outstanding individuals for assistance in developing competitive proposals);

d. Developing research groups both within the faculties and across faculties and divisions;

e. Establishing research institutes to promote research and postgraduate activities at both national and international levels;

f. Seeking joint funding by promoting joint academic appointments, joint postgraduate scholarships, joint industry scholarships, collaborative research programmes with external agencies, and the commercial development of discoveries;
g External promotion through the production of annual research reports, publications highlighting current research activities, and the targeting of specific publications to promote the research work of the institute;

h Internal promotion through internal newsletters and the encouragement of guest lectures, seminars, performances and exhibitions;

i Establishing targets for the proportion of students undertaking postgraduate research degrees (say 5% of EFTS);

j Increasing the funding for research by enhancing the skills of key people in the preparation of applications for funding, and establishing a research grants office to publish sources of funding and assist in the application process. This would also include encouraging staff to seek industry funding for research, and the promotion and support of joint appointments with industry and public sector organisations;

k Encouraging collaborative research through the identification of research strategic alliances with other universities, both nationally and internationally, the provision of study leave programmes to enable staff to be visiting fellows at overseas universities, and the encouragement of staff to become involved in the editorship of international publications;

l Upgrading the infrastructure for research by providing dedicated research facilities, equipment, and information technology, and allocating priority infrastructure to research centres and research groups where accepted research management plans have been developed;

m Ongoing development and evaluation of the institutional research management plan, including regular reporting of progress made, and undertaking both internal and external review of research outcomes from each faculty or division of the institute; and,
n The appointment of new staff with research experience to positions arising through growth or when staff replacements are being sought.

In Britain, 29% of the total higher education budget is devoted to research (Johnes, 1996). This is allocated as a consequence of the Higher Education Quality Council's research assessment exercise (RAE). The 1994 RAE indicates that research assessment is conducted on a faculty by faculty basis by a process of peer review, and that issues considered include:

- number of staff in the faculty
- age ranking of the faculty concerned
- number of publications produced by the faculty in the assessment period
- number and value of research grants and income
- student loads
- numbers of research staff and postgraduate research students

The faculties nominate a range of research publications deemed to be representative of their work, and most of the research funding is subsequently allocated using the RAE results in an attempt to put the funding where the research is judged to be of the highest quality. Research councils are also able to fund specific research projects on a competitive basis.

Johnes (1996) argues that this process in Britain encouraged homogeneity in research activity as a result of the universities being required to compete for high RAE rankings. He argues that this blurs the sectorial distinction between degree granting institutions, and that this in turn is driving change in the vocational and further education sectors.

Other effects of this policy include (Wilson, 1995):

- universities attempting to maximise research reporting by splitting research reports into several individual parts;
• periodic high levels of staff transfer as academics are lured to other institutions in time to have their work available for the RAE;

• changes in appointment processes which prioritise the appointment of staff with strong publication records rather than younger staff who will lower the average outputs; and,

• lowering the status of good teachers vis a vis good researchers, and the encouragement of staff to turn to research rather than teaching.


These are important issues for new universities. Bazely (1994) found that all the new universities in Australia fell short of the established universities in their research outputs. Harman & Wood’s (1990) study of five universities in NSW had also shown this to be the case. As Bazely points out, however, this was not surprising, given that in the CAEs more time had traditionally been spent on teaching, that teaching loads were still higher than in the traditional universities, and that researchers needed more support and collegial help.

Some factors that have been shown to help to increase research productivity (Bazely, 1994) include:

• collegial interaction between colleagues;

• the provision of strong role models;

• intrinsic as opposed to extrinsic motivation;

• the provision of a culture and environment conducive to research; and,

• the provision of time, library facilities, laboratory space, and equipment (though the absence of these is not necessarily an impediment to the highly motivated researcher).

Bazely concludes that the development of a research culture is something that requires a deliberate institutional planning strategy, monetary assistance and infrastructural support, active policies to expand postgraduate education, changes
in staff expectations, special incentives (promotion, study leave, annual awards), and commitment to research by faculty management. Baldwin (1991) suggests that learning how to get a paper published is important and that there is a strong relationship between a published paper and a successful grant application.

Some major questions arise - will research continue to be the major measure of prestige and status for a university, is this measure one that has been promoted by the traditional universities in order to enhance their own status, and is there really a measurable correlation between the quality of research in a university and the quality of its teaching? Ramsden (1991) points out that the traditional performance indicators in the universities have focused on research rather than teaching, and recommended the use of student experience questionnaires as a tool to redress this imbalance. The quality of research is constantly under review by researchers, but the quality of teaching in universities, it seems, is a more secondary issue, and has never been measured against or correlated with the research outputs of those involved.

While the New Zealand Education Act (1989) requires of a university that its teaching and research be interdependent, this interdependence has never been demonstrated as a causal relationship. Indeed the insistence that teachers should be researchers implies that both activities are best carried out part time, and it could be in fact be argued that scholarship is the best adjunct to teaching.

Notwithstanding, it is important, particularly for an institution seeking university status in an environment that requires it to demonstrate the interdependence of teaching and research, that some means of encouraging this interdependence be found. Hattie and Marsh (1996) suggest that this may be difficult. Their summary of 58 studies in different universities was comprehensive, but concluded an almost zero correlation between teaching and research.

Closer examination of this paper, however, indicates that the low correlation is between a subset of research (measures of research productivity), and a subset of teaching (students' evaluations of the quality of pedagogy). This implies a need for further research to investigate why there is not greater integration and
application between research and teaching. For common sense would tell us that research-based teaching, assuming the research is relevant, is likely to be better than research-free teaching (MacPherson, 1997).

RESEARCH PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

1 “Linke” indicators

The Linke indicators for research are summarised in table 1 below. Each of these indicators is measured (at the university level) per ten full time academic staff or equivalent (EAS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research higher degree productivity rate.</td>
<td>Ratio of research higher degree completions per 10 EAS for Masters by research and PhD degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of research grants and value of research grants (two separate indicators).</td>
<td>Average number (and value) of external research grants awarded from Government or State public authorities, private organisations or foundations, and overseas sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff support from external research grants.</td>
<td>Percentage of academic staff directly involved in or supported by external research grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average publication rate.</td>
<td>Average number of publications per year in the categories of books and monographs (differently weighted), refereed journal articles, published conference papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity rate of other original works.</td>
<td>Average number of other original works per year in the categories of public broadcasts, recordings, or exhibitions including contributions as author, editor or composer, registered patents, inventions or designs, and commercial and other published computer software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid consultancy rate.</td>
<td>Average number of paid consultancies, each valued at a minimum of $1,000 for client groups of Government, other public authorities, private organisations, and overseas organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: “Linke performance indicators for research
2 Performance Evaluation Group Indicators

In Australia in 1992, a Performance Evaluation Group surveyed all Australian Research Council large and small grant applicants. Only seven indicators were ranked among the four highest for each major disciplinary grouping. They were:

- articles in refereed journals;
- commercially published peer reviewed books;
- major refereed conference presentations;
- papers in refereed conference proceedings;
- articles weighted by journal citation impact;
- chapters in commercially published peer reviewed books; and
- competitive, peer reviewed grants.

In 1993, this survey was revisited by the Centre for Research Policy, University of Wollongong. They found that

"PEG preferred indicators can be used as a basis for capturing research output system-wide that is more oriented towards communication with broad international audiences, but that within internal institutional assessments and in field of research assessments, the primacy of indicators and wider inclusions, for example, of "unpublished reports to government" or "unpublished conference papers" be reassessed for the specific field of research situation" (NBEET, 1994).

3 "Hattie" indicators

As part of a DEET funded project, the views of all Heads of Department at the University of Western Australia were sought. The questionnaire was “designed to determine the relative importance of various indicators for measuring the research achievement, attainments and attributes of the different departments” (Hattie, 1990:42).

From that questionnaire, “a list of performance indicators that were considered suitable for all departments” was drawn up. In order of preference, they were:

- number of articles in refereed journals of repute;
- number of books;
- reputation of a department;
• journal article quality;
• number of monographs;
• selection to editorial boards, scientific panels, research councils and advisory boards;
• number of chapters;
• invitations to deliver keynote address at conferences;
• election to learned academies or select societies;
• number of invited and guest lectures given;
• thesis examination;
• dollar value of internal research grants; and
• research expenditure over reference period.

It is worth noting that this list of performance indicators omits public performance and exhibition of creative works, presumably reflecting a university that does not have a department of fine or performing arts.

The development of research in an institution where teaching has been the dominant activity, however, demands a shift in workplace culture, and requires significant workplace learning.

Clarifying the focus of change, making change organisational and systemic, and deploying resources to spur change have all been identified (Fullen, 1993: 60-61) as crucial factors in organisational learning. This theme is also taken up by others (Senge, 1990; Argyris and Schon, 1978; Barth, 1990; and Garvin, 1993) who identify leadership and management of change as ingredients in the establishment of a learning organisation.

Holliday's (1994:2) definition of workplace learning posits that "conditions of workplace learning are states of being, thinking, or acting that promote, through their presence, processes of learning". None of these conditions, however, are likely to emerge without leadership that values and encourages them.

Fullen (1993: 70-74) expands on the role of the leader, but cautions against the traditional view of a leader as the charismatic hero who feeds on the assumption of other people’s powerlessness. He cites Senge in describing the best leaders as those who design rather than crusade, who become stewards of broader purposes for the organisation rather than decision makers and problem solvers, and who
become teachers fostering learning for everyone, helping people throughout the organisation to develop systemic understandings.

He does not, however, promote directionless "groupthink" (uncritical acceptance and/or suppression of dissent in going along with group decisions), nor "balkanisation" (the formation of strong loyalties within groups that result in indifference or hostility to other groups). But he does conclude that the improvement of learning situations requires becoming involved in the wider environment in which the organisation exists without losing focus on its key mission.

**CONCLUSION**

The literature review has shown that while there is no definitive descriptor for the meaning of a university, there are some defining characteristics of a university that seem to be agreed to in the three countries considered. These include the ability to award degrees, the possession of quality assurance mechanisms that ensure the ongoing credibility of the qualifications awarded, and the existence of a research culture that informs the processes of teaching and learning. The point at which a non-university institution that has these characteristics can be considered to be a university, however, is not clear. In the UK there is a continuing move by institutions to seek university status, while in Australia this is not currently a significant issue since most publicly funded tertiary institutions are either universities already, or do not have degree awarding powers.

In New Zealand the Education Act provides a qualitative definition of a university, but this definition requires further interpretation which in 1995 had not yet been forthcoming. There have been no new universities established in the last decade, nor have there been any amalgamations of polytechnics with universities, and there are therefore no contemporary precedents to follow. The only two amalgamations involving universities were those of Waikato and Massey with their adjacent Colleges of Education, and there is little reported in the literature on the issues surrounding these events.
The literature from the Australian reforms of the late 1980s where the CAEs either became universities or amalgamated with universities has shown that the driving force behind these reforms was the desire by Government to achieve greater efficiency. The issues arising from these changes which are relevant to the AIT case study include concerns at the possible loss of diversity in the tertiary sector, and the need to develop the research cultures of those organisations that became universities, in many cases without adequate planning. Since there is no evidence of any research-based case for the Australian higher education system to revert to a binary division, it can be concluded that these reforms were largely successful, that the system is more efficient and entrepreneurial, and that the coexistence of teaching and a research culture has been positive for the institutions concerned.

The AIT case study, which is the substance of this dissertation, provides new perspectives on the definition of a university in the New Zealand context through an analysis of the ways in which the Institution tested the definition of a university as set out in the Education Act.

In addition to assisting AIT in the articulation of its case for university status, the literature review has also been used to inform the Institution regarding the changes it needed to make, especially in its research activity, to successfully achieve university status.
This chapter considers the key questions established in chapter 1 in order to select an appropriate research methodology.

Justification is provided for the use of an interpretive approach within the context of a case study of AIT during the years 1995–1998. This research is aimed at providing a greater understanding of the directions that AIT chose, and it is posited that this can only be achieved through an unravelling of the complex interactions between the policy, legislative, and social forces that prevailed during the period under study.

The role of the researcher in this study is also a critical issue. This is described as one of participant observer. The way in which this role has been acknowledged and accounted for in the case study is therefore discussed, along with a summary of the sources of data used and how the data was collected.

SELECTION OF A RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In 1995 I set about the task of constructing a case for AIT to be given university status. There were no precedents to follow in New Zealand, though colleges of advanced education in Australia and polytechnics in the UK had become universities in the previous seven years. However, institutions in these countries exist in a different legislative framework than is the case in New Zealand.

It was at this point, therefore, that my research began. Tentative questions to be addressed at the outset included:
1 What is a university, and how is it to be distinguished from any other tertiary institution?

2 How does AIT match up against the characteristics of a university set out in the Education Act, and what changes would AIT have to make in order to demonstrate conformity with these characteristics?

The initial application that I completed in November 1995 required me also to identify the alternative legal pathways to follow for an institution seeking university classification in New Zealand.

AIT’s application for university status became the catalyst for a widespread national debate which was carried out in the media, within the universities and allied associations, within the polytechnics, and with members of Parliament. The process of consultation meant that the debate was furthered in professional and employer groups. Over the next three years, the process of reaching an official position on whether or not an institution could be reclassified as a university, the process by which this would be determined, and the grounds on which such a determination could be made became clearer, as did the effect of AIT’s application on the rest of the tertiary sector in New Zealand.

By 1998 when I came to recast the case for AIT to be established as a university, answers had emerged to the above two questions. In the case of question 2, the answers had not only been identified, but also implemented. But the processes of the previous three years had raised further research questions.

3 What challenges did AIT’s application present to the traditional concept of a university in New Zealand, and how did the other New Zealand tertiary institutions respond to this challenge?

4 What were the factors that led AIT to consider a merger with CIT and ACE, and why did the merger fail?
What are the implications of impending university status for AIT, and its strategic options for the future?

These are the five research questions that are addressed in this thesis.

Candy (1989) posits that educational research has been influenced by three different intellectual traditions, viz. positivistic, interpretive, and critical.

**Positivist approaches** derive from a general philosophical belief that "positive" knowledge can solve major practical problems, and that knowledge can only be advanced by means of observation and experiment (Cohen & Manion, 1985:12). From such assumptions the implementation of "scientific method" is derived where a hypothesis is proposed, and empirical or experimental inquiry which looks for invariant causal relationships seeks to disprove the hypothesis. Positivistic research focuses on causal motives rather than focusing on the intentions, values, attitudes, and beliefs that influence behaviours.

**Interpretive approaches** are based on an epistemological framework seeking an interpretive account of phenomena. Assumptions commonly shared by interpretive theorists include (Candy, 1989:4):

1. the belief that any event or action is explicable in terms of multiple interacting factors, events, and processes, and that causes and effects are mutually interdependent;

2. an acceptance of the extreme difficulty in attaining complete objectivity, especially in observing human subjects who construe, or make sense of, events based on their individual systems of meaning;

3. the view that the aim of the inquiry is to develop an understanding of individual cases, rather than universal laws or generalisations;

4. the assumption that the world is made up of tangible and intangible multifaceted realities, and that these are best studied as a unified whole, rather than being fragmented into dependent and independent variables (in other words, context makes a difference);
a recognition that inquiry is always value-laden, and that such values inevitably influence the framing, bounding, and focusing of research problems.

Phenomenology, ethnomethodology, and symbolic interactionism are all grounded in the interpretive approach. Each is based on an intention to seek a coherence that will understand and explain insights with consistency, not seeking to reinterpret the past, but to provide deeper, more extensive, and more systematic descriptions of what happened from the point of view of the subjects involved.

Critical approaches are based on the belief that research can legitimately look beyond the perceptions of individuals to the factors which influence such perceptions:

"The very process whereby one interprets and defines a situation is itself a product of the circumstances in which one is placed" (Cohen & Manion, 1985:38).

Candy (1985:7) claims that the beliefs underlying critical research can be summarised within the following guiding assumptions:

1 much human action is outside the conscious control of the personal agency, and is embedded in social conditions beyond the consciousness of the actors involved;

2 any interpretive explanation makes sense against a background of social rules, practices and beliefs, and there is thus a "logic of the situation" which differs from the "logic of causes";

3 unless research is restricted to merely recording actors' interpretations and understandings, it inevitably involves the reformulating or "resymbolising" of events or expressions which is an act of construction rather than discovery;

4 researchers make use of expert knowledge that potentially sets them apart from the subjects being researched and which gives them access to a specialised language of interpretation not accessible to the people being studied; and

5 intentional agency may be frustrated by social rules, by constitutive meanings of the social order ... and the core project ... is one of human liberation and emancipation.
Thus, critical approaches are both dialectic and transformative. They are not only focused solely on critical self-reflection, but coupled with action for change. They are directed towards subjective or social transformation rather than objective description.

While none of these three approaches is mutually exclusive, and each has some features in common with the others, the research questions listed above can be most usefully addressed through an interpretive approach. Using Candy's paradigm, it is clear that:

1. The events and actions involved in AIT's becoming a university can really only be explained through analysis of the interacting policy, legislation, and social forces that came into play as the process of the application took place.

2. The fundamental beliefs held by most key decision makers about what a university and a polytechnic should be meant that almost all evaluations were subjective.

3. The research is essentially aimed at providing a greater understanding of the directions AIT has chosen, rather than attempting to come to a generalised conclusion about the strategic directions of other institutions.

4. This understanding cannot be achieved without a deep understanding of the context in which AIT persisted with its application.

5. The research has been conducted in an environment where terms such as "academic", "university", "research", and "learning" are heavily value laden.

The research questions set out above, in addition, are centred around a particular case: the Auckland Institute of Technology. The research is therefore a case study.

A case study has been described (Yin, 1989:23) as
"an empirical inquiry that
• investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when
• the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which
• multiple sources of evidence are used"

The phenomenon in this study is the process of AIT deciding and then proceeding to seek university status. The context is the confluence of the New Zealand tertiary education sector at the time when it began to internationalise, and the New Zealand legislation which establishes the broad characteristics of polytechnics and universities, but which lacks clarity in defining classes of institution which have many overlaps and between which the boundaries are considerably blurred. This study also uses multiple sources of evidence including submissions from many institutions and organisations, minutes of meetings and working groups, reports, data gathered by other researchers, media reports, and qualitative and quantitative data gathered from within the institution.

Adelman et al (1976:6) say that case study research always involves “the study of an instance in action”, and that case study research may be initially set up in one of two ways:

1. An issue or hypothesis is given, and a bounded system (the case) is selected as an instance drawn from a class...

2. A bounded system is given within which issues are indicated, discovered or studied so that a tolerably full understanding of the case is possible.

This study investigates a period of complex change in the years following the Education Amendment Act 1989 when the boundaries between AIT and its context (both national and international) were by no means clearly evident and where numerous external influences impacted on the Institution. The case (AIT) is also a bounded system consistent with the second category proposed by Adelman et al above, even though the boundaries for AIT are not isolated from the contextual changes of the educational environment.
In order to develop a fuller understanding of the environment and processes involved in AIT's application to become a university, the consequential changes that took place in the organisation, and the impact of the quest for university status on the tertiary sector in New Zealand, the focus of the research has been the unravelling of the linkages between:

a changes in the tertiary systems in Australia, the United Kingdom, and the way in which both these and AIT's application impacted on the New Zealand system;

b changing concepts of a university in the context of the massification of tertiary education and the changing demands of professions and the community for higher qualifications;

c varying interpretations of the Education Amendment Act, 1989 and its intent with respect to the classification of tertiary institutions;

d changes in the political structures of New Zealand in the mid to late 1990s; and

e changes in the strategic directions of AIT as it moved to become established as a university.

The research is in part based on the proposition that AIT's evolution into a university questioned the interpretation of the concept of a university in the New Zealand context. The investigation also examines some of the internal changes that AIT itself experienced during the period of the study. These include changed directional strategies (including consideration of merging with other institutions as a form of institutional change), changed internal funding priorities, and a modification in the values of the organisation as it moved to embrace a research culture.

A case study is entirely appropriate for research in instances such as these, because a transactional or interpretive approach is more adaptable and flexible in
an investigation contextually surrounded by a range of interactive influences and value systems.

While this is not an evaluative study, to a very large extent the questions about the capacity of AIT to meet the guidelines for interpretation of the sections of the Education Act that set out the characteristics of universities are evaluative. In addition, many of the decisions taken by AIT in its quest for university status (decisions relating to strategy, consideration of potential merger options, and decisions relating to research enhancement) required extensive evaluation.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines evaluate as “... ascertain amount of; find numerical expression for, appraise, assess; ...”. This implies that both quantitative and qualitative elements may be involved. Norris (1990:97) claims that it is generally assumed that evaluation is the application of research methods to elucidate a problem of action. Hence, evaluation may be seen as an extension of research, sharing its methods and methodology, and requiring similar skills.

Evaluation has come to be associated with social improvement, through the application of scientific methodology for the improvement and more effective management and policy making in social or political affairs, particularly related to education, health, and welfare, though the “fourth generation” approaches (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) appear to represent a change in direction.

Most of the information required for this dissertation is “hard” and already available. The “softer” information relates to intent, reputation, and community expectations, and can therefore be appropriately assembled using a “fourth generation” or constructivist model which probes the way in which stakeholders perceived AIT’s application for university status as well as allowing for the traditional collection of data.

Evaluation is therefore an appropriate component of the research described in this dissertation, for evaluation quite naturally takes its place in an interpretive approach to social research.
At the heart of the debate surrounding the nature of educational research has been the question as to the extent to which educational research should be based on the aims and empirical methods of established science, as opposed to focusing on the subjective explanations of how people attribute meaning to their circumstances and how they develop and make use of rules which govern their behaviours. Evaluation provides a bridge between these issues, allowing for both empirical data gathering, and the subjective interpretation of it.

Owen (1993:3) lists the most likely objects for an evaluation as planning, programmes, policies, organisations, products, or individuals. He claims (p.14) that the purposes of evaluation are enlightenment, accountability, improvement, classification, development, or symbolic (though he dismisses the latter as an invalid use of an evaluator’s time).

“Evaluation is thought of and funded as a utilitarian enterprise. It is usually justified in terms of the political or administrative need for the information it produces and its capacity to rationalise social policy making ... evaluation can be seen as a way of generating feedback for the purposes of programme or policy improvement.” (Norris, 1990:49)

Many of the measures considered in this dissertation are performance indicators. These are common evaluation instruments, and have been applied to most outputs of educational organisations, including research targets, equity targets, staffing and student profiles, accreditation targets, and so on. More recently they have been increasingly focused on the teaching functions of universities and colleges, and applied through student evaluation instruments to measure the teaching and organisational units of the organisations concerned (Ramsden, 1991).

In this study, performance indicators have been applied to the definition of a university, and in AIT’s case, its ability to achieve university status will have depended on the satisfaction of a wide range of performance indicators.

But consideration of the data used in this dissertation is also related to key evaluation questions which are in turn centred around such questions as “to what
extent does...?”; “Is there...?”; “In what ways...?” which Owen (1993:50) describes as evaluative data management.

Case studies have a distinctive place in evaluative and interpretive research (Patton, 1989) as they can help to explain causal links in real-life situations. The case study method is also appropriate where the circumstances are changeable, the context is evolving, and flexibility and adaptability are necessary (Anderson, 1990). As a key focus of this study is an analysis of the factors that were identified by the NZQA as needing attention for improvement in AIT’s university status quest, the evaluation is formative in that it can be expected “to feed back and improve on-going practice” (Anderson, 1990:165).

Interpretive research using a case study is also an appropriate methodology when attempting to identify specific features of an organisation and show how they influence or are influenced by the way the organisation functions. One of the assumptions underlying qualitative research is that reality is ever changing, it is not a “fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured,...what is being observed are people’s constructions of reality, how they understand the world” (Merriam, 1988:167).

The case study method was therefore chosen as the overriding model because of its strength in allowing the researcher to concentrate on a specific situation (AIT’s application) and to identify the various processes at work (Bell, 1993). But at times within this case study, an evaluative approach has been taken because it provides “an emphasis on process - how things happen rather than whether a particular outcome was reached: and there is a concern with meaning - how the various participants see and understand what happened” (Bogdan & Birklan, 1992:204).

The validity of a case study depends on the researcher showing that constructions of reality are adequate and honest representations of how the participants in the study view themselves and their experiences (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984).
It is difficult to ensure reliability in an interpretive case study that attempts to record change, growth, or development. But the focus on reliability has been on the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the data (Bogdan & Birklan, 1992) and the fit between what was recorded and what was actually occurring in the organisation during the period in which the study was undertaken.

To ensure validity and reliability, I therefore sought to obtain “internal criticism” (Charles, 1995) by asking colleagues who were engaged with me at the time to read the relevant draft sections of my dissertation and to correct my perceptions and interpretation of the various events recorded.

This study is centred on the translation of AIT into a university characterised by a focus on applied research and the provision of degrees related to the needs of the professions, and how the complex issues of this process interrelated with the concurrent negotiations in 1996/97 to merge with two other institutions, one of which was a polytechnic (CIT), and the other of which was a college of education (ACE).

These merger negotiations considered both an intra-sectoral amalgamation, and an inter-sectoral amalgamation, with the sum of the three institutions seeking a further cross-sectoral classification. Although the merger failed, it did catalyse other merger proposals in New Zealand which further tested, in the courts, the sections of the Education Act that AIT was challenging.

The legal and political issues have been examined, along with the ways in which the requirements of the legislation with respect to the characteristics of a university and the process of the merger negotiations themselves affected the nature and internal culture of AIT.

While I was a participant observer in both the articulation of the case and the promotion of it to the key stakeholders involved, the essential decision making belonged to the governing bodies of the institutions concerned, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, and the politicians.
The guidelines for the establishment of a university are both quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative components of the guidelines have led to a collection of data which allowed for a detailed empirical analysis of the institution which, along with a detailed analysis of the qualitative components of the guidelines, provided a basis for strategic decisions to be made, aimed at achieving the goals of the Institute.

Five components of case study research design have been identified (Yin, 1989) as follows:

1. **Identification of the study questions or problems**

There are five critical questions which have been outlined above. These five questions will enable the research propositions to be examined.

2. **Identification of the propositions which direct attention to what should be examined within the study**

In this study it is proposed that the justifying reasons for AIT's application to become a university were based on international trends in Australia and the United Kingdom, where the former CAEs and Polytechnics became universities offering a range of applied degree programmes not offered in the traditional universities, and that the process of making the application itself triggered an internal shift towards a research culture which was not previously evident. It is also argued that the move to university status was a key factor in the decisions by ACE and CIT to consider an amalgamation with AIT, that the proposed merger between the Wellington Polytechnic and Massey University was also a direct result of AIT's quest for university status, as was the application by the UNITEC Institute of Technology for university status, and the proposal arising within the Association of Polytechnics in New Zealand, APNZ, for the formation of a New Zealand University of Technology.

The linkages between these events and changes have been made with the support of a collection of notes from interviews and discussions with key participants,
field notes, and the views of others expressed in a variety of publications between 1995 and 1998.

3 **Identification of the units of analysis**

The unit of analysis is AIT. Within the institution, attention has been focused on the views of internal stakeholders, strategic decisions made by senior management with respect to priorities given to new developments, the financial priorities given to research, staff recruitment patterns, and to changes in the student enrolment profiles.

4 **Linking the data collected to the propositions**

This has taken place throughout the investigation. Because the outcomes of both the university classification request and the mergers were not known until well after the study had commenced, the data did not exist at the outset of the research, and as it emerged, even some of the original propositions had to change.

5 **Identification of the criteria for interpretation of the findings**

As stated above, this interpretive case study has been designed as a practical reflective activity where the research itself as it proceeded informed the decision making centred on the issues around which the study is based.

It is proposed in this thesis that AIT's application to become a university began a process which brought about significant changes to the strategic directions of the institution. To test this proposition, it has been necessary to identify the educational culture of AIT for the purposes of this research, and to undertake a qualitative study of this.

Schein (1992:12) defines the culture of a group as
A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.

This definition of culture does not include overt patterns of behaviour, but the overt behaviours of a group are determined by both the cultural predisposition (i.e. the perceptions, thoughts, and feelings that are patterned) and the situational contingencies that arise from the external environment (Schein, 1992:14). Thus, while the essence of a group's culture is its pattern of shared assumptions, it will be manifested by its observed behaviours, and can be analysed through investigation of visible artefacts; espoused values, rules, and behavioural norms; and tacit, basic, underlying assumptions.

In the context of this dissertation, it is proposed that the significant culture shift was from a widely held view that AIT primarily existed to provide teaching and where research was of minor importance, towards a view that both teaching and research were of more equal importance. This has been manifested not only through a quantifiable increase in research outputs, but also by changes in institutional policies and procedures, changes in the criteria for the promotion of lecturing staff, changes in criteria for the recruitment and appointment of new teaching staff, changes in staff development activity, changes in budget priorities, and changes in the perceptions of teaching staff about the place and value of research.

**The role of the researcher**

In New Zealand, the Education Act defines the most senior person in a tertiary institution as the Chief Executive Officer, CEO. In the universities, this person is called the Vice Chancellor (a protected term which cannot be used outside of a university). In some polytechnics the title CEO is normally used, while in others the term used is Director, or Principal. At AIT, the CEO has the title of President.
My title at AIT is Vice President. My counterparts in other polytechnics are often called deputy CEOs, and in universities, Deputy Vice Chancellors. My range of responsibilities is fairly broad, and includes responsibility for academic and international affairs.

It was from within this senior role in AIT with responsibility for academic matters that I agreed in 1995 to develop the case for AIT to seek university classification, the subject of this dissertation. The effort and time involved dominated my workload over the next three years, but placed me in a unique position to collect and assemble a very comprehensive file of records and other data relevant to both the university quest and the merger negotiations that AIT was involved in during this period. The merger and university status issues were never separable, and as the research shows, decisions about mergers were only made in the context of the question “will this help or hinder our university status case?”

My research therefore needs to be understood in this context. I have been at all times a participant-observer. This is common in case studies and in critical social research, but needs to be declared and acknowledged. At times I have felt too close to the action to be able to “read” the situation dispassionately, though no researcher is ever totally dispassionate or neutral, as we all carry our values with us into whatever we observe. At other times, as different results emerged in the process of AIT’s quest for university status, I have felt a range of personal emotions which have further highlighted my close association with the matters I have been researching and confirmed my subjectivity. In order to move beyond my own subjectivity, it has therefore been important for me to seek external input to my own perceptions.

As well, in writing this dissertation, it has often been difficult for me to remember to write about background or matters of detail that I have come to take for granted. I discussed these dilemmas with a senior colleague who had not been involved with AIT’s case for university status or its merger discussions, and expressed the paradox that if she were undertaking this research, she would probably interview me at length as a primary source of information, but that as the researcher I had far less opportunity to identify another primary informant.
She therefore suggested that she interview me in order to ask some of the questions I might not think to ask of myself. This exercise transpired to be particularly helpful.

It has also been very helpful in this context to have been supervised in the writing of this thesis by a senior academic from an Australian university. Not having the detailed knowledge of the New Zealand tertiary sector that a New Zealand academic might have had has led him to ask many questions that might otherwise have been thought obvious or taken for granted.

I have also been very conscious in my discussions with key individuals outside of AIT that I was known to be a strong advocate for the Institute's university status quest, and that their communications with me about it, particularly when they were opposing AIT, would probably have been different had I been perceived only as a neutral observer or researcher. As a result I have had to rely more on their public and written statements than any private records of their perceptions.

Consequently, it has been necessary for me to seek intersubjectivity as a participant observer. Babbie (1992) defines this as "enlisting the assistance of others as you begin to refine your theoretical conclusion". I have therefore sought throughout to validate my own perceptions of events by checking them against the data. I have found that often it is best to do this by waiting until some months after a key event before reviewing and writing up the events, thus distancing myself from the emotions of the time, and enabling reflectivity. I have discovered often in the course of this research that close examination of a document received up to a year previously revealed more than I had read in it when it was received. I have also validated my understanding of events by regularly asking questions of other colleagues working with me through the various elements of the matters being researched (How do you see this? ... what do you think is happening? ... Why do you think X did this?, and so on).

I do not think, however, that my role as participant-observer has at any point been at one or other of the two ends of the continuum between complete participant or complete observer. For while I have taken a key role (arguably a
pivotal role) in the university status application, it has never been an exercise that could have been carried out by just one person, and I have therefore had the involvement of many others to protect me from becoming a captive of my own perceptions alone.

It is not necessary for the researcher to be a neutral observer provided there is frequent and meaningful interaction between the participants (Guba and Lincoln, 1989) and that there is reflexive and constant identification of and confrontation with any presuppositions (Harvey, 1990) where the research design is emerging and the participants are actively involved in the inquiry itself. This is what I have tried to do throughout this study.

**DATA COLLECTION**

The collection of data in this study has entirely been performed by me. It has been assembled through a systematic filing in chronological order of all material that came to my attention relating to

- university definitions
- mergers
- research enhancement in new universities
- changes in educational policy that could have any relationship to AIT’s university quest

The literature review was also built around these areas.

These files, most of which have now been stored in the archives of the AIT library, have been supplemented by field notes recorded after or during meetings and discussions with key individuals. The field note material that has been retained is personal, recording personal perceptions and my own value judgements about what was happening. Rather than conducting formal interviews, I gave copies of early drafts of relevant sections of this dissertation to key informants who were asked to correct or confirm the accuracy of what I had written. Their comments were used to change my script where necessary.
Most, if not all of the printed materials were shared with those colleagues with whom I was working on the university status and merger cases. These colleagues have been able to verify the accuracy of the materials, and a regular dialectical exchange with these personnel has therefore been an inherent part of the research.

As stated above, critical reflection has been a key factor to be valued between my colleagues and me, and has occurred in the context of our regular meetings between 1995 and 1998. The results of the research have also been shared freely with the executive of AIT on an ongoing basis. This dialogue has critically scrutinised the ongoing validity of the research findings as they emerged.

The account is in large part experiential, looking at the experience of AIT in seeking a status change in the context of a legislative prescription that had never been previously tested. Cocker (1996) points out that the process of learning from experience is an historical one. This thesis therefore provides an historical account of events, with the method of explication, in some parts, being that of historical narrative as elaborated by Hexter (1971). It has been argued by Castles (1989: 11) that a sense of history is a serious gap in contemporary policy analysis, "a lacuna which can probably only be properly remedied by a focus on the experience of particular cases."

All internal changes within the institution that were considered to be relevant to the mergers or the university classification have been identified over the period 1995-1998, and linked to the propositions of the research.

Sources of Data

I have utilised a number of sources of evidence to create a case study data base and develop a "chain of evidence" (Yin, 1989). This has included:

1. Information relating to the formation of "new universities" in Australia in the late 1980s and the UK in the early 1990s,
Information relating to mergers between universities and Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) in Australia in the late 1980s and early 1990s,

Interviews with key informants in Australian universities about the outcomes of mergers in Australia in the late 1980s,

AIT's submission to the Minister of Education for university classification in 1995,

Submissions received by to the Minister and the NZQA in late 1995 and early 1996 regarding AIT's application,

The report of the panel established by NZQA in 1996 to recommend benchmarks for the establishment of a university and to report on the extent to which AIT conformed to these benchmarks,

Submissions to the NZQA in 1997 regarding the guidelines for interpretation of the Act,

Quantitative and qualitative data subsequently obtained by AIT in 1996 and 1997 to support its case for university status,

The 1998 case for AIT to be established as a university,

The case for a merger between AIT, CIT, and ACE submitted to the councils of the three institutions in October 1997,

Records of the merger working parties during the period March 1996 through December 1997,

Records of meetings of the council of AIT during the period 1995 through mid 1998 where mergers and university status issues were discussed,
13 Records of the discussions between AIT, its legal advisors, and key decision makers and politicians during the period July 1995 through June 1998,

14 Quantitative survey data such as staff and council members’ attitudes to the mergers gathered from AIT during 1997,

15 Interviews with key informants regarding the attitudes of other tertiary institutions to the AIT’s decision to seek university status and to merge with ACE and CIT,

16 Annual reports including research reports from New Zealand universities and selected universities in Australia and the UK.

Having identified some tentative research questions at an early stage, I established files of materials including news clippings, records of interviews with key informants, and my own field notes made at various times throughout the period 1995-98, collating these under the headings that were expected to become the chapters of this dissertation. These were supplemented by notes taken from articles and books gathered in the context of the literature search, and relevant institutional research reports written by colleagues.

**CONCLUSION**

This thesis is a case study of AIT seeking to be established as a university in the context of New Zealand legislation. The researcher was the person who developed and articulated the case, the research contributing to the process as it unfolded. A large proportion of the data used is from primary sources.

An interpretive methodology has been justified and adopted in order to provide a fuller understanding of the both the processes followed by AIT, the reasons why the Institute chose its particular path, and the reactions of other institutions within the New Zealand tertiary sector.
Chapter 4

THE CONTEXT

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the context of AIT's application for university status is described. This is done through an exploration of New Zealand education policy leading up to the reforms of tertiary policy enacted in 1989, the background to the 1989 Education Amendment Act, and the impact of the reforms during the years 1990-95 on the tertiary sector, with particular reference to the impact of these reforms on the polytechnics and the Auckland Institute of Technology. Finally, the further policy changes signalled in the Green paper of 1997 which had potential to impact on AIT's university status application are discussed.

NZ EDUCATION POLICY LEADING TO THE REFORMS OF 1989

Significant policy changes were introduced to the New Zealand tertiary sector with the passing of the Education Amendment Act, 1989. At the time of passing this Act, New Zealand, with a population of a little over 3 million had thirty eight tertiary institutions; seven universities, six Colleges of Education (previously known as Teachers' Colleges), and twenty-five Polytechnics.

Until 1960, the universities had all existed as colleges of the University of New Zealand, Massey and Lincoln being agricultural colleges affiliated with Victoria University and the University of Canterbury respectively. After the dissolution of the University of New Zealand in 1961, and prior to the 1989 Act, the universities had the sole rights to grant degrees. Each operated autonomously pursuant to their own statutory authorities granted by their individual Acts of Parliament. Massey University was established as an independent university in
1961, the University of Waikato was established as a new university in 1968, and Lincoln University gained its independence in 1985.

The rest of the tertiary sector had few independent powers, with staffing levels and remuneration, capital works, and courses offered being determined from Wellington by the Department of Education.

Within the Department, tertiary policy overall was managed within a tertiary secretariat. For the non-university institutions there was a Continuing Education Division to advise on and administer Government policy, while the universities were funded from the Department through the Universities Grants Committee.

The continuing education sector was relatively new, with independent Technical Institutes being established from 1960 (CIT and the Auckland Technical Institute, ATI), but growing rapidly in number through the 1970s and early 1980s. Some of these institutions were called Polytechnics (Taranaki, Wellington, Nelson, Christchurch, Otago, and Southland), while those established after 1976 were called Community Colleges. There was, however, no difference between them either in legislation or departmental administration, and in 1988, with two exceptions, all chose to rename themselves as Polytechnics. CIT chose to retain its name, and the Auckland Technical Institute sought and was granted, though only after considerable opposition from the other polytechnics, Ministerial approval to be named the Auckland Institute of Technology.

The intent of successive governments was to provide access to post secondary training and community education in every significant population centre, and in many ways the administration of the sector was highly reflective of the administration of the national secondary school system.

The powers of boards of governors were little different to those of secondary schools, and polytechnics were graded by size equivalent to the gradings of secondary schools. The grading served to determine the salaries and number of senior staff employed by the institutions. Whenever a polytechnic grew to the size of the country's largest secondary school (i.e. about 2,000 students), it
would be split and a new institution established. The Manukau and Carrington Technical Institutes were both formed in this way from the ATI, in the belief that local communities in Auckland would be better served. In 1985 when the Department of Education, with enthusiastic support from Manukau and Carrington, moved to again split ATI to form a North Shore Polytechnic, ATI mounted a vigorous defence (ATI, 1985), which succeeded in retaining the integrity of the institution to operate on both its central city and north shore campuses.

The proliferation of polytechnics meant that there was great disparity between them both in terms of size and diversity. By 1989, the larger polytechnics offered some three and four-year full-time programmes and had student enrolments in excess of 3,000 EFTS, while Telford and Tai Poutini offered few full-time courses and had student bodies of less than 200 EFTS.

The colleges of education were more homogeneous, all offering similar three-year diploma programmes in pre-service primary teacher education, with pre-service secondary teacher education (one-year diploma programmes for graduates) being available in Auckland and Christchurch. The size of these colleges ranged from 1,000 to 2,000 EFTS with Auckland being the largest after the amalgamation of the Auckland Primary and Auckland Secondary Teachers Colleges in 1984. As with the polytechnics, the Department of Education determined intakes, the courses offered, the staffing levels, and capital purchases and developments.

The autonomy granted to the colleges of education and the polytechnics in 1990 as a consequence of the 1989 Act saw

1. A rapid development of degree programmes in the polytechnics, and

2. Close links being forged between the colleges of education and their local universities where degrees were developed by the universities and jointly taught between the two partners concerned.
These links between the universities and colleges developed into mergers between the Hamilton Teachers College and the University of Waikato in 1991 (Smithells, 1992), and between the Palmerston North College of Education and Massey University in 1996 (Massey University, 1995), reducing the number of colleges of education to four.

In the case of the Auckland College of Education, the relationship between the college and the University of Auckland broke down in 1996, with the college gaining approval and accreditation to offer its own degrees and announcing its intention to withdraw from participation in the university degree from 1997. Shortly thereafter, the College also announced its intention to enter into merger discussions with AIT which had recently made application to be reclassified as a university, though the outcome (see chapter 9) was a decision by the College to merge with Massey University, further reducing the number of colleges of education to three from 1 January 1999.

Mergers between polytechnics have not yet occurred but can be expected to take place over the next few years. Unlike the Australian experience in the late 1980s, however, these will not be forced by overt government policy, though this thesis will show that the polytechnics will have had little option in the environment shaped by the 1989 Act.

**BACKGROUND TO THE 1989 EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT**

Economic reforms characterised the political agendas world-wide in the late 1970s and early 1980s, (Scollay, St John, and Smelt, 1987; Pelly, 1991; Leach, 1993) with the Thatcher and Reagan administrations in the UK and the USA providing the most publicised examples. The rationale for these reforms was to move the economy towards a more market system and in so doing to reduce government involvement in the delivery of public services. The reforms transformed many societies in the west, and in so doing brought about the reunification of Germany, and the collapse of the old Soviet Union with the adoption of free market economic policies in most of the Eastern Bloc countries. The changes are probably not reversible within the next generation.
These economic reforms were driven by the ideological belief that competition would produce better results, and that the private sector would manage better than the public sector could (Douglas, 1980; Douglas, 1987; Easton, 1989; Bollard, 1993; Boston, 1991). A free market approach involves the creation of markets wherever possible. Markets work best (according to this ideology) where there are competing buyers and sellers, prices are determined by supply and demand, and quality is maintained by consumer choice. Inefficient providers will be driven out by the efficient who will reduce costs and give better services.

The New Zealand political environment of the late 1970s and early 1980s was dominated by its Prime Minister, R D Muldoon, whose Keynesian interventionism had seen the country pass apparently unaffected through the oil shocks and other social changes that had affected the economies throughout the western world. But the economic survival of the time had been achieved by borrowing, with a controversial “think big” strategy resulting in huge investment in infrastructure that was planned to lead to greater self-sufficiency. Expensive projects including oil refineries, aluminium smelters, an ammonia urea plant, and the catalytic production of petrochemicals from natural gas were all begun. Marginal tax rates rose to 66%, and government controls were imposed on virtually every enterprise.

A “snap” election called by Muldoon in 1984 saw a change of government which brought to power a group of politicians who had been in opposition for almost a decade. Most of the leaders of the incoming Labour Government were highly educated. The Prime Minister, David Lange, was arguably the most articulate leader the country had ever seen, while his deputy, Geoffrey Palmer, came from an academic background in constitutional law.

Butterworth and Tarling (1994) note that the incoming government had made relatively few commitments to tertiary education, but had “committed itself to reviewing all aspects of continuing and tertiary education, and to examining the role of polytechnics, including the setting up of a grants committee, to redressing the staff:student ratio, and to reviewing student allowances, all of them tasks that had concerned Labour and indeed its National predecessors” (p.75)
The incoming Government’s briefing included a document written by the Treasury entitled *Economic Management* which proposed that tertiary education was more a “private good” than a “public good”, i.e. the major beneficiary of a tertiary education was the recipient rather than the community as a whole. It noted the extent to which tertiary education was “subsidised” by the State and made a case for greater use of market forces in the provision of tertiary study. Butterworth and Tarling comment (p.77) that “Economic Management comes close to blaming the education sector for the poor performance of the economy”.

In New Zealand politics, the Treasury’s views are always influential, but never more so than during this period. For over the next six years, economic reform was radical. It was begun by the Labour government of 1984-90 which inherited an almost crippling level of national debt, and which came to power in a memorable and very public situation (verging on constitutional crisis), where the money supply had been exhausted. In its first week in office, the Government devalued the dollar by 20%, and within 12 months inflation reached 24% (with interest rates to match), while the restructuring took place (Douglas, 1987: 246-52). Major public corporations (telecommunications, railways, airlines, etc.) were privatised over the next six years with massive redundancies. Unemployment soared.

The growth in unemployment, incidentally, was not merely a New Zealand phenomenon. It was experienced throughout the OECD countries. In Australia, where economic reform was by no means as radical as that in New Zealand, unemployment also rose dramatically from an average of 6.5% in the 1970s to almost 11% in 1993 (Lewis, 1994), creating an environment for a substantial rethink on education and training policy.

Despite the pain being experienced by many New Zealanders, the Labour Government was returned with an increased majority in 1987 by a voting public hoping to reap the promised benefits arising from the economic reforms that had begun (Hawke, 1993). In many ways this was a confusing political period. The Labour Government was pushing the monetarist reforms that would have been expected of the National Party, while National still languished in the polls, seemingly
crippled by the legacy of interventionism Muldoon had left. Jesson (1989: 111) comments that the Labour victory was pyrrhic, for Labour had been voted back by the affluent middle classes while tens of thousands of the traditional working class voters stayed at home. It can be argued that this turn-around of political and ideological roles in the late 1980s was the root cause of the moves in 1992 to change the political system to a mixed member proportional representation (MMP) system which is the current system of democracy in New Zealand.

Economic reform was not all that marked this period. Significant and lasting social change was also occurring. One of the most striking changes was the substantial rise in the participation rate of married women in the workforce (Lewis, 1994: 177). This in itself was influenced by a decline in the fertility rates, an increase in the number of years of schooling and tertiary education received by women, and increases in the real wages of women in the workforce. In 1979 only 39% of undergraduates were female, today they are in excess of 50%.

Fargher (1985: 18) summarised the issues perceived by many educationists caught in the nexus of the economic and political changes of the time:

"The two values - materialism and egalitarianism - which have sustained our society in the past will continue to do so. What we must do is to acknowledge and be aware of their weaknesses; to work to strengthen their positive aspects - real equality of opportunity. This means working to strengthen toleration and acceptance that the majority in a democratic society must still acknowledge and respect the rights of minorities within that society. For (tertiary education) this demands immediate changes to provide learning environments more suited to the needs of Maoris, women, and the young unemployed."

Fargher himself was a leader in articulating the ideological values that lay behind educational philosophy in the 1980s. This was a time when the Labour government which had traditionally espoused values of egalitarianism more strongly than the National party was at the same time embarked on a policy of monetarism which, in the end, was to be the enduring legacy of its term of office.
Inherent in the views of educational policy makers of the time (Douglas, 1987), and probably still today, is the notion that increased access to education is the major vehicle for achieving better economic and social justice.

There is evidence to support this view. Analysis of statistics comparing earned income by age and education shows quite clearly that incomes increase with educational qualifications (Chapman, 1988), both in terms of private rates of return and social rates of return. But it is not at all clear, however, whether these statistics are necessarily causal in their relationship; it is possible that graduates who earn more might well have earned more even without their degrees. And people who attend university have historically been drawn disproportionately from upper socio-economic backgrounds, implying that family values and ability to meet the costs involved might well be a major factor in participation.

Increased participation in tertiary education was a feature of the late 1980s and early 1990s, both in Australia and New Zealand. In the Hawke-Keating era of 1983-95, student enrolments increased by 78% in Australia (Marginson, 1996), while in New Zealand the growth has continued to the present time with a 25% growth in student numbers between 1991 and 1995 (Laxon, 1996).

Marginson (1996) claims that in Australia, "Most of the reforms were installed in only eight months, between the Green paper of December 1987 and the White Paper of July 1988. Little happened before Dawkins, and apart from quality assurance, even less happened after." If this was the case in Australia, which is doubtful, it certainly could not be claimed that the parallel changes in New Zealand all happened in such a short period of revolution, nor that they could be all attributed to the fiat of any single politician!

Notwithstanding the powers of Government policy to influence the directions and provision of education, it can be argued that the social revolutions of the 1970s and 80s had at least as much influence on educational reforms at that time as the economic considerations.
Education policy was firmly rooted in the values of egalitarianism and oriented towards the needs of disadvantaged groups, as reflected in the following initiatives which dominated tertiary education policy in New Zealand in the late 1980s.

Young unemployed

The Young Persons Training Programme (YPTP) was established in 1984 to provide job-related skills for the long-term registered unemployed. YPTP courses were established in all urban centres in New Zealand with District Employment Training Action Committees set up to evaluate local needs and to bring the employment services and polytechnics together in a joint effort to provide training related to identified employment opportunities in the area. The administration and targets for the scheme were later altered on a number of occasions by successive governments, but it still exists with minor modification as the Training Opportunities Programme, funded by the Education and Training Support Agency and with its targets heavily oriented towards young Maori and Pacific Islanders.

Women

A "Girls Can Do Anything" campaign was established and promoted throughout the late 1980s, supported by posters, newspaper, radio, and TV advertising. The teacher unions established women's advisory committees and women's development officers. Education Department policy prioritised new course developments in tertiary education that would lead to greater participation by women, and both EEO and E Ed O objectives to achieve gender balance became a key element in the performance evaluation of tertiary institutions.
Maori and Pacific Islanders

Maori and Pacific Island Liaison Officers were established in every tertiary institute in 1985 through a specially tagged funding initiative. Outside of the formal education system, kokiri centres were established by the Department of Maori Affairs in community centres and marae to provide pre-employment training as part of a staircase to provide equality of opportunity, encouraging young Maori to progress further and acquire vocational skills at higher levels. Acknowledgement of the Treaty of Waitangi became a charter requirement for all state-funded institutions.

Part-time students

The Technicians Certification Authority (TCA) established in the 1970s and 1980s a wide range of highly focused technician certificates designed for people to upgrade their skills while in employment. The courses (New Zealand Certificates in Engineering, Science, and Commerce in the main) were offered over five levels, though students completing secondary school with relevant subjects were normally exempted the first two years. These certificates, which included a compulsory concurrent employment requirement, became major course offerings in the polytechnics, and were highly regarded by employers. Over 80% of all students enrolled at the Auckland Technical Institute in 1985 were part-time, many of whom attended in work hours with encouragement from their employers.

The high unemployment rates in the late 1980s and early 1990s had a strong influence on the demise of these programmes, and in 1995 they were officially abandoned in favour of national diplomas which could be studied full-time. This reflected both the reluctance of employers to release staff in times of high unemployment and more difficult economic circumstances, and also the need to cater for school leavers and others who could not find work and were excluded from such programmes by virtue of their being unable to fulfil the concurrent work experience requirements.
Offenders against society

The Department of Justice expanded its prison education programmes in the late 1980s, and transferred the responsibility for its delivery to polytechnics in 1990 by way of formal contracts for delivery. The intent of this was to further enable the linking of what can be done in the secure confines of a prison with the vocational skills offered in a polytechnic. For the most part, prison education is dominated by literacy and numeracy training, though many of the more able inmates are increasingly using computers and the internet to access courses offered by distance mode.

Adult literacy

Again, initiatives by the Department of Education in the 1980s saw funding being made available to community groups involved in adult literacy schemes throughout the country. In smaller cities, these were often administered and co-ordinated through the polytechnics, though in the major cities, larger community organisations were able to receive the funding directly.

The rural population

New Zealand has had a long history of providing education at all levels for the rural community (Cumming, 1978). In the provision of continuing education, the Young Farmers Clubs, Country Women’s Institutes, and advisory services from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, together with extramural programmes from the universities, have all existed for many decades, reflecting the low population density and rural nature of New Zealand society. Nevertheless, the 1980s saw further development with the establishment of the Rural Education Activities Programme which provided education co-ordinators based in each of the provincial cities, and funding to enable them to set up and respond to continuing educational needs of the regions. This was an exciting development and really marked the end of the golden period when the state provided all costs for community education, whether in rural or urban settings.
The sharemarket crash of 1987 burst the bubble of business optimism that had pervaded New Zealand for the previous few years. Commercial construction stopped. Investment companies and "pop star" executives with high media profiles were shown to have had clay feet. The monetarist reforms of the 1980s and the continued funding for egalitarianism in education policy could not coexist for much longer. Economic forces were about to make their impact more strongly.

This almost exactly coincided with the return of the Labour Government for its second term of office. A new Minister of Education (Hon Phil Goff) was appointed in 1987.

In 1990, Goff lost his seat in Parliament, and during the three years 1991-94 he took a position at AIT in the School of Communication Studies from which he developed one of AIT's most highly successful degrees, using the opportunities provided by the legislation he had helped to establish during his term as Minister. Later, in the course of AIT's application for university status, Goff gave considerable assistance as an opposition member in gathering support for the quest amongst the Labour Party, while the former Deputy Prime Minister (and later Prime Minister) in the 1984-90 Labour Government, Sir Geoffrey Palmer, drafted the sections of AIT's case which dealt with its legislative aspects. The knowledge of these two people was invaluable to AIT in seeking university status.

It was during Goff's term of office, that legislative reforms moved to education in 1989-90 with the passing of the Education Amendment Act (1989). This Act established the foundations for competition between schools, private providers, and tertiary institutions by:

- Changing the governance structures of schools and tertiary institutions to provide more autonomy with a greater level of local decision making,

- Disestablishing the Department of Education which had been the administrative arm of government education policy for over a century,

- Establishing a Ministry of Education which was to be very much smaller in size than the Department of Education had been, and which was to provide only for policy development and implementation,
• Making provisions for private training establishments to be set up and registered to compete for funding against the state institutions,

• Establishing the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) with the role of approving and accrediting programmes in institutions (excluding universities), conducting national examinations in the senior secondary schools, and developing a National Qualifications Framework (NQF),

• Establishing the Education and Training Support Agency (ETSA), with the role of facilitating greater industry participation in training programmes, and

• Establishing the Education Review Office (ERO) with the role of reviewing the performance and operation of the schools.

Having passed the Act, the Labour government, which had lost its enthusiasm for the market-driven approach to social and economic policy, suffered an overwhelming defeat at the polls in 1990. The incoming National government with its traditional predisposition towards the private sector extended the processes of privatisation (Hawke, 1993; Mulgan, 1994), and took up the challenges of implementing this legislation in an environment of higher unemployment than had been experienced since the 1930s (and which would rise even higher over the next four years).

The Porter project, which was commissioned in 1990, reported in 1991 (Crocombe, Enright, and Porter, 1991) and highlighted the failure of the New Zealand education system to encourage the study of subjects hypothesised to be essential for future economic success. They summarised:

"New Zealand’s private sector participation rate is low by OECD standards. The educational attainment of the private-sector workforce is also low. Those who are educated often do not have the skills necessary for modern economic competition. A significant portion of the economically-active have chosen to leave New Zealand. The heavy and well focused private and public investments that are a feature of Germany, Switzerland and Japan (not to mention emerging nations such as Korea and Singapore) are not a central feature of New Zealand’s human resource development system. In a world where the nation’s productivity and standard of living are more dependent on the quality of its skill base, New Zealand has grave cause for concern" (pp 168-169).

This report was backed up by the report of the Prime Ministerial task force on manufacturing in New Zealand, released in 1992:
"With regard to training, the thrust and principles of the new Industry Training Act are supported. At this early stage in the transition to a new system many manufacturers are, however, very concerned that it may not support a training system which will adequately meet the sector's future needs.

It is an open question whether New Zealand has the necessary commitment at present to provide the skills and attributes which are needed for its economy to flourish in the fiercely competitive conditions of the 1990s.

Manufacturers from their unique perspective of seeking to match their skills and their other resources with global market opportunities are apprehensive about the ability of the education and training system to provide the necessary support for a competitive, dynamic manufacturing sector.

The change and improvement needed requires the combined efforts of the Government, the Education Department, education and other providers, manufacturers, and the wider business community."

Acceptance of these beliefs together with a resolve to reduce the unemployment statistics through encouraging greater participation in training and education resulted in rapid growth in student numbers in tertiary education, together with greater retention rates in the senior secondary schools.

The legislative changes in the Education Amendment Act 1989 were bold. For on the one hand they led to far greater autonomy for institutions, thus diminishing the power of central government to control what was taught, while on the other hand Government was clearly wishing to encourage training and education directly related to exports, trade, and industry.

The OECD report (1983) highlighted the issues:

"Calls for greater autonomy ... are sometimes opposed on the grounds that this would lead to a proliferation of general courses, failure to recognise and respond to the needs of industry, and the emergence of a philosophy ... that would introduce problems of overlap between schools, polytechnics, and universities" (p.58)

The report, however, concluded:

"There is no conceivable way in which an education system can deliver the exact mix of skills and competencies of the right kind and in the necessary
quantities to meet the needs of economic and labour market systems that are not only essentially unpredictable, but which are almost certain to change out of all recognition in the course of a single individual’s life. To be able to do so would imply a capacity to predict economic conditions and technological change in a way quite beyond human reach” (p.83)

Perhaps recognising this, but nevertheless moving policy into uncharted waters, the Education Amendment Act was enacted with subsequent amendments in 1990 and was followed by the complementary Industry Training Act in 1992.

**THE IMPACT OF THE REFORMS ON THE TERTIARY SECTOR, 1990-95**

The intent of the Act for the tertiary sector was described in its long title:

“An Act to reform further the administration of education and, in particular, to reform tertiary education and training with a view to:

(a) giving tertiary institutions as much independence and freedom to make academic, operational and management decisions as is consistent with the nature of the services they provide, the efficient use of natural resources, the national interest, and the demands of accountability;

(b) establishing a consistent approach to the recognition of qualifications in academic and vocational areas;

(c) encouraging greater participation in tertiary education and training, in particular by removing barriers to access for those persons who have previously been under-represented;

(d) contributing to a dynamic and satisfying society by promoting excellence in tertiary education, training, and research.”

The Act, however, did not arise in a vacuum, and had been preceded by a number of reports to government covering various parts of education policy in the context of the Labour government’s intention to reform education as part of its adaptation of social policy to the needs of the 1980s and 1990s.

National Development (October 1987); The Tertiary Review, Report on Submissions to the Tertiary Reviews (Feb. 1988); The Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy, The April Report (April 1988); the Picot report on educational administration, Administering for Excellence (May 1988); and the Hawke report, Report of the Working Group on Post Compulsory Education and Training (July 1988). These were followed by two government publications (Learning for Life: 1 (February 1989) and Learning for Life: 2 (August 1989)) which foreshadowed and invited comment on government intentions with respect to the roles of central agencies, tertiary providers, and research funding, etc. which were to be reformed by the Act.

The working group convened by Professor Hawke was commissioned to bring together the findings of all of the previous reports, to make recommendations for the reform of government interventions into post compulsory education and training and related institutional arrangements, and to advise on transitional arrangements.

Most of the recommendations in the Hawke report were incorporated in the Education Amendment Act (1989). For tertiary institutions, the main features included:

1. disestablishment of the Department of Education and its replacement by a Ministry of Education which would be set up primarily as a policy ministry (as opposed to an operational department) to provide comprehensive policy advice on education and training encompassing all aspects of the post-compulsory sector;

2. the devolution of decision making at institutional level to institutions, within a charter and statement of objectives to be negotiated between the council and the ministry;

3. disestablishment of the Vocational Training Council, the Authority for Advanced Vocational Awards, the Trades Certification Board, the University Entrance Board, the Universities’ Grants Committee, and the establishment of a
National Education Qualifications Authority which would assume the role of establishing a national qualifications framework;

4 the introduction of a system of funding for tertiary institutions which would be on an equivalent full-time student basis and applied equally to all classes of tertiary institutions. This also included (Learning for Life:2 p.8) a commitment to expansion of the tertiary sector with a decision to expand the funding base and to increase the proportion of private funding in post school education and training (i.e. fees and other income);

5 the inclusion in the powers of the Qualifications Authority of the power to approve and accredit institutions (including private providers) other than universities to award degrees, and to audit performance, and;

6 enabling New Zealand schools and institutions to enrol full fee paying students from other countries.

The Hawke report was very influential in the shaping of the legislation that was to impact on the tertiary sector. Hawke’s descriptions of the characteristics of universities (section 5.10.9) are reproduced almost verbatim in section 162(4) of the Act, and his comments on the future for colleges of education (section 5.7.1) have transpired to be correct;

"There are several possible futures for colleges of education:

i Amalgamation with universities

ii Semi-autonomous status as schools of education within universities

iii Amalgamation with polytechnics

iv Establishment as stand alone institutions. It is not necessary that all individual colleges of education should follow the same path."

The “level playing field” for tertiary institutions was thus laid out and commissioned, setting the scene for significant restructuring of their management,
a more competitive (market driven) relationship between them, and for the significant rationalisation of programmes and institutions that would inevitably follow, but without the government fiat that featured in the reforms in Australia.

**THE IMPACT OF THE 1989 EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT ON AIT, 1990-95**

The granting of new autonomous powers to AIT did not of itself bring about significant change noticeable by an external observer. Internally, a new council was appointed, (though in practice its composition was recommended by the previous council with few changes occurring) and the incumbent Principal was in turn appointed under contract as the Chief Executive Officer. The CEO became the only employee of the council, and the employer of all other staff, reflecting the changed role of the council in becoming a governing body as opposed to a body responsible for industrial or management matters.

The role of the new council comprising up to twenty members (which included four members appointed by the Minister) was to establish the charter and statement of objectives for negotiation with the Ministry, to monitor the performance of the institution, and to report annually to the Minister.

With the new funding system, however, the institution gained control of almost all of its funding, and was free to set its own staffing levels and make its own decisions relating to capital expenditure. A management review was undertaken, resulting in the appointment of senior executives to manage the resources and to report on institutional performance. Planning began for a major capital works programme. This was overdue for AIT, which had had to lease accommodation in the central city, a major issue that had been constantly deferred by the Education Department which would have preferred to see the Institution split.

From an academic standpoint, however, it can be argued that the most significant changes to AIT derived from the establishment of the NZQA and the subsequent opportunity to develop degree programmes.
The NZQA was established in 1990 after the passing of the Act, and AIT lobbied vigorously for an early policy and protocol for the approval of degrees. In part this was due to a long-held belief that justice was not being served when so many students in programmes such as Physiotherapy were being denied a degree while their counterparts throughout the world were graduating with a more prestigious qualification. In part it also stemmed from the deeply held conviction of the senior management, that AIT as a polytechnic suffered an undue downgrading of its status by comparison with the universities (Hinchcliff, 1997).

In 1991, AIT was the first New Zealand polytechnic to receive approval and accreditation to offer a degree programme (Physiotherapy), and rapid growth of degree programmes followed. By 1995 AIT had had twenty-five separate degree programmes approved, and had expanded these into masters degrees and postgraduate diplomas. Over two-thirds of its students were enrolled in degrees or higher diplomas, and some of its degrees were experiencing such strong demand that only those applicants from above the 90th percentile of school leavers were being accepted.

This degree development occurred across all faculties of the Institute:

Faculty of Arts:
- Bachelor of Communication Studies (1992)
- Bachelor of Graphic Design (1992)
- Bachelor of Hospitality Management (1996)
- Bachelor of Spatial Design (1994)
- Bachelor of Visual Arts (1993)
- Bachelor of Arts (Japanese) (1995)
- Bachelor of Arts (Chinese) (1995)
- Bachelor of Arts (Fashion Technology) (1996)
- Bachelor of Arts (Social Science) (1997)
- Master of Arts (Multi disciplinary) (1996)

Faculty of Commerce:
- Bachelor of Business (1993)
  (separately approved majors in Accounting, Advertising, Computer Information Systems, Economics, Management, Marketing, International Business, Tourism)
- Bachelor of Business (Honours) (1996)

Faculty of Health Studies:
- Bachelor of Health Science (Midwifery) (1994)
Bachelor of Health Science (Nursing) (1992)
Bachelor of Health Science (Occupational Therapy) (1993)
Bachelor of Health Science (Physiotherapy) (1991)
Bachelor of Sport and Recreation (1996)
Master of Health Science (Interdisciplinary) (1995)
Doctor of Philosophy (1998)

Faculty of Science and Engineering:
Bachelor of Applied Science (1993)
Bachelor of Engineering (1997)
Bachelor of Medical Laboratory Science (1995)

Faculty of Te Ara Poutama:
Bachelor of Maori Studies (1994)

Other major strategic and organisational changes took place as follows:

1  Internationalisation

The Education Amendment Act allowed, for the first time, institutions to enrol full fee paying international students. In 1990 AIT began a small English language school as its first venture into this market. By 1994, not only had this school become the largest and most profitable enterprise of its type in New Zealand, but AIT had at the same time reached the point of achieving an enrolment of 5% of its EFTS as full fee paying international students in its mainstream courses and had developed over 20 significant staff and student exchange programmes in the UK, Europe, and Asia.

The economic environment created by the government in the early 1990s had seen significant Asian immigration into New Zealand, and the international student growth coupled with enrolments of permanent residents meant that 18% of students enrolled in 1995 were recorded in the annual report as having been born in another country.

These factors caused a considerable shift in the orientation of the Institute's strategic planning. Academic Board minutes of the years 1992-94 contain numerous references to the need to broaden the experience of New Zealand students by preparing them for employment in an international environment. Thus
the approvals were granted for a degree specialisation in International Business (1995) and a postgraduate diploma in International Practice (1996).

Offshore ventures also began. By 1995 (Hawley, 1995) over 1000 students were enrolled in AIT programmes in Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam.

This experience was a strong influence in AIT’s 1995 decision to seek university classification.

2 Quality Assurance

Concurrent with the autonomy gained through the Education Amendment Act, policy documents were developed to ensure accountability. These policies provided for the broader academic community to be involved in the approval of new programmes, and for external moderation as a normal feature of all significant programmes.

As a result of this, AIT became more exposed to the practices and developments in other institutions, particularly the universities in Australia and New Zealand, as well as in the related professions. In 1995, AIT degree monitors were drawn from both New Zealand Universities (Auckland, Waikato, Massey, Victoria, and Otago) and overseas Universities (Monash, RMIT, Sydney, Queensland, Hong Kong, and Sheffield).

This experience was also influential in AIT’s decision to seek classification as a university.
3 Marketing

A feature of the environment created by the Education Amendment Act was the competition that emerged between tertiary institutions for students.

In 1990, Auckland had one University, three Polytechnics, and one College of Education.

By 1996, Massey University had established a campus at Albany with an enrolment of 2000 EFTS, and with plans (subsequent to its merger with the Palmerston North College of Education) to introduce pre-service teacher education in 1997. Otago and Waikato Universities had opened small outpost campuses in downtown Auckland, the University of Auckland had opened a new campus at Tamaki to serve the eastern suburbs, The Open Polytechnic and the Central Institute of Technology had opened major outposts in downtown Auckland, and the Tai Poutini Polytechnic had also moved its sound engineering programmes to Auckland.

The need to establish a marketing profile became an imperative, and between 1990 and 1996, the marketing budget at AIT increased by 172% while student enrolments increased by 32%. Focus groups were convened and other market research (Forsyth, 1995) was conducted to determine ways of ensuring that AIT would not only hold but increase its market share against an increasingly aggressive competition.

This too became a factor in the decision to seek university status for AIT.

4 Student fees

The decision of the Labour government in the late 1980s to impose significant student fees was rescinded in 1990 by the National government which announced that it would not impose any fee, but would leave this to the institutions themselves to set. Government for its part, however, would be progressively
reducing funding to a level of 75% of course costs, and using the existing funding to provide more places.

This caused considerable political debate which continues, for the effect was to increase student fees by a further 50% on average. But whatever the pros and cons of charging significant student fees, my own observation is that the policy had the following effects:

1. Attrition from full time programmes fell (presumably because to drop out now meant losing one's investment),

2. students became less tolerant of poor administration or teaching, and

3. students became more discriminating in their choice of institution, seeking a best combination of fee, institutional reputation, and programme content.

The factors listed above all led in part to AIT’s decision in 1995 to seek university classification (discussed in chapter 6), and in 1996 to engage in merger discussions (discussed in chapter 9) with the Auckland College of Education (ACE) and the Central Institute of Technology (CIT).

**THE GREEN PAPER OF 1997 AND REFORMS OF 1998**

In April 1997, a memorandum from the Ministry of Education was received by the Tertiary Consultative Committee requesting an input on issues that should be canvassed in a forthcoming tertiary review. The Tertiary Consultative Committee is a group of representatives from the universities, polytechnics, colleges of education, and wananga, established to enable the Minister to consult in a broad sense with the tertiary sector. The memorandum specifically invited comment on what the tertiary sector should look like in 10-15 years' time, how funding arrangements might be changed, how current ownership of tertiary assets might be changed, and how delivery structures and regulations might be improved.
It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to deal with the full range of issues raised in the Green paper, but over the next few months considerable public comment ensued in the NZ Education Review and the media, mostly concerned with funding issues and fuelled by a concern expressed by student associations that some form of voucher system might be introduced.

When the Government’s Green paper (MOE, 1997) was released, the issue of direct relevance to AIT’s university status quest was encapsulated in section 5.2 under the heading “Protected terms” (p.40):

- **It is not envisaged that the number of providers, or the kinds of quality assured programmes or qualifications they could offer, would need to be regulated.**

- **The terms “university”, “bachelor”, “master”, “doctor”, “national”, and “New Zealand” could continue to be protected, but clarification is needed about whether other definitional distinctions (“college of education”, “polytechnic”, “wananga”, “institution”, and “private training establishment”) should remain in legislation.**

- **Providers using protected terms would continue to be required to demonstrate that they meet defined criteria.**

- **Maori could determine whether the term “wananga” should be restricted and, if so, what characteristics could be used to define wananga education.**

While the Green paper specifies that the discussion was restricted to the regulatory restrictions on protected terms and that statutory distinctions and legislative details were outside the scope of the paper (p.40), it goes on to note that the distinction between providers has blurred over recent years through mergers already agreed or under discussion (a reference to the current negotiations between AIT, ACE, and CIT), that restriction of the term “university” was now preventing non-university providers from expanding their market share, and that “the term is expected to come under increasing pressure in the future”. (p.41)

Further, “There is debate about whether the characteristics of university education need to be distinguished from other types of provision. Some people argue that the term “university” must be protected and supported by tight criteria in order to preserve the international credibility of New
Zealand universities. Others argue that it is the performance of an individual institution, rather than the title of a class of institutions, which establishes an international reputation.” (p.42).

It can be argued that the inclusion of the issue of protected terms in the Green paper was a direct result of AIT’s application for university status, as before this occurred, the matter had never arisen.

In a rare show of apparent coherence of view, both AIT and the University of Auckland made submissions on the Green paper supporting the retention of the existing protected terms, AIT (p.9) arguing for the addition of the titles “polytechnic”, “institute of technology”, and “wananga” to the list of protected terms, while the University argued strongly against any relaxation of the criteria for use of the term “university”, on the grounds (p.15) that;

“Any suggestion that the international standing of the New Zealand universities is being lowered will quickly be communicated around the world and, regardless of the Government’s intentions, the impact on our ability to recruit quality students will be compromised. This has both a direct economic impact on New Zealand and an indirect impact, as less discriminating people overseas relegate New Zealand services and products to a less than ‘premium’ status.”

However, AIT’s support for the retention of the protection of the term “university” was derived from the belief that it would imminently be able to meet the guidelines being suggested by the NZQA, while the University’s position was based on its belief that no more universities should be allowed;

“Creating more universities may have a negative effect on the reputation of New Zealand university qualifications and research in the international marketplace” (p.14),

and that polytechnics were being weakened by their entry into the degree granting area (p.14).

It is difficult to believe that an institution like AIT calling itself a university would be likely to damage the reputation of the University of Auckland. Harvard, Yale, Oxford and Cambridge seem hardly to have had their reputations sullied by the
proliferation of universities around them, and nor is there any evidence that the more prestigious Australian universities have been damaged by the entry of the former CAEs into the university system.

What happens when sectorial change occurs, is that the existing universities often form their own networks and quality assurance networks. Thus, the emergence of the Group of Eight, the Australian Technology Network (ATN), and the Regional Universities in Australia. This has not caused confusion between the traditional universities and the new, many of the latter carving out their own distinctive reputations and niches.

The Education Forum, a group of eminent educationists in New Zealand, made this point in its submission in arguing for greater diversity (p.60):

"Diversity in quality and standards need not diminish the reputation of any one institution. With diversity and a continuum of qualities, it is pointless to strictly define what is, and what isn’t, a university. The idea that all institutions of a particular type or which fall into the same category are equal is a polite myth, and it is better to recognise the fact and encourage students to seek information, and institutions to be concerned about their reputations".

The Open Polytechnic submitted (#12)

"There is a very clear distinction between protecting the quality or title of the product (the degree or other qualification) from protecting the name of the providers. Providing protection for the minimum quality standards of qualifications provides a measure of minimum quality assurance to students. Protecting the right of some institutions to use a particular title while excluding others who provide the same products, simply limits competition and must have an adverse impact on quality and costs.”

While the Green paper posed the question as to whether the legislation should be changed with respect to protected terms, the matter may well have been made redundant by the budget announcements made on May 14 1998 and the passage of a small amendment to the Education Act during the appropriations the following week.
Warning had been given prior to the 1998 budget that the important issues signalled in the Green paper would in practice be enacted through the budget. The announcements were probably the most significant since the reforms of 1989 and will probably bring about even more radical change to the tertiary sector as a whole. The key features of the funding system announced by the Minister were that:

1. EFTS funding to institutions will be based on actual enrolments from 1999,

2. Private establishments will be funded on the same basis as public institutions from 2000,

3. There will be no enrolment targets or base funding for any institution from 1999, and

4. There will be no upper limits on numbers that will be funded in any discipline, with the exception of Medicine, Dentistry, and Veterinary Science (the three most expensive courses).

This in effect enacted the “student centred approach” to funding that was being foreshadowed in the West Report (1998) in Australia - a system more commonly referred to as a voucher system. This had been proposed also in the Green paper, with the media and many academics vehemently opposing the concept. At this stage, however, there has been no indication as to whether or not there will be any upper limit on the number of years any individual can be entitled to subsidised study, so this is technically not a voucher system.

This was an important change, some the effects of which can be predicted:

1. Institutional competition for students will increase dramatically,

2. Institutional amalgamations will occur as a result of the competition and in order to reduce costs,
The private sector will increase in size from the year 2000 if it has the same level of funding available to it as the public sector, and overseas universities will have every opportunity to link with or set up in opposition to New Zealand universities.

Effectively, the funding for the New Zealand tertiary sector will be deregulated from 1999. This will have the further effect of requiring some level of deregulation in the area of institutional classification.

An amendment to the Act to clarify that mergers between different classes of institution are permissible in law, and that merged institutions can continue to perform the functions of the merging partners, was passed under urgency on 20 May 1998 in the context of the budget announcements. This legislation was triggered by the High Court action between Massey University and the Manawatu Polytechnic (described in chapter 9) which claimed that the decision of the Wellington Polytechnic to merge with Massey was illegal, the Minister announcing that he was introducing the legislation in order to stop taxpayers' funds being spent on legal fees rather than education.

While it may be coincidental that this legislation, which implies that universities can perform polytechnic functions and that there are no clear distinctions between the classes of institution in terms of what they are able to do, was passed in the context of the budget appropriations, it is certain that such blurring of the functions of different classes of institution will be a growing feature of the deregulated tertiary environment from 1999.

**Conclusion**

The context of AIT's application for university status was one of radical economic and social deregulation which was impacting on all sectors of society. During the six years since the passing of the 1989 Education Act, AIT had developed a wide array of degrees and postgraduate programmes and ventured into significant international activity.
Deregulation implies greater competitiveness, and it was this need to compete both domestically and internationally for students, particularly in the burgeoning degree programmes, that led AIT to consider its further positioning in the tertiary sector.

These political, social, and economic policy changes are not yet complete, and a future environment of more intense competition can be expected.
Chapter 5

AIT’S APPLICATION FOR UNIVERSITY STATUS

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, a detailed description and analysis of the processes leading up to AIT’s 1995 decision to seek university status is undertaken, together with an analysis of the issues AIT’s application raised, as articulated in the submissions made by various educational organisations and community groups to the Ministry of Education. These include a wide range of issues including the meaning of a university, how AIT should be evaluated against the requirements of the Act, and the wider policy issues that needed to be addressed by Government.

THE DECISION TO SEEK ESTABLISHMENT AS A UNIVERSITY

The issue first arose in AIT when the Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) in Australia began to merge and establish themselves as universities in the late 1980s, and when the British Polytechnics followed suit in 1992.

It is highly unlikely that the issue would ever have arisen at all if these changes had not occurred in those countries, and indeed, AIT had not intended to seek university classification from the outset. It was already the country’s leading polytechnic, and had not experienced any hindrance to its academic growth and development as a result of its status. Its national affiliations were mostly with other polytechnics, and many of the diploma level programmes it offered had been developed in tandem with other polytechnics.

The power to award degrees came to the Institute in 1991, but was seen by AIT as a matter of natural justice, the issue having been pushed for some years (Hinchcliff, 1984, 1988, 1989, 1989a).
In retrospect, gaining the power to award degrees can be seen as the first stage in AIT’s ultimate determination to seek university status, for there can be little argument that had it not been able to do so, the matter of becoming a university could never have arisen. This power was not limited to Bachelor’s degrees. The legislative requirements for a degree set out in section 254(3) of the Education Act were developed in 1991 by the NZQA in consultation with the New Zealand Vice Chancellors’ Committee (NZVCC) and later revised in July 1995 into a set of guidelines: Quality Assurance for Degrees and Related Qualifications, establishing a comprehensive regulatory framework which providers offering degrees must meet. These guidelines do not distinguish between Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees, but do indicate that approval to award a Doctoral degree would be subject to further guidelines yet to be agreed to between the NZQA and the NZVCC. AIT’s first Bachelor’s degree was approved in 1991 (in Physiotherapy), and its first Master’s Degree was approved in 1996 (in Health Science).

An application for approval of a PhD in Health Science was made in 1996, but agreement between the NZVCC and NZQA on the accreditation criteria was not reached until late in 1997. Subsequently, the CEO of NZQA decided that the criteria and processes for the approval of doctoral degrees should include both PhD and professional doctorates, and the regulatory framework for approval and accreditation by NZQA for doctorates was not finally promulgated until July 1998.

Despite the newly acquired power to award degrees, there was no widespread belief within the organisation that it should change its essential character. There was, however, a growing concern that it was continuously handicapped in its growing internationalisation by the perception that it was somehow inferior to the Australian CAEs and British Polytechnics who had gained university status in the previous five years. There was also anecdotal evidence (AIT, 1995: appendix XIV) of potential students enrolling at the University of Auckland rather than AIT because AIT did not offer “a university degree”.

Charles Sturt University
Wagga Wagga Campus
Library
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It can be argued that it was the international context in which AIT found itself that led to its decision to seek university classification. Australian Colleges of Advanced Education became universities in the late 1980s, and British Polytechnics likewise were granted university status in 1992.

A discussion paper, "The Name Game", written by AIT’s president (Hinchcliff, 1992) argued that the name “Auckland Institute of Technology” had earned acceptability, and that the Institute had been vindicated in not yielding to pressures to adopt the term “polytechnic”. He asserted that the word “Auckland” was the most appropriate for geographical reasons, and that the word “Technology” was a term worth retaining, the etymological roots including technos meaning art or craft, and logos meaning wisdom. But the word “Institution” would be better replaced by “University” (p.2):

"because “University” is the internationally recognised term for an educational institution offering a comprehensive range of tertiary courses such as ours,

because through the “internationalisation” of education we seek to attract students from Asia and connect with educational programmes from universities, e.g. Henley,

because it is fairer for our graduates as they take their undergraduate qualifications either into the international marketplace, or to universities offering postgraduate programmes,

because the term “university” accords a mana to institutions, which we deserve and believe we should share in as we seek to attract appropriate resourcing.”

Hinchcliff’s comments in this paper further note that UK polytechnics had been given blanket endorsement to change to universities, that the Nanyang Technological Institute in Singapore had become the Nanyang Technological University, and that the New South Wales Institute of Technology in Sydney chose the name “University of Technology, Sydney”. He suggested that AIT should follow the Sydney example, acknowledging that the university in Princes St was called the “University of Auckland”, and seek to be called the “Auckland University of Technology”.
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This discussion paper was widely distributed within the institution, and resulted in a memorandum from the president of the AIT students' association to the AIT council on 7 February supporting the concept and recommending that the council agree to seeking the name change.

The issue was also canvassed outside AIT, with written support being received (Booth, 1993; Turmeau, 1993) from two British Vice Chancellors who had recently visited AIT. Turmeau enclosed a copy of a paper written by two Polytechnic Directors in 1991 articulating their case for university status (Barden and Booth, 1991).

Barden and Booth's argument was that there was considerable overlap between the functions, style, and student mix in polytechnics and universities, that the title "polytechnic" caused great confusion, that there was a perceived status gap between institutions that bore no relationship to the satisfaction reports by students and graduate employers, that this further disadvantaged the polytechnics when gifts were made to higher education, that the need to market internationally should not give advantages to universities rather than polytechnics, that the polytechnics were "far better developed" than the Australian CAEs had been when they became universities, and that failure to allow the freedom to change their titles would involve serious career disadvantages for "possibly a million graduates" from the polytechnics.

All of these were arguments that struck a resonant chord in AIT.

Sir Christopher Ball (recent head of the UK Higher Education Funding Council and previously an Oxford Don), who had been visiting fellow at AIT in 1991, wrote a strong letter of support (Ball, 1993), and asked "when were the clients wrong?" (referring to the students supporting the case). He also commented that the opposition he had read from senior staff in the University of Auckland (stating that if polytechnics became universities, technician education would decline) offered "a static world view, a travesty of history, and a conspiracy theory to explain events. None of these is persuasive. Why should governments and institutional leaders conspire to damage technician education? What about
the demand-side problems (decline in applicants, poor job prospects)? The decline of technician education is largely the result of science and technology not being presented attractively at school, and job prospects are poor as a result of a decline of the manufacturing sector.”

With gathering momentum for the change, AIT’s solicitors were asked for advice, but wrote that they could not give advice on the matter as they would be acting for the University of Auckland. An alternative firm of solicitors was engaged, and advised that AIT had four options.

option 1: to request a change of name under section 162(5).

option 2: to seek establishment as a university institution under section 162.

option 3: to seek disestablishment as an institution and to become an educational facility described as a university under section 264.

option 4: to seek a change to the Act.

Option 3 was a complex technical move which, it was agreed, was highly unlikely to succeed, as the Minister would be unlikely to allow the disestablishment of AIT.

Option 4 was seen as a clumsy and very lengthy procedure, though it was seen as being probably the most correct procedure, given that the Act as presently framed did not seem to recognise the emergence of an institution such as AIT which was “partially a Polytechnic and partially a University”. This option was also expected to encounter significant opposition.

Options 1 and 2, then, were to either seek to remain a polytechnic and incorporate the word “university” in the name, or to seek to become established as a university. At this stage there had been no serious argument for reclassification, and option 1 was clearly the one to be tested.
In September 1993, AIT asked the Minister to change its name to “Auckland University of Technology” under section 162(5) of the Act. It sought to remain in the polytechnic sector for the purposes of the Act, and acknowledged that at that time it did not have all of the characteristics of a university specified by the Act (White, 1993).

Although this request had been made on the suggestion of the Minister during an informal conversation over lunch a few weeks earlier, the Minister refused the request on the grounds that “...the Education Act does not allow an institution to use the term ‘university’ as part of its name without being able to demonstrate it has all the characteristics of a university” (Smith, 1993). In this letter he advised that he had taken advice from the NZVCC who would not agree to an institution using the term “university” unless it could demonstrate it had all the characteristics of a university, and recommended that AIT make a formal application to the NZQA to “seek use of the term ‘university’ and undergo the processes used by NZQA to meet the requirements of the Education Act 1989.” This was followed by a further letter (Smith, 1994) stating the Minister’s regret that his previous letter “might have been misleading”, and that there was no provision under the Act for an application to be made directly to the NZQA. Later he further advised (Smith, 1994a), “Should AIT consider that, at some time in the future, it has all of the characteristics of a university, I would be prepared to consider a submission from you.”

This somewhat contradictory series of letters from the Minister reflects conflicting advice being given to him by his officials in the Ministry, and further reflects a situation where AIT was testing the Act in ways that had not been foreseen at the time it had been drafted.

A letter was also received by AIT from the Chancellor of the University of Auckland (Barker, 1993) stating that they had taken legal advice, and

“The legal advice is that, on the basis of the material we have received from your office, there would be good grounds for challenging in the courts any decision to change AIT’s name to Auckland University of Technology. Our advice is that while the Minister of Education is entitled
under section 162(5) to change the name of an institution, that power cannot permit the Minister to change the status of an institution by a name change and thereby circumvent the intentions of the Act.

Further, the University is advised that AIT would be in breach of the provisions of the Fair Trading Act if it used the word “University” in its title when it did not have the characteristics of a university and could be challenged by existing institutions for passing itself off as a university.

I trust this makes the University of Auckland’s position clear.”

A letter from the NZVCC (Tairoa, 1994) further stated that “the NZVCC does not have any arguments that differ from those put forward by the University of Auckland.”

It became apparent to AIT that the only course of action was to seek university classification. In a letter to the Minister, Hinchcliff wrote (Hinchcliff, 1994)

“Clearly, we accept that we cannot use the title “university” unless we are one. However there is a danger of a Kafkaesque problem here. You might know of Kafka’s book ‘The Castle’ in which it was impossible to get inside the castle without a key to the castle. But it was necessary to get into the castle to get the key.”

The pressure to be able to use the word “university” in the marketing and development of corporate alliances for the institution was growing. AIT had developed a strong presence in Malaysia during 1992 as it entered into a joint venture with a private college and was being vigorously marketed. I spent most of 1992 in Kuala Lumpur as Director of the College, and many inquiries from potential students revealed that lack of university status was a very serious handicap. Graduates from the AIT twinning programme in Kuala Lumpur began to transfer either to the UK or to Deakin or Curtin Universities for reasons of qualification status.

To seek a change in classification was not a decision that came easily for the council. The executive of AIT, which by now included Deans who had been recruited from Monash University and the University of Auckland, was unanimous that the Institute was comparable to the new universities in the UK and Australia at the time of their inception. The Academic Board was equally
concerned that the international reputation of the Institute required university classification, and moved to support the quest with just one abstention while at the same time reaffirming its commitment to the "trades" courses and lower level or second chance opportunities that it had always offered.

The Council, however, debated the issue at some length during 1995. The initial resolution came from the student representative, and was strongly endorsed by the President.

Two senior University of Auckland staff were members of the Council and argued strenuously against it. They believed that the Institute would change dramatically. It would move away from its traditional role, and become like all of the other existing universities, but in a weak position because it would be ranked against them using traditional university benchmarks, notwithstanding that the New Zealand universities had never had a ranking system. One of them (Wright, 1995) tabled a detailed paper outlining the legal hazards, and in particular the difficulties there would be in having any of AIT's current courses approved to be taught in a university where approvals have to be made by the NZVCC Committee for University Academic Approvals (CUAP).

Another councillor who had been on the council for nearly 20 years was adamantly opposed to the move as he had "stood up for the underdog all my life" and believed that becoming a university was an elitist action. The two staff representatives, both of whom had consistently opposed change during their periods on the council, were also against the move even though the staff associations were supportive. Two other councillors claimed neutrality (Fieldnotes, 1995).

The August 1995 meeting of council agreed to establish a "name change" committee of four or five members to work with me, determine the cost benefits of the application, and seek assurance (AIT Council minutes, 14.8.95) that

"on the change of name to a university we do retain the flexibility to offer, without diminishment, the range of courses we are currently offering."
This committee comprised members who were opposed to the status change as well as some of Council's more convinced supporters, and was requested to report to the 11 September meeting of the Council.

At the September 1995 meeting of Council, a two-page summary of the intent to seek university status was approved for distribution to key stakeholders. Discussion again centred on the issue of retaining the core character of AIT, and minutes of the meeting include reference to the following sentence in the summary which was deemed to be crucial:

"The Council is giving consideration to this only on the basis that the Institution would continue to offer the same range of courses that it now does" (AIT Council minutes, 25.9.95).

While the minutes of the meeting would seem to indicate that the matter was still undecided, in fact the final agreement to seek university status came with the following resolutions recommended by the "name change" committee (AIT Council minutes, 27.11.95):

1. That council approves the making of an application to the Minister of Education to establish the Auckland Institute of Technology as a university provided the Institute retains the flexibility to continue to offer, without diminishment but within the constraints of Government policy and stakeholder demand, the range of courses we are now offering (passed on a show of hands by 12 votes to 5);

2. That the views of all stakeholders continue to be sought, including Iwi, with the results made available to council and a portfolio of letters from Business and the Professions, supporting the change to university status, be put together for the application to the Minister if Council decides to proceed with an application for such a change of status;

3. That consideration be given to retaining the name "Auckland Institute of Technology" even if the Minister approves AIT becoming a university under the Act;

4. That an independent, but unbiased international university academic/administrator be retained to review the application and advise council whether AIT has all the characteristics of a university as specified under the Act;
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5 That consideration be given to consulting Mr. Norman Kingsbury and/or obtaining a second (QC's) opinion on the legal issues, to ensure any application to the Minister is legally robust, given the likely challenge in the courts by the existing universities to a favourable decision by the Minister;

6 That the committee be renamed the University Status Review Committee to avoid confusion over what is involved;

7 That any approach to the Minister of Education, the Ministry of Education, NZQA, or the Treasury about the Institute's application to become a university be made through the Council Chair or through persons authorised by Council.

It was agreed to seek the assistance of a new Wellington-based law firm which specialised in constitutional law and political lobbying, Chen and Palmer. The formal application was concurrently prepared over a period of about six weeks in October-November 1995 by me in collaboration with Chen and Palmer, and in anticipation of Council agreeing to a resolution to proceed.

One of the principals of Chen and Palmer, Sir Geoffrey Palmer, is a previous Prime Minister of New Zealand, and as the local member of Parliament, had taken the case to Parliament in 1989 for the Lincoln College of Agriculture to be established as a stand-alone university - a move that at the time drew the full opposition of the existing universities, just as the AIT application was expected to do in this instance. Sir Geoffrey was also the brother-in-law of AIT's President Hinchcliff, and had taken an interest in AIT's consideration of its future. His experience of the opposition from the university establishment to the Lincoln legislation gave him, by his own admission, an extra interest in AIT's case. Mai Chen, his partner, also expressed considerable interest in the case.

On 28 November 1995, AIT presented to the Minister its application to be reclassified as a university (AIT, 1995). The 500 page application contains a comprehensive rationale for the request and analysis of the Institute against the requirements of the Act.

In the absence of the Institute Chair and President, the application was presented personally to the Minister by a small group comprising Sir Geoffrey Palmer, the
Chair of the AIT University Status subcommittee, Mr. Lindsay Fergusson, and me. Within the next twenty-four hours, meetings were held with a number of leading politicians from both parties, including the Leader of the Opposition, senior officials in the Ministry of Education, Treasury, the NZQA, and the NZVCC, to brief them on the intent of the application. I had also prepared a four-page handout setting out the rationale for the application and reassuring stakeholders that the role of AIT as a leading provider of technical education was not going to be changed, but rather that justice was being sought for AIT graduates.

With the exception of the NZVCC, we were accorded (Fieldnotes, 1995) a supportive hearing. The Minister expressed interest in the case as did the Opposition MPs who confirmed that they did not see it as a political issue on which they would contest any decision by the Minister. The Leader of the Opposition, Helen Clark, however did express some concern that the Universities not have their reputations sullied by institutions with lower standards being added to their ranks. This was not unexpected, as her own background was strongly aligned with the University of Auckland, and her husband was a senior researcher in the Medical School. The Treasury officials offered full support, coming from a belief in the further deregulation of the education industry, particularly if it was likely to lead to stronger export performance.

The NZQA’s chief executive likewise indicated support for an institution like AIT (which had been supportive of NZQA) joining the university sector which was vigorously opposing the introduction of the Qualifications Framework or any involvement of the NZQA in their traditional activities.

Within AIT, the executive discussed at length the various options for naming a new university. The following were all considered. The acronyms were considered to be equally important, as AIT had always been known and referred to in New Zealand by its acronym.

- Auckland University of Technology (AUT)
- University of Technology, Auckland (UTA)
In the final analysis, however, it was agreed that a name change might not be necessary, this view being reinforced by the strong statement from the University of Auckland (cited above) that it would be likely to litigate under the Fair Trading Act if AIT chose a name even remotely like its own. Accordingly the Council resolution and AIT's application in November 1995 did not request a name change, citing the case of RMIT in Melbourne which had university status, but retained the name it had had as a college of advanced education prior to the Dawkins reforms in Australia.

**AIT'S 1995 APPLICATION**

The rationale for changing AIT's status to a university was set out most succinctly in the executive summary (AIT, 1995:8);

"**AIT seeks to become a university primarily in order to benefit its students, who strongly support this application, to change AIT's status to a university. The students will enjoy enhanced vocational prospects and more mobility both in New Zealand and overseas if the institution from which they secure their degree is called a university. Also, if AIT became a university, it would have greater opportunities to enter into exchange programmes that would benefit students.**"

*Granting AIT university status would also enhance its marketability in respect of New Zealand and international students. Currently it is disadvantaged in attracting international students as such students put great weight on the status of a qualification. AIT loses many potential international students to equivalent and overseas institutions because such institutions have been permitted to use the term "university" (such as Universities of Technology in Australia).*

*Changing its status to a university would also help AIT in marketing consultancy services and curricula development services, recruiting and retaining staff, and competing for research funding."*
The practical and policy justifications for changing AIT’s status were set out in section D of the application and summarised in para. 17 of the executive summary as follows:

"Granting AIT university status will:

(a) facilitate the complementarity of resources in the tertiary education sector;

(b) promote technological and vocational education, which is needed to enhance New Zealand’s competitiveness;

(c) assist in the integration of all post-compulsory education and training into a seamless continuum of learning opportunities;

(d) benefit the Auckland region by increasing the number of university places, with the population growth in Auckland being such that the region can support and gain from a university with the characteristics of AIT;

(e) further the government’s goals of equity and equal opportunity;

(f) enhance competition in the tertiary education sector;

(g) promote greater efficiencies in students’ choice of institution, in the labour market, and in the market for research;

(h) strengthen economic linkages with international markets and countries;

(i) by enabling AIT to attract more international students, increase New Zealand’s export earnings and opportunities for New Zealanders to mix with people from other cultures;

(j) facilitate international exchanges; and

(k) increase export earnings from providing research and consultancy services overseas."

This rationale was later criticised both by the University of Auckland and the UNITEC Institute of Technology (UNITEC, 1996) as representing only a marketing argument and not a sincere desire to be a university and promote the charter of a university. However, the body of AIT’s application makes detailed reference to the changing nature of the organisation, to its commitment to postgraduate programmes, and the development of a research culture.
While the key focus of the application was centred on an analysis and interpretation of the Act, it also made extensive assertions about the nature of a university (section E), and compared AIT with a number of other institutions (section F).

The application asserted that contemporary society required a new understanding of the nature of a university (section E). It challenged the notion of a university as a place committed to the search for greater knowledge and understanding but detached from society and not concerned with vocationally oriented subjects, and where entry is restricted by predetermined entry criteria which do not allow for the staircasing of qualifications from foundation and second chance opportunities.

The bulk of the application, however, addressed the characteristics of a university as set out in section 162(4) of the Act, claiming that AIT met all of these characteristics, and that it was further advanced than any other New Zealand university had been at the time of its inception.

This evidence included an analysis of existing enrolments showing that about two-thirds of its equivalent full time students were enrolled in higher level programmes (paras 231-234 and appendix XI), that the institution had approval and accreditation for over twenty bachelor level degrees (para 237), that postgraduate degrees were approved and offered (para 238), that there was substantial research activity in all faculties (paras 242-288 and appendix VI), that students were well recognised overseas and in New Zealand by the relevant professions (paras 297-300), that the Institute offered a number of programmes either not offered elsewhere in New Zealand or only offered elsewhere in New Zealand in universities (para 314), that the strategic plans for the Institute would see current trends consolidated (supplementary information table 1), and that there were quality assurance mechanisms in place to ensure that the Institute would continue to perform to international standards (paras 289-295).

The application dealt in detail with the legal procedures required under sections 160, 162, and 164 of the Act (see appendix II). These legal processes make the
reclassification of an existing institution into a university in New Zealand a more complex process than pertained in the UK in 1992 or Australia in the late 1980s. They also provide considerable opportunity for existing universities opposing the reclassification to litigate and slow the process down.

These sections of the Act were in fact used in 1997 by the Manawatu Polytechnic to stall the proposed merger between the Wellington Polytechnic and Massey University, and had the effect of slowing the process of amalgamation between Massey University and the Auckland College of Education in 1998 (described in chapter 9).

In November 1995 prior to the presentation of AIT’s application to the Minister, I met with the Vice Chancellor of the University of Auckland, Professor Kit Carson, to explain what AIT was doing and why, and was left in no doubt that the University would oppose AIT’s quest using every avenue available to it. Interestingly, his last words to me at that meeting were (fieldnotes, 26.9.95);

"The Minister has already been told that if AIT does not meet the criteria for a university, then his best action would be to enlarge the University of Auckland."

These sentiments were further confirmed by the Chancellor of the University, Sir Ian Barker, in a meeting with the AIT Council Chair and me in January 1996.

These sections of the Act were, therefore, seen by AIT’s legal advisors to be potential sources of judicial action by AIT’s adversaries, and meant that every step in the process of seeking the reclassification would have to be carefully considered from a legal perspective.

On receipt of the application, The Minister, in accordance with the Act, requested the Ministry of Education to seek submissions on the matter, and requested the Qualifications Authority for advice.

The Ministry received 101 submissions.
ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION ON
AIT'S 1995 APPLICATION

The Ministry of Education’s deadline for receiving submissions on AIT’s application closed on June 6, 1996, nearly two months after a “panel of repute” appointed by the NZQA to assist it in advising the Minister had visited AIT.

The submissions were presented by a wide variety of respondents, both national and international, including universities, polytechnics, private providers, professional associations, and individuals.

Eighty-eight of the submissions generally supported AIT’s application. These submissions came from a widely representative and broad spectrum of community and industrial interests, local bodies, and professional organisations as well as a number of educational institutions. Most of them made short one or two-page statements to the effect that they supported AIT in its university status application. None of them presented any analytical comment, though some did add as a condition to their support, the need for AIT to continue to do what it was already doing.

Of the thirteen opposing the application, two (#s 91 and 101) were from universities (Auckland, and Lincoln), and four (#s 93, 92, 51 and 55), were from university-related organisations (NZ University Students’ Association, NZVCC, the Auckland University Association of University Staff, and the NZ Association of University Staff. A further three (#s 90, 88 and 87) were from the polytechnics competing with AIT in the Auckland region (UNITEC and Manukau) and a professional body led by the CEO of UNITEC (the Institute of Professional Engineers in New Zealand, IPENZ). Submission 52 was from a disaffected staff member of AIT who claimed that staff were being forced to teach at higher levels and that low level courses were being stopped. Submission 98, from the NZ Council of Trade Unions, was concerned that AIT would become primarily focused on degree activities to the detriment of vocational training, and place the National Qualifications framework at risk. Another private
individual (# 95) felt that AIT could not become a university because it wasn’t funded to be one, and that it should transfer its “academically strong” courses to the University of Auckland. The Secondary Principals’ Association of New Zealand (# 83) commented simply that they opposed it because Auckland already had a sufficient number of universities.

Of the opposing submissions, the University of Auckland and the NZVCC made the two most detailed statements of opposition. The university-related associations appear to have used these submissions as the basis for their own, adding little to the argument, with many of their phrases and points being word for word the same as the arguments expressed by the University of Auckland.

The UNITEC submission supported AIT’s application being granted in due course but not now. This was backed up by claims that AIT did not meet the criteria of the Act, that AIT did not have verifiable financial viability, an extended statement of belief about the negative impact of AIT’s application on other polytechnics in the region, and a confusing conclusion which on the one hand claimed that New Zealand was not yet ready for more universities, but on the other hand asserted that it soon would be (presumably when UNITEC was in a position to follow suit!).

The UNITEC submission reflects an institution (which was known to view AIT as its major competitor) deeply concerned about its own position should it be left with a status disadvantage and anxious to not be left behind. UNITEC therefore also submitted that the establishment of a New Zealand University of Technology (NZUT) which could award AIT’s degrees would be a better alternative. The NZUT proposal (discussed in chapter 9 of this dissertation) was at the time being strongly promoted by UNITEC.

The Lincoln University submission did not express a view as to whether or not AIT should be a university, but sought merely to clarify its own history as it believed this might not have been clear in the AIT application where AIT stated that it had more degree students than Lincoln. The submission pointed out that while this was true, Lincoln had always been a constituent college of the
University of New Zealand until 1961 and of the University of Canterbury until 1989 when it gained its autonomy. Its Principal had, prior to the establishment of the University, been a member of the NZVCC, and at the time of its reclassification as an autonomous university, it had an established research profile, 17% of its students were postgraduate, and 66.3% were enrolled in first degrees. The submission also stated the view that a decision by the Minister to deny AIT's application would not impede the development of AIT in the way that a decision not to allow AIT to award degrees would do.

The University of Auckland and NZVCC submissions, supported by the submissions from the university related organisations, on the other hand raised a number of technical issues relating to the extent to which AIT met the requirements of the Act. Both these submissions dealt with each of the five characteristics of a university set out in section 162(4) of the Act, proposed their own interpretation of them, and commented on AIT's conformity to these interpretations.

The NZVCC did not agree with AIT's submission (section 225) which had posited that the Minister could exercise his discretion on the basis that AIT had plans and systems in place to ensure that it would soon fulfil the criteria, and made this point both in its submission and in its meeting with the NZQA panel, resulting in a decision by NZQA to revise the terms of reference of the panel which in draft form included:

\[d\text{ offer advice to the Board of the Qualifications Authority on the extent to which the applicant either meets the characteristics or is able to meet the characteristics within a specified time frame} \text{(emphasis added).}\]

In the revised version, this was altered to read:

\[d\text{ Advise the Board of the Qualifications Authority on the extent to which the applicant has the characteristics of a university and make recommendations where appropriate} \text{(emphasis added).}\]

AIT did not choose to contest this change and accepted that it would probably be easier to show conformity with all the characteristics in whatever form they
would be interpreted than to enter into lengthy litigation which would be both costly and probably take some years to resolve, and by which time it would be likely to have met the benchmarks anyway.

The University of Auckland strongly contested the rationale for AIT’s application, noting that the five paragraphs in the executive summary of AIT’s application focused on the perceived benefits to AIT of a status change, and did not address the statutory requirements to conform to the characteristics of a university set out in the Act. Thus, the University concluded that the Act was not drafted to enable institutions to become universities in order to enhance the vocational prospects and mobility of graduates (para 9), the fact that AIT had more students studying at higher levels than any other polytechnic (para 10) was irrelevant because the Act omits any reference to the size of institutions, the wide range of degrees offered by AIT (para 11) did not in fact represent a wide diversity of teaching at a higher level since most of these degrees were at Bachelor’s level, granting AIT university status to enhance its marketability (para 12) was merely a commercial consideration and not a criterion under the Act, and changing AIT’s status to a university to enable it to recruit and retain staff (para 13) was also a commercial consideration and irrelevant to a decision to grant university status.

The University’s contentions were based on legal opinion about the meaning of the Act. But as has been stated in other parts of this thesis, the decision to grant university status was never going to be a matter of legal conformity to the Act alone. AIT’s application itself stated (para 370) that “...the fact that an institution satisfies all the characteristics of a university does not automatically mean that the Minister must accord it that status. The final decision still rests with the Minister,” though AIT had also conceded in the same paragraph, “Given the express specification that the Minister must take into account the characteristics of a university, it seems unlikely that Parliament would have intended the Minister to be required to take any other factors into account.”

On Characteristic 1 (Universities are primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence), the
NZVCC did not agree that learning at level 6 on the NQF equated to advanced teaching, and reiterated their long-standing belief that degrees should not be broken up in terms of Framework levels, but registered as a whole on the Framework (a view also held by AIT, incidentally). They noted that New Zealand’s existing universities currently enrolled between 90-100% of students in degree programmes, but that it was desirable for universities to also offer some sub-degree diplomas and certificates. They claimed that “primarily” could mean anything between 51% and 99%, and proposed that in quantitative terms, a university should have a minimum of 75% of students enrolled in degree level studies. They further submitted that the enrolment profile should have a significant involvement in postgraduate education, and suggested the Australian benchmark for recognition of a university which requires a minimum of 3% of the student load being engaged in postgraduate research would be appropriate.

The latter but not the former suggestion was adopted by the panel in setting a guideline of 50% of students in degree level studies with 5% of these in postgraduate studies.

The NZVCC on the grounds of its own suggestions for the criteria thus reached the logical conclusion that AIT did not meet this characteristic.

The University of Auckland likewise expressed the view that “more advanced learning” refers to study towards degrees as a minimum and to postgraduate degrees and diplomas in particular, claiming that if AIT had an ongoing commitment to its lower level courses, this would mean that it would continue to offer more courses at lower level than any other level. This argument was not based on student load, but on the quantum of courses offered, many of AIT’s lower level courses being tailored for very small numbers.

The University also commented on paras 161-166 of the AIT application which drew attention to the status of Lincoln University at the time of its creation as a university, pointing out that Lincoln became a university before the Education Act 1989 had been enshrined, and that at the time Lincoln had seven different Bachelor’s degrees, five distinct Master’s degrees, and a number of doctoral
degree programmes. AIT’s contention had been that Lincoln had fewer degree students than AIT at its inception. This was not contested either by the University or by Lincoln in its own submission.

Para 78 of the AIT application also made comparisons with the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, RMIT, which the University claimed were not supported because RMIT had a wide range of graduate and postgraduate programmes when it became a university. This argument did not acknowledge the existence in RMIT of an extensive range of TAFE programmes which exceeded in number the range of programmes in its CAE section, and which carried approximately 60% of the student load.

On characteristic 2 (Universities’ research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of their teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge), the NZVCC suggested a benchmark of 25% of all staff possessing a PhD qualification as a minimum position, and claimed that AIT could not demonstrate either the interdependence of teaching and research or that most staff are active in advancing knowledge because it had not demonstrated this.

The University also submitted that AIT could not conform to this characteristic because only a small proportion of its staff possessed doctoral degrees, thus concluding that most of its teachers could not be active in advancing knowledge. It also claimed that both RMIT (23%) and the Queensland University of Technology (26%) had a higher proportion of staff with PhD degrees than AIT. The University, however, did not suggest any benchmark for interpretation of this characteristic.

These submissions presented a shallow interpretation of this characteristic, for AIT’s experience had been that many of its PhD staff were in fact less active in research than many staff with lesser qualifications. An interesting research project could be performed correlating the qualifications of staff in a polytechnic with their research outputs.
On characteristic 3 (Universities meet international standards of research and teaching), the NZVCC did not recommend benchmarks, but suggested a more flexible definition of research than the definition proposed by the NZQA and used by AIT, and suggested that the test of research capability would be the success of applications for support of research contracts through the Foundation for Research Science and Technology (FRST). The NZVCC noted that AIT had not made any bids for such support.

With respect to international standards of teaching, however, the NZVCC noted that the quality of students entering AIT was good (s.301) and the employability of graduates impressive, leading to the conclusion that AIT graduates do not lack recognition or status in New Zealand.

The University of Auckland likewise did not recommend any benchmarks for interpretation of this characteristic, but selected the AIT faculty with the weakest research outputs (Science and Engineering) for analysis to conclude that because only a small percentage of staff had had their research reported in refereed journals, AIT did not meet international standards of research. No reference was made to international standards of teaching.

On characteristic 4 (Universities are a repository of knowledge and expertise), the NZVCC acknowledged that all tertiary institutions are in a broad sense repositories of knowledge and expertise, but questioned whether AIT’s knowledge and expertise was similar to that held in universities. Comparisons of library expenditure were then used as a means of raising questions as to whether AIT’s library facilities were adequate for university purposes.

The issue of library resourcing was also used by the University of Auckland and all the university related groups who made submissions to claim that AIT could not be a repository of knowledge and expertise. Further reference was made by the University to AIT’s “low” percentage of staff with PhDs as further evidence that it failed to meet this characteristic.
The concept that the possession of a PhD is a precondition for the possession of knowledge and expertise is one that is highly questionable, as is the concept that knowledge and expertise is only held in libraries.

On characteristic 5 (Universities accept a role of critic and conscience of society), the NZVCC concluded that there no easy ways to determine whether or not an institution is a critic and conscience of society, and that they could not judge AIT on this, while the University of Auckland attacked the credibility of some publications that had appeared in AIT Press in the previous year, claiming (6.5.4) that this "raises questions as to the processes which AIT has in place to monitor the information it places in the public domain."

On s.162(4)(b)(iii) of the Act (Universities are characterised by a wide diversity of teaching and research, especially at a higher level, that maintains, advances, disseminates, and assists the application of knowledge, develops intellectual independence, and promotes community learning), the University of Auckland concurred with the conclusions of the NZVCC who compared the overall definition of a polytechnic (s.162(4)(b)(ii) with that of a university, and had concluded:

"These statements are not easy to distinguish but in the university case there has to be a wide diversity of teaching and research, especially at a higher level. The emphasis is on the linking of teaching and research which is the hallmark of a university and the emphasis is on "a higher level". This is a reference to postgraduate teaching and learning. The polytechnics by contrast are characterised as concentrating on continuing education including vocational training. There is no mention of developing intellectual independence in the polytechnic definition and their research is to be "applied and technological research that aids development."

"The picture that emerges from the AIT application is one that is much more like a polytechnic than that of a university as conceived in the legislation ... we therefore consider that AIT in terms of the sixth characteristic is still a polytechnic and not a university ... the AIT application is in the NZVCC view premature."

AIT's 1995 application did in fact give considerable attention to the issue of developing intellectual independence in its students (Section J) and pointed out
that all of its approved degree programmes had had to show this as an aim as part of the approval process.

Nevertheless, the conclusion reached by the NZVCC was probably a fair one, both from the perspective that AIT did not on the basis of its 1995 application at all points meet reasonable interpretations of the Act (later confirmed by the NZQA panel) but also from the implicit acknowledgment that the boundaries between a university and a polytechnic were, in AIT’s case at least, blurred, and that in the future AIT would probably meet whatever benchmarks were to be established.

The University of Auckland said that there were policy issues relating to the number and types of institutions required in Auckland, the size of tertiary institutions, student mobility, the marketing of tertiary institutions overseas, and the recognition of qualifications, but did not comment further on them. They had, however, all been raised in the AIT application and the acknowledgment by the University of them as issues indicates that AIT’s action in seeking a status change was in fact prompting a number of matters for wider debate.

NZVCC also raised some general policy issues:

"It is likely that a favourable decision will prompt other polytechnics, particularly in Auckland, to seek university status. Unlike the United Kingdom or Australia where former polytechnics and CAEs have gained university status, there is no Further Education or TAFE sector in New Zealand. If polytechnics neglect their wider responsibilities in the quest for university status there is a danger that there will be a lack of focus on education and training in the post-school sub-degree area."

The issues raised in this comment, however, neglect the fundamental question of whether or not it is appropriate for a university to also broaden its scope and range of activities through the inclusion of technical and further education in the same way that many polytechnics had done in developing degree and postgraduate programmes.
Within 12 months, Massey University had already moved to further overlap its activities with those of the polytechnics through agreeing to merge with the Wellington Polytechnic, effectively undermining the stated views of the NZVCC.

**The meaning of a university - Analysis of the submissions**

In summary, the submissions can be divided into two categories: those commenting on the appropriateness of AIT being a university, and those commenting on whether or not AIT met the technical requirements of a university as described by the Act.

Little was added to the sum of knowledge under the first category, other than that (to the extent to which the submissions reflected public opinion) there would not be significant political opposition to a status change except from within the University of Auckland, and that there was considerably more support for it than against it. There was generally strong agreement from the supporters of AIT's application that its graduates performed well in comparison to university graduates, that its reputation deserved university status, and that there would be considerable benefits for New Zealand if AIT could present itself internationally as a university.

The submissions from the University of Auckland, the university-related organisations, and the NZVCC do, however, provide important viewpoints on the meaning of a university and on how the Act should be interpreted from the standpoint of these views. In the context of these submissions, weaknesses in AIT's case were also exposed.

The views of these organisations suggest that an existing organisation seeking to be given university status must first be able to demonstrate that it conforms to the profile of the universities currently in existence in New Zealand. These universities, can in the main, be seen as having developed from the traditional British model of a university that existed prior to the disestablishment of the binary divide in 1992, and similar in most respects to the Australian universities prior to the Dawkins reforms of the late 1980s.
Charlesworth (1998) describes the traditional Australian university as having been driven into this mould through the 1940s-1980s by a succession of leading academics completing their undergraduate studies in Australia, undertaking postgraduate and doctoral studies in Oxford, Cambridge, or other highly regarded British universities, then returning to Australia where they continued to shape the university system in the forms with which they had become familiar. This is a pattern readily identifiable in the New Zealand universities.

Thus, the universities are for the main part concerned with discipline-oriented degrees as opposed to degrees and other qualifications designed to meet the needs of professions, and the student bodies are largely composed of undergraduates studying for degrees as opposed to shorter programmes related to workplace needs. Research is seen to be an important and even dominant activity to engaged in for its own sake. For many academic staff in the universities indeed, research is perceived to be of greater importance than teaching, as evidenced by the criteria for staff promotion, and the importance attached to seeking external research funding.

It is from this perception of a university, therefore, that the claims of the universities that an overwhelming percentage of students should be enrolled in degrees before an institution can legitimately be described as a university can be understood. This has long been the hallmark of a New Zealand university, though the growth in number of postgraduate students has been a more recent phenomenon of the last two decades. The insistence that academic staff qualifications be mostly based on research-based doctoral studies (even though the large majority of teaching is carried out at undergraduate levels) rather than significant professional experience is likewise to be understood from the history of these universities.

One of the key research questions in this dissertation relates to the meaning of a university. While the Act defines a university in terms of a series of characteristics, AIT’s application and the subsequent submissions received upon it reveal substantially different beliefs relating to this question.
On the one hand there is the view espoused by the universities themselves that a university comprises a community of academic staff engaged in research and where the teaching is mostly directed at undergraduate students enrolled in a three or four year degree. The research is of higher prestige if it is experimental or theoretical work primarily to acquire new knowledge, or which is intended to generate new knowledge in areas where no known specific applications have been identified.

On the other hand there is the view promoted by AIT’s application that a university is a place to advance practical knowledge and to provide the basis for continued independent learning in a vocational context, where research should have some relevance to the development of knowledge for application, and where students may be enrolled in significant numbers in undergraduate programmes other than degrees. The reputation of such a university should be established by the quality of its teaching as assessed by its students, and the quality of its graduates as assessed by their employers, rather than on the prestige of its theoretical and strategic research.

There is some common ground in these two perspectives. There is agreement that a university should provide a framework of understanding of a discipline or group of disciplines, the ability to think critically, and appropriate investigative skills. Where the differences lie are in the question of whether it is from within a degree programme alone that one can gain these understandings and skills, and the extent to which research is an integral determinant of the ability of the organisation to provide them.

The Act specifically requires that the research and teaching of a university be closely interdependent. None of the submissions on AIT’s application gives significant attention to this requirement. As pointed out in chapter 2, however, demonstrating the interdependence of research and teaching has proven to be elusive. It can be argued that while pedagogical skills and research skills are not necessarily correlated within individuals, and that those who are engaged in significant research will probably spend less energy on their teaching than those
who are not, it is from a context in which research is valued and freely discussed that higher level teaching and the advancement of knowledge will take place.

The development of a research culture within AIT (the subject of the next chapter) can certainly be seen as having stemmed not only from the requirement to demonstrate such a culture in order to attain university status, but also from a growing appreciation of the place of research in a university. To this extent the debate arising from AIT’s 1995 application had a strong effect on the culture of the organisation itself.

**WIDER POLICY ISSUES**

The debate about the meaning of a university and the emergence of the two differing perspectives promoted by AIT on the one hand and the established universities on the other made it clear that whatever technical interpretation of the Act was to be applied, the status quo was being challenged. The response of the other polytechnics (discussed in chapter 9) also meant that AIT’s application for university status could not be treated in isolation.

Wider issues of national and regional interest were therefore raised within the Ministry of Education and were summarised in a policy analysis (Ross, 1996) which was submitted to the Tertiary Consultative Committee (TCC).

These issues were identified in the analysis as having been prompted by AIT’s application for university status, and suggested that the Ministry in agreeing to a bid by any polytechnic for university status would need to be satisfied on the following issues:

1. **Assessing New Zealand’s Tertiary Education Requirements**

Ross commented that there were questions over whether there was an “ideal” number of particular types of tertiary institutions for New Zealand, but suggested that a more relevant concern could be what “type” and “quality” of institutions are required to fulfil New Zealand’s tertiary education and training requirements.
and how well the current arrangements respond to these changing needs and demands.

In this respect, the Ministry was interested in the following questions:

- Was there a current growth in demand for degree programmes?
- Would the polytechnic’s application for university status have an impact on the provision of lower level and vocational courses?
- How might Government’s purchase policy be assessed to ensure that these programmes were still available?
- What assessment of demand for these programmes has been carried out?

A related question concerned the sustainability of an application for university status over time. Would the standards currently met by the applicant continue in the future?

2    *International Competition and Reputation*

The concerns of the polytechnic sector relating to its ability to market polytechnic education internationally, particularly given that more international recognition is provided to university than polytechnic qualifications, was acknowledged, along with the need to retain the international reputation of New Zealand’s tertiary institutions.

In this respect, Ross suggested that information and evidence would need to be provided as to how the lack of university status was impacting on the marketability of the institution, and how student employment or further education prospects were being disadvantaged internationally. This information would need to include evidence of potential international partnerships that were not being able to be fulfilled, or that foreign students were choosing university over polytechnic education and training in similar fields of study.
3 Fiscal Implications for Government

It was suggested that changes in status or the establishment of new institutions might have an impact on Government resources in terms of fiscal liability and the potential impact on the EFTS funding system, and the allocation of resources to existing institutions.

An assessment of this would therefore be needed, including the financial position of the institution and the forecasts of the institution’s viability, along with EFTS projections to assess the future impact on the total EFTS pool.

4 Regional Provision of Education and Training

The impact of university status on the regional provision of education and training was seen to be similar to the national issues, and a case would therefore be required, based on the regional needs of students and the business and education communities.

It was suggested that an assessment of changing demand for courses and programmes in regional institutions, such as EFTS growth and changing trends in the types and level of courses demanded, would therefore be necessary in order to satisfy the Ministry that the establishment of a new university would be an acceptable and sustainable decision for Government to make.

These wider policy issues, in effect, established the chains of further evidence that the Ministry would require, over and above the advice by the NZQA, as to whether the applying institution met the criteria for university status set out in the Act. These were noted and specifically addressed in the recasting of the case for AIT’s university classification in 1998 (see appendix II).
CONCLUSION

The AIT application for university status triggered a national debate about the meaning of a university. Given the somewhat homogeneous nature of the New Zealand universities and the requirement that the application be made under sections 160-164 of the Education Act, the Act itself came under scrutiny with the argument becoming centred on the extent to which an aspiring university had to be involved in degree teaching and research in order to satisfy the requirement that most of its teaching be at a higher level and most of its staff be engaged in advancing knowledge.

In addition to raising the question of whether a university can have a significant involvement in technical and further education, the application also raised wider concerns as to whether polytechnic education would be diminished if the country's leading polytechnic became a university. The universities themselves were arguing that their own reputations would be diminished if a university with a different student profile was to be permitted, and the other Auckland polytechnics were concerned about their own market share being damaged if AIT gained a higher status.

The essential questions seem to hinge around the issue of whether or not New Zealand wants to diversify its university sector, and whether or not Government can or should predetermine the balance of courses that students shall enrol in.

These questions and the concerns of the rest of the tertiary sector are discussed further in chapters 9 and 11.
Chapter 6

The Response of the NZQA, 1996-97

Introduction

Chapter 5 described how AIT developed and articulated its case for university status in 1995, analysed the submissions that were received on it, and identified some of the issues of understanding about the nature of a university that resulted.

In this chapter, the role of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, NZQA, in advising the Minister of Education on AIT’s application is explored in detail. There having been no precedent, a “panel of repute” was established to recommend benchmarks for interpretation of the Act. These were subsequently published as recommended guidelines on which public submissions were sought. This process, which took a period of two years, is analysed, along with the submissions received by NZQA and the panel’s evaluation of AIT’s 1995 application against its proposed guidelines.

These guidelines are compared to those existing in Australia and the UK.

The Advice of the NZQA: Establishment of the Panel of Repute

The NZQA established a “panel of repute” to consider the matter with the following terms of reference (NZQA, 1996, appendix 1):

a) With reference to “The Granting of Consent to Use Protected Terms” and the characteristics and definition of a university set out in Section 162(4) of the Education Act 1989, establish benchmarks to determine whether an institution applying to be established as a university has the characteristics of a university.
b) Gather and consider evidence that enables professional judgments to be made according to the benchmarked criteria for each characteristic.

c) Consider the consultation advice gathered by the panel and by NZQA.

d) Advise the Board of the Qualifications Authority on the extent to which the applicant has the characteristics of a university and make recommendations where appropriate.

The panel comprised a previous Chancellor of the University of Auckland, two Vice Chancellors from universities outside of New Zealand (RMIT and Humberside), a New Zealand Professor of History, an eminent Maori community leader, and an eminent business leader.

They met for a week in April 1996 at AIT to consider the application and sought a substantial amount of additional information, including a more detailed analysis of enrolments, copies of the research registers, details of staff qualifications, and plans for upgrading staff qualifications. They interviewed members of the Council, Academic Board, students, and Industry Advisory Committee Chairs. Representatives from the University of Auckland and the New Zealand Vice Chancellors Committee were also invited to meet the panel and express their views.

The panel forwarded the first draft of its report to NZQA five months later in September 1996. This draft was in turn forwarded to AIT for comment on its factual accuracy, and finally tabled for the board of the NZQA in November 1996, almost exactly one year after AIT had made its application to the Minister. The Board did not discuss the report at that stage, but received it and passed it to its Policy Advisory Committee.

AIT's president and I were invited to meet with the Policy Advisory Committee in January 1997 to comment on the guidelines, and made the point that we were generally satisfied that they presented a reasonable interpretation of the Act, but that there were inconsistencies in the referencing of levels of study, and no guidelines for interpreting the word "diversity".
In the event, the recommended guidelines were in May 1997 made public in draft form, and submissions invited on them. Initially the closing date for submissions had been set at 31 August 1997, but this was later extended to December 1997, a full two years after AIT had made its original application.

**THE PANEL’S PROPOSED GUIDELINES**

The twenty-three page report of the panel addressed each of the characteristics of a university set out in section 162(4)(a) of the Act, recommending the following “guidelines” (as opposed to “benchmarks”) for interpretation of the Act, and stating (appendix 4) that

“*In applying itself ... the panel recognised that the role of a university was changing and that new universities may bring features not yet foreseen. Consequently, it established a set of criteria able to be applied as guidelines on a case by case basis for applicants wishing to be recognised as a university. It does not intend the criteria to be applied as rigid and unswerving benchmarks. Instead it stresses the need for each applicant’s character and features to be carefully assessed on its own merits using the criteria as a guide to interpretive decisions*." (underlining in original)

**Characteristic (i): (Universities) are primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence.**

The Panel considered that students completing programmes of “more advanced learning” would demonstrate the following:

- a substantial knowledge of a discipline or group of related disciplines;
- investigative skills appropriate to the disciplines;
- the capacity to think critically;
- the ability to work independently with others; and
• the ability to apply the knowledge and skills acquired to different situations.

The Panel identified “more advanced learning” as being able to be identified with programmes at levels 6-8 on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and considered that a university would normally meet a requirement of 60% of equivalent full-time students (EFTS) being enrolled for qualifications at level 6 or higher, with 50% of its EFTS being enrolled in degree level programmes and 5% of total degree enrolments being at postgraduate degree level, including research-based masterates and PhDs in a range of disciplines appropriate to the character of the institution.

Levels 6-8 of the NQF represent its three highest levels. Level 8 corresponds to postgraduate study, level 7 to the final year of a Bachelor’s degree, and level 6 to a diploma or other subdegree programme finishing at a level of academic achievement equivalent to the mid point of a Bachelor’s degree.

These guidelines took a quite different profile to those established in either Australia or the United Kingdom where benchmarks were essentially established as minimum thresholds.

The Australian Vice Chancellors Committee guidelines (AVCC, 1991) on the criteria for a recognised university indicate a number of quantitative indicators:

(i) A student load of the order of 500 EFTSU in each of three broad fields of study; and

(ii) 3% of total student load allocated to postgraduate research students.

The UK criteria (HEQC, 1994) are less stringent, but again include quantitative measures:

a) an HE enrolment of at least 300 EFTS in each of five different academic subject categories;

b) an HE enrolment of at least 4000 EFTS ;

c) at least 3000 EFTS on degree level courses.
The differences between the criteria established in each of Australia and the UK reflect the different environments in which the criteria were developed. In Australia they were developed in response to the Dawkins reforms and were probably intended by the Vice Chancellors' Committee to prevent an undue dilution of the profile of existing universities by Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) which did not have the research history of the universities prior to 1988. It can be speculated that in this way, CAEs were encouraged to amalgamate with universities rather than to amalgamate with themselves or seek university status without amalgamation, though fifteen of the thirty-five Australian universities existing in 1991 (Goedegebuure, Lysons, Meek, 1993: 403-404) were in fact amalgams of former CAEs which were supported during their early years as universities by a "mentor" university appointed for this task.

The UK criteria were primarily established to allow the polytechnics to be reclassified as universities without encouragement to merge with existing universities, while keeping the Colleges of Higher Education out of the university cartel. The effect of this has been that there is more diversity in the university sector in the UK than there is in Australia. Universities with fewer than 5,000 EFTS are common, and the University of Central England (the former Birmingham Polytechnic) with over 10,000 EFTS in 1996 still has only approximately 200 EFTS enrolled at postgraduate level (Horsburgh, 1996).

**Characteristic (ii): (Universities’) research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of their teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge.**

The panel applied the definition of research promoted by the Tertiary Action Group (TAG, 1996). This definition was adopted by AIT and appears in Appendix II, section 2.

The panel in applying this definition considered that a university would normally demonstrate
• Curriculum and pedagogical evidence that the research outcomes of the staff inform teaching programmes;

• institutional policies and practices ensuring the interdependence of teaching and research;

• human resource policies and practices giving recognition to both research and teaching and their interdependence;

• information resources and services supporting both research and teaching;

• development strategies at every level of the institution to encourage leadership and strategic planning for learning and research effectiveness, including the ability to identify areas of excellence;

• 60% of academic staff teaching at level 6 and above of the NQF being active in research;

• regular and wide dissemination of reports of research activity and outcomes;

• collaborative and multidisciplinary research to effectively utilise resources and sustain selective centres of excellence; and

• individual, team, and collaborative student research projects.

This approach by the panel appears to have established new ground for what is essentially both a qualitative and a quantitative definition of a university as a research institution.

The guidelines established by the Australian Vice Chancellors Committee were more prescriptive than evaluative, while in the United Kingdom the approach was to establish qualitative guidelines with minimum quantitative benchmarks.

The AVCC guidelines suggested the following quantitative indicators:

• the staff of the institution would be expected to obtain one competitive research grant for every 20 full-time equivalent members of staff graded at lecturer and above per annum;

• the staff of the institution would be expected to have an average of 0.5% refereed publications per annum per full-time equivalent staff member;

• at least 25% of all academic staff would be expected to have both a relevant PhD and research experience.
In the UK, the HEQC (1994) took a more qualitative approach, requiring new universities to have research degree-awarding powers, with associated expectations that the institutions would have the following characteristics:

a. formal quality assurance processes to ensure the scrutiny, supervision, and monitoring of research degree programmes,

b. proper definition of the responsibilities of supervisors, students, examiners, research managers, and administrators,

c. a nucleus of staff within the institution with experience in managing research degree programmes,

d. use of external academic or professional advice in research degree approval processes,

e. the availability of appropriate courses in research methods,

f. the employment of supervisors with successful PhD supervision experience,

g. training arrangements for inexperienced supervisors,

h. the fostering of a research environment for students and supervisors,

i. established contact and collaboration with external research groups, and

j. an active track record in seeking external research funding.

The HEQC also indicated that a prima facie case would require 50-60 current research degree registrations and 20-30 PhD conferments.

For New Zealand, then, the panel recommended guidelines with fewer quantifiable benchmarks but with greater emphasis on the evidence drawn from
within the institution to ensure that research and teaching are closely interdependent, with most teaching being done by people active in advancing knowledge.

This was consistent with the Act which prescribes the characteristics of a university. It was also consistent with the New Zealand environment of political, economic, and social deregulation where there were no Ministry guidelines or Government regulations in effect.

Characteristic (iii): (Universities) meet international standards of research and teaching.

The panel considered that a university would normally demonstrate:

- a research culture committed to producing demonstrable outcomes;
- a teaching and learning culture committed to producing competent and effective graduates;
- external grants and institutional funds committed to support research;
- a suitable number of staff with post-graduate qualifications, and an active programme of staff development to enhance those qualifications;
- quality assurance throughout the institution to ensure maintenance of standards;
- external evaluation of degree courses and external examination of postgraduate theses;
- participation of staff in international research programmes and forums;
- recognition and acceptance of its research by the broader community, and by employer and professional and other relevant bodies; and
- international acceptance of programmes through international student and staff transfers.

It is interesting to note that the Australian Vice Chancellors’ Committee’s guidelines give very little attention to the need for demonstrating international standards. There is only a reference to the need to have “a commitment to the
concept of free enquiry by its staff and the scholarly publication of their findings” (clause iii), which could be interpreted as meaning that there should be a commitment to research findings being made available for the scrutiny of the international community, and a very general statement that “the institution will have courses which meet national and international standards at a high level” (clause iv).

Similarly, the HEQC criteria include only one reference to international standards: “appropriate external academic and professional points of reference so that standards are judged against those of the wider academic world” (clause 3.2(c)). The reference continues “This is especially important in smaller and monotechnic institutions where limited breadth or volume of work will otherwise be a significant disadvantage”, implying that perhaps this is not so important for large and diverse institutions.

*Characteristic iv: (Universities) are a repository of knowledge and expertise.*

The panel considered that a university would normally demonstrate:

- An active and dynamic influence on its region and its community; and in doing so would make its information and human resources readily available to the wider community.

The Australian Vice Chancellors’ Committee guidelines do not make explicit reference to a university having an active or dynamic influence on the region through its information or human resources. But there is reference to meeting the needs of professional associations (clause (v), to the staff having professional standing in the community (clause vii), and to the need for the institution to have “extensive library and information storage and retrieval resources” (clause ix).

There is by contrast no reference at all to this characteristic in the HEQC guidelines which are entirely devoted to issues associated with academic management and the provision of research degrees.
The New Zealand Vice Chancellors’ Committee’s submission to the Minister on AIT’s application likewise did not refer to the impact of a university on its local community, focusing almost entirely on the physical repositories of knowledge such as libraries, databases, and scientific and art collections.

The panel’s recommendations on guidelines for this characteristic could therefore be seen as the basis for an evaluation of a university which goes beyond the internal measures of what the institution possesses and into an external measure of what the community at large might expect from its university.

This is an important feature in the definition of a university and consistent with the University of Auckland’s view as stated in its charter:

“In pursuing its prime goals the University .... acknowledges its responsibility to the community by contributing to the cultural and intellectual life of the city, region, and nation; providing opportunities for lifelong learning and continuing professional education; making expertise, library and archival collections and other facilities available to the community....”

Characteristic (v): (Universities) accept a role as critic and conscience of society.

The panel considered that a university would normally

- Initiate or readily provide informed and responsible comment on issues facing society, and be sensitive to social and cultural issues in a manner appropriate to an organisation of advanced learning and research.

There is no direct reference to this characteristic of a university in the AVCC’s guidelines for a recognised university, though clause (iii) which states that “the institutions will have a commitment to the concept of free enquiry by its staff and the scholarly publication of their findings” implies that academic freedom should be enshrined. Embracing the concept of academic freedom, however, is a more passive requirement than the imperative to accept a role as critic and conscience of society.
The HEQC criteria do not mention either academic freedom or any role as critic and conscience of society. This is surprising given the history of Europe in the twentieth century and the criticism leveled in particular at academics in Hitler’s Germany who failed, in the view of many, to speak out against the rise of fascism and anti-semitism.

The New Zealand legislators might therefore take credit for having included this characteristic as a requirement of its academic institutions, despite the discomfort that outspoken academics often cause for politicians.

The “Definition” of a University in the Act

Section 162(4)(b) of the Act states that:

“A University is characterised by a wide diversity of teaching and research, especially at a higher level, that maintains, advances, disseminates, and assists the application of knowledge, develops intellectual independence, and promotes community learning.”

The Panel considered that this was not one of the characteristics, but that it sat beside them as a summary definition of a university. No guidelines were in fact developed by the panel for interpretation of this definition, and while it was acknowledged that the Minister was required by the Act to take this definition into account with the characteristics, it concluded:

“The panel wishes to stress that it has formulated guidelines to interpret the legislation in order to make a case by case judgement. The panel has taken this approach because, among other reasons, it wishes to advise ... that it found considerable difficulty with the definitions and criteria in the existing legislation.... The panel believes that the combination of the prescribed characteristics, university definition, and the definition of a degree, derive from a limited paradigm of a university.

...Finally, the panel notes that while AIT has been subjected to rigorous assessment against the statutory criteria, a similar exercise has not been undertaken with respect to any existing university. Questions remain about the extent to which the current universities satisfy the same criteria and assessment processes.”
As in New Zealand prior to 1989, there does not appear to be a similar definition of a university in Australian Federal legislation, where each university is established under its own act under the legislature of the relevant state as a body corporate. The Australian National University Act, 1991, is typical of such Acts, and establishes the functions of the University as including:

- advancing and transmitting knowledge, by undertaking research and teaching of the highest quality;
- encouraging and providing facilities for research and postgraduate study...;
- providing facilities and courses for higher education generally...;
- providing facilities and courses at higher education level.;
- awarding and conferring (academic awards).;
- providing opportunities ... to obtain higher education qualifications;
- engaging in extension activities.

Under the Act, the University is required, in performing these functions, to pay attention to national and international roles.

There are no English provisions equivalent to section 162 of the New Zealand Education Act 1989 either. This reflects the decentralised tertiary education system in the UK.

In summary, the Panel was required to interpret an Act which is unique to New Zealand and which was enacted in an environment where devolution of centralised control of the tertiary education sector had recently taken place and where the legislators had felt it necessary to define the respective roles of the autonomous institutions that were being established.

This is an important background note to the potential defence of its position that AIT would have to adopt, given that AIT's opponents were already claiming that
allowing AIT to become a university would both destroy polytechnic education and dilute university education.

**ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY THE NZQA ON THE PROPOSED GUIDELINES AND FINAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GUIDELINES**

NZQA received thirty-three submissions on the proposed guidelines, nine of which were merely an acknowledgement that they had been received. I sought copies of the submissions from NZQA in order to gain further insight into the diverse views being expressed in the media as to what a university was, and the extent to which the guidelines were perceived to adequately summarise the essential meaning of a university.

The largest submission was my own, written for AIT, supporting the proposed guidelines, but asking for a definition of "diversity" and claiming that graduates in one year diplomas at final year degree level should be considered equal to students in full degrees of three years' duration. These two matters were also raised in the submission from ACE.

As expected, there was little agreement between the submissions. Private sector institutions and organisations (the Association of Proprietors of Integrated Schools, and the International Pacific College) supported fully the concept that other organisations should be able to use the term "University" and recommended more flexible means of allowing this. Other polytechnics (Manukau, Taranaki, UNITEC, Wellington, and the APNZ) generally supported the guidelines while submitting that a new category of "university of technology" was really necessary to enable diversity in the university sector to emerge.

The National Council of Women (NCW) and the New Zealand Federation of University Women (NZFUW) both expressed their concerns that the emergence of new universities would "dilute" the standing of the existing universities and their international standing in research and teaching. They therefore submitted
that the research capabilities of aspiring universities needed to be more rigorously
defined, that the numbers of staff engaged in research needed to be higher, and
that the percentages of students enrolled in degree and postgraduate programmes
needed to be greater than indicated in the proposed guidelines.

These views were also expressed by the NZVCC and the University of Auckland,
both of which made submissions which were essentially unchanged from their
earlier submissions to the Ministry of Education (see chapter 5).

The New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit’s submission likewise
supported the views of the NZVCC and the University of Auckland that the
percentages of students in degrees needed to be at least 70% with a minimum of
10% of all EFTS being in postgraduate programmes, an exaggerated
interpretation of the word “most” which is required in the Act!

This submission went further however, making a number of suggestions to ensure
that an institution given university status would have the material and financial
resources to maintain and enhance its university characteristics, with robust
policies and strategies to ensure its ongoing development. The Ministry of
Education also made a submission on this same issue, indicating that in addition
to meeting the criteria outlined in the Act, the Ministry would be required to
advise the Minister on the application and would take into account:

- “an assessment of New Zealand’s national and regional tertiary
requirements and the likely impact on this provision if the provider either
fails or gains university status;
- the likely sustainability of the university status, if gained, over time (e.g.
what measures are in place to ensure the standards are maintained or
improved);
- assessment of any fiscal implications for Government.”

In summary, a large number of submissions made the point that a requirement for
only 60% of staff teaching at level 6 or higher on the NQF (which itself could be
only 60% of the staff) implied that the overall percentage of research active staff
could be as low as 36%, and that this was unacceptably low.
The existing universities and university-related organisations also submitted that new universities should have degree and postgraduate enrolments at levels consistent with those in the established universities.

Interestingly, only one submission (the Federation of University Women) made any comment on the "ethos" of a university. They claimed that it needed to be a "community of scholars" in "a very wide variety of disciplines - arts, humanities, science, and law etc." This view (discussed in the literature review for this dissertation) has its roots in the concept of a university as described by Newman. Whether it is descriptive of new universities throughout the developed world is, however, debatable.

NZQA’s consideration of the above submissions resulted in some changes to the guidelines recommended by the panel, particularly tightening the requirements with respect to research, but not changing the required percentages of students in degrees, as follows:

**Characteristic (1):** (Universities) are primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence.

No changes were made to the recommended guidelines.

**Characteristic (2):** (Universities’) research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of their teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge.

(a) The definition of research was changed to amalgamate two complementary definitions developed by the Tertiary Action Group, and expands on the range of activities which comprise research while making explicit the requirements for the results of research to be open to scrutiny.

(b) A number of other minor changes were included in the guidelines, requiring that research be:
• Included in staff promotion policies and practices.
• Conducted with access to appropriate physical and information resources.
• Incorporated in corporate and teaching management plans.
• Subject to peer or other appropriate review.

(c) The requirement that 60% of staff teaching at Level 6 or higher on the NQF be research active was replaced by a requirement that most staff (at all levels of teaching) be research active.

Characteristic (3): (Universities) meet international standards of research and teaching.

Two additional guidelines were added:

• To provide an environment for free expression of views.
• To require a commitment to the concept of free enquiry.

Characteristic (4): (Universities) are a repository of knowledge and expertise.

One additional guideline was added, requiring a university to be “a storehouse of knowledge and expertise”.

Characteristic (5): (Universities) accept a role as critic and conscience of society.

No changes were made to the recommended guidelines.

To summarise, the changes mostly made more explicit the general requirements that were in the original draft guidelines.
Two issues on which AIT made submissions for change were not altered:

The percentages in the qualitative guidelines for characteristic 1 including the requirement for 50% of EFTS to be enrolled in degrees was unchanged, though there is a more explicit statement that the guidelines are not to be rigidly applied and have to be interpreted against the character of the institution. AIT had sought an amendment to this guideline to give equal recognition to level 7 diplomas which are generally of one year’s duration and designed for graduates and practising professionals who need a degree level programme to upgrade their knowledge and expertise. The example cited by AIT was its graduate diplomas in teaching which are available only to graduates, but are not classified as postgraduate programmes because they are not research based.

The suggestion that the guidelines include an interpretation of Section 162(4)(b)(iii) was not accepted. Thus there is still no guideline for the interpretation of diversity in the overall definition of a university. AIT had suggested that the HEQC and AVCC guidelines should have been used as models in establishing a requirement for a minimum enrolment at degree level in a number of different subject disciplines.

It should not be thought that final publication of the guidelines meant the end of controversy about them. At his council’s April 1998 meeting, the Vice Chancellor of Otago University tabled a letter to the Minister claiming that the NZQA’s guidelines would “jeopardise decades of effort by the seven universities on behalf of the nation”, and reiterating his previously expressed view that 90 percent of students should be enrolled in degrees.

The education spokesperson for the Alliance (a minor opposition political party) also joined in the criticism (NZER: 27.5.98) claiming that if only half of the students in a university were in degrees it would lead to a downgrading of New Zealand universities where currently two-thirds of students were in degrees:

"The result of the watering down of New Zealand universities is that our international reputation will be damaged. People with degrees from New
Zealand universities will all have their qualifications downgraded if these things are not sorted out.

The Government wants no control over what is happening in the tertiary sector. They prefer to leave it to the education marketplace. If they continue with their hands off approach and refuse to set sufficiently high standards for universities we will be left with the lowest common denominator.”

While this is an interesting reflection of the illogic that has surrounded the debate, one suspects that even the universities might feel embarrassed to be associated with such verbiage.

The final guidelines did not, however, move the goal posts for AIT. The single outstanding problem remaining for AIT was that its postgraduate EFTS did not include any doctoral students. But this had been a long-standing issue over which AIT had had no control, and would need to be evaluated in that context. NZQA had not been able to develop criteria for the approval of doctoral degrees without NZVCC agreement, and this had not been forthcoming.

THE PANEL’S 1996 EVALUATION OF AIT

Having drafted guidelines for interpretation of the Act, the panel evaluated AIT’s application against them, reaching the following conclusions:

**Characteristic 1 which requires a university to be “primarily concerned with more advanced learning”:**

The panel found (p 7-8) that the proportion of enrolments at level 6 or higher of the National Qualifications framework (64%) was adequate, but that the proportion of equivalent full-time students (EFTS) enrolled in degrees (40%) was less than the indicative level proposed by the panel. It was noted that degree enrolments were expected to grow over the next two years.

While postgraduate programmes were operating in the Health Studies Faculty, enrolments in these programmes did not meet the proportions expected, and the
postgraduate programmes available in 1996 did not cover the range of Faculties that would reflect the character of the Institute.

Accordingly, the panel was not of the opinion that AIT met the guidelines for this characteristic.

*Characteristic 2, which requires the research and teaching of a university to be closely interdependent with most teaching being done by people who are active in advancing knowledge:*

The panel concluded that AIT's research and teaching were closely interdependent, but that the extent of the research activity was not sufficient to meet this characteristic. The report comments (p.13) that developmental strategies of the Institute aimed to address this situation, but that some of these were only in their early stages.

It was also concluded (p.14) that the proportion of staff undertaking research was significantly below the levels expected by the panel for a university, though the Health Studies Faculty had proportions of staff engaged in research that would meet the panel's guideline.

*Characteristic 3, which requires a university to meet international standards of research and teaching:*

The panel agreed (p.18-19) that AIT met international standards of teaching both in its degree and subdegree programmes, and noted the parity of acceptance of AIT graduates with university graduates by employer and professional bodies. However the panel found that AIT did not currently meet international standards of research, though it expressed the belief that AIT was on a developmental path towards those international standards, as evidenced by strong staff development programmes both for increasing the base numbers of staff with research qualifications and for improving the postgraduate supervisory capability of staff.
Weaknesses were identified in the levels of external funding being attracted for research, and in collaborative research with international partners, but it was noted by the panel that AIT's ability to access larger publicly resourced funding for research was restricted both by its emphasis on applied research and its current non-university status. The panel also noted the difficulties faced by an institution without university status in developing a research culture, and suggested that the availability of university designation would accelerate the process substantially.

**Characteristic 4, which requires a university to be a repository of knowledge and expertise:**

The panel found (p. 26-28) that AIT was clearly such a repository through the quality and diversity of its programmes, the demand for its programmes by students and employer bodies, its alliances and linkages with industry, commerce, and the health sectors, and the demand from those sectors for consultancy and professional advice.

**Characteristic 5, which requires a university to accept a role as critic and conscience of society:**

The panel was satisfied (p.28) that AIT had established a culture which encourages positive and constructive social criticism by its staff and students, commented that various members of the academic staff write and speak in the media and elsewhere on contemporary issues, and noted that AIT staff had regularly been involved in preparing submissions of an applied research nature on legislation, to the government and non government agencies.

*Section 162 (4)(b)(iii) of the Act which requires a university to be characterised by a wide diversity of teaching and research, especially at a higher level, that maintains, advances, disseminates, and assists the application of knowledge, develops intellectual independence, and promotes community learning:*
The panel concluded (p. 29-30) that there was sufficient evidence that AIT maintains, disseminates, assists the application of knowledge, that it developed intellectual independence in its programmes, and that it very actively promoted community learning. Notwithstanding, the panel commented that AIT’s current levels of research activity raised doubts about how widespread was its capability to advance knowledge.

In conclusion, the panel found that AIT demonstrated a wide diversity of teaching and that it was firmly embarked on a process for the development of a research culture which would enable it to produce a wide diversity of research, and indeed had already made “remarkable progress” in many of the aspects that make such a culture.

CONCLUSION

The NZQA, informed by the proposal of the panel of repute and subsequent consultation, agreed to a set of guidelines for interpretation of section 162 of the Education Act which describes the characteristics of a university (NZQA, 1998).

This chapter has shown that this legislation is unique to New Zealand. By comparison with Australia and the UK, New Zealand provides a significant legal barrier for an institution seeking university status. It is not sufficient for the aspiring institution to have plans to demonstrate each of these characteristics; it is necessary for the characteristics to be already demonstrable.

The NZQA guidelines, however, are broadly comparable to the guidelines required in both of these countries, though it can be argued that they go further in requiring evidence of achievement of international standards, and of over half of all teaching staff being engaged in research. There is no evidence of other countries requiring that a university accept a role of critic and conscience of society, and the guidelines would seem to be unique in attempting a means of defining this.
The guidelines themselves have been criticised by the established universities as falling short of their definitions of “most” and “advanced”. But in a technical and legal sense it is difficult to see how arguing that numbers greater than 50% do not represent “most” can be sustained, unless “most” is to be defined as “as much as the others”.

Notwithstanding the controversy, New Zealand as a result of AIT’s application has published an official statement as to what constitutes a university. A university as described within these guidelines is consistent with many universities that currently exist in Australia and the UK, and therefore provide a reasonable and adequate protection for the term “university”.

The panel found that AIT’s 1995 application fell short of these guidelines as a result of insufficient enrolments in higher level programmes and deficiencies in its research activity and reporting.

Learning that the panel was not recommending immediate university status for AIT meant that institutional changes would be needed in order for it to conform to the suggested guidelines.

How these changes were addressed is the subject of the next chapter.
Chapter 7

Changes in AIT: 1995-98

Introduction

In this chapter, the impact on AIT of the panel’s evaluation is studied.

This includes actions taken to raise the percentages of students enrolled in degree and postgraduate programmes, and initiatives, informed by the research described in this dissertation, to develop a research culture in the Institute, leading to an improvement in the quality and reporting of its research. These changes are measured through a comparison of research reporting in the succeeding years.

Implications for AIT of the Panel’s Evaluation

Having seen the NZQA panel’s draft report, AIT was in a position to consider its position. The draft report was not recommending immediate reclassification, the Institute had begun merger discussions with ACE and CIT with a view to seeking the establishment of an entirely new university, and even optimistic projections indicated that AIT’s student enrolment profile would probably not meet the guidelines until 1998.

There appeared to be a real likelihood of political and public relations damage being inflicted on AIT by the University of Auckland if the report of the panel got into the public arena, and at that stage there was a lot of confidence amongst the executives negotiating the merger that it would proceed. I advised the Council of these issues, and the Chair wrote to the Minister (Kingi, 1996) advising him that AIT was considering a merger and requesting him to defer any decision on the application for university status until the discussions with CIT and ACE had been
concluded. It was also pointed out in this letter that any decision in favour of the reclassification could be challenged on legal grounds if the merger proceeded and AIT changed its character as a result of a merger between the time NZQA forwarded its advice and the date of the Order In Council.

The Minister agreed to the deferral, and we were left with time either to develop AIT’s student enrolment profile and research reporting to meet the expected guidelines, or to effect a merger which would assemble a new institution able to meet the guidelines for establishment of a university.

This enabled AIT to avoid the public relations exercise of having to explain why it did not meet the guidelines when it had generated a lot of publicity with its application. No doubt it would never have been in this situation if guidelines had existed, but it was a case of AIT having made a decision to seek university status with no precedents to follow, a complex legal process to be tested, and a number of powerful competitors seeking to stop the status change.

The draft report of the panel made it clear that there was further work to do in two key areas in order to meet the guidelines being proposed. These were:

1. To improve the student enrolment profile in degree and postgraduate programmes, and

2. To improve the quality and reporting of research.

IMPROVING THE STUDENT ENROLMENT PROFILE IN DEGREE AND POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

There was not a lot that could be done in this area other than to continue with what was already being planned. Some of the degree programmes offered at the time of the panel’s visit were new, and students were only in the first years of the degree. These programmes would, as pipeline growth occurred, grow in numbers as existing students stayed on and entered the final years. I had produced
projections for the panel which showed how this would happen, and that the numbers would reach about 50% of all EFTS in 1998.

Postgraduate programmes also needed to be developed. In 1995 when the application was made, there was only a postgraduate diploma in Physiotherapy, and when the panel came in 1996, this had been added to only by a multidisciplinary Masters in Health Science degree, enrolling graduates from Nursing, Midwifery, Physiotherapy, and Occupational Therapy.

The Arts Faculty gained approval in 1996 for two specialist Masters of Arts degrees (in Art and Design and Communication Studies), and was planning further development of Master’s programmes in Languages and Social Sciences which would be submitted for approval in 1998.

The Commerce Faculty agreed to proceed with an Honours option for its four-year Bachelor of Business degree, enabling postgraduate studies to be offered. This was approved in 1997.

The Science and Engineering Faculty, which had been slower than the other faculties to develop degree and postgraduate programmes, had been considering a Bachelor of Engineering degree for some time. This was prioritised and approved in 1997. A series of Postgraduate Diplomas in Research, Applied Science (International Practice), and Engineering were also developed, and approval gained for them from the NZQA in 1997, while a Masters in Applied Science was approved in early 1998.

The final step was to ensure funding support for these new programmes. The Deans were encouraged in 1997 to over-enrol in all programmes, creating a stronger case for AIT to achieve growth in student numbers for funding in 1998. In the event, the Institute managed to over-enrol by approximately 5% in 1997, and AIT achieved as a consequence the highest growth rate in EFTS funding for 1998 of any institution in the country.
The programmes submitted to the Ministry for new funding in 1998 (AIT, 1997a) included all the newly approved postgraduate courses and the Bachelor of Engineering. The common wisdom in New Zealand institutions at the time was that what would be approved by the Ministry was akin to a lottery, but AIT’s top priority listing (with one exception, a certificate in Maori development, Te Ara Timata) comprised its postgraduate list along with the BE degree.

The Ministry’s allocation of funding for 1998 agreed to the priorities in the AIT submission, and the Institute was able in 1998 to ensure that its numbers in degree and postgraduate programmes would meet the guidelines proposed by the panel.

At the time, the guidelines were still in the public arena for submission, and there was considerable anxiety in the AIT executive that the goalposts might be moved. The University of Auckland was known to be pushing for the guidelines to require 85% of EFTS to be enrolled in degrees, but in the event, the EFTS percentages were unchanged when the final guidelines were agreed to by the Board of the NZQA in January 1998.

Strategies were also necessary to ensure that the Institute would be capable of delivering postgraduate programmes to a significantly increased number of students. It was agreed within the executive that the recruitment of experienced postgraduate supervisors was difficult when AIT was not a university, as the staff concerned would necessarily need to be recruited from universities.

While the Act protects the terms university, chancellor, vice chancellor, degree, doctor, master, and bachelor, it does not protect the title professor. Accordingly policies and procedures for the appointment of staff at professorial and associate professorial levels were developed in 1997, approved in September, and used in advertisements for relevant positions thereafter. The first professorial appointments were subsequently made in 1998.
IMPROVING THE QUALITY AND REPORTING OF RESEARCH

This was seen to be a more difficult task, for it involves a significant culture shift within the organisation. In this dissertation, it is therefore dealt with in greater detail than the issue of improving the number and percentage of students at higher levels. Before setting out to address this issue, I considered how the issue had been dealt with in other new universities (see chapter 3).

As a first step, I decided to produce a research report for 1996, and convened a meeting of the faculty research co-ordinators to decide on a format for this.

Research reporting had never before gone beyond a page or two in the annual report, and these pages had never been audited or cross-checked. Staff who felt they had done some research had been invited to record it, but there was considerable evidence that many staff either did not hear of the invitation or did not feel it was necessary. And the research that was recorded was never subjected to any rigorous audit.

The 1994 and 1995 annual reports, however, had been the only available evidence of any research outputs when the 1995 application for university status had been assembled. In 1996 when the panel visit was imminent, it had become obvious that more was needed, and I had hurriedly asked the Deans to appoint a research co-ordinator and establish research registers so that a better picture of what was being done could be made available. The research registers, in which staff were asked to record their current research topics, showed that there was a lot more research activity than the annual reports suggested.

Predictably, however, the records of research in the AIT annual reports did not stand up to reasonable scrutiny.

The University of Auckland had seized on this in its submission to the Ministry (appendix C), and reviewed the research outputs concluding that of the 34 listed papers in refereed journals in 1994, only 20 in fact were, while in the 1995 annual report, of the 46 listed refereed journal articles listed, 13 were stated to be “in
press” and a further 14 could not be traced. The University further highlighted conference papers which appeared to be speeches made at meetings of various bodies, and numerous examples of records pertaining to previous years, consultancies where the name of the client was not given, theses which were “in process”, and other inconsistencies in the recording of research.

I found this criticism by the University to be most helpful in developing strategies to manage the changes that needed to be achieved if AIT was going to be able to meet the guidelines. These changes were dealt with by addressing the following issues.

1 The definition of research

In order to enhance research, it is first necessary to define it.

AIT needed a definition that would give adequate recognition to the applied nature of much of its research activity, and subsequent to the visit of the NZQA panel in 1996, AIT’s Academic Board agreed to a definition adopted from the Tertiary Action Group (TAG, 1996) and recommended by the panel (see appendix II, page 21).

This definition is appropriate for an institution like AIT because it recognises the validity of research activity in areas such as Art and Design, which is mostly presented in the form of exhibitions and public performances, while distinguishing between creative works and other forms of research. “Creative work” normally results in a physical end-product which can include a performance or an object. The invention and generation of “ideas” and “hypotheses” are more usually considered to be “basic or fundamental” research, but these descriptors have been widened, thus enabling research activity and reporting to specifically focus on “creative work”.

The definition also enables the inclusion of research in applied settings to be explicitly recognised through the incorporation of consultancy and professional practice as activities in which research can take place.
2 Research performance indicators

In order to demonstrate AIT’s research activity, it was also necessary for some research performance indicators to be developed, consistent both with those developed elsewhere and the definition of research that AIT had chosen.

The Linke (1991), Performance Evaluation Group (1992), and Hattie (1990) indicators discussed in chapter 3 of this dissertation were considered early in 1997 in the context of AIT’s research and the need to produce an annual research report in a style comparable to that of the other New Zealand universities.

The 1995 research reports from six universities (Otago, Canterbury, Lincoln, Victoria, Massey, and Waikato) were studied and a decision made to follow the Waikato model which included not only the records of research outputs, but also an overview of some of the more interesting projects under investigation. I felt this would make the report more readable, and also reflect the character of AIT in the overview of its research.

As a result, AIT’s research outputs were listed under the following headings:

1. Articles in refereed journals
2. Other publications (including books, chapters of books, monographs)
3. Conference proceedings and presentations
4. Theses and dissertations
5. Commissioned research and technical reports
6. Multimedia presentations (including videos, CDROMs, and exhibitions of creative works)
7. Other (including newspaper articles, media interviews, and the like)

It was further decided that the inclusion of external research grants would take place from 1997 onwards.
I decided to list AIT's research in this way in order to set some precedents for development of research performance measurement using the indicators identified by the Performance Evaluation Group (1992) in Australia. These were considered more appropriate than the Linke indicators which relied extensively on higher degree completions and external research grants (both of which being areas in which AIT's development was still at an embryonic stage) or the Hattie indicators which relied on qualitative evaluation of the environment in which the research was reported (e.g. the "quality" of the refereed journal, the "reputation" of a department, and so on).

Publishing research outputs under these categories not only enabled conformity with established practice in the other universities, but also established the framework for research performance indicators to be included in the statements of objectives for each Dean and Head of School, at levels consistent with the expected guidelines for the establishment of a university.

Both the production of the first research report in early 1997, and the development of research performance indicators which could be incorporated in the management objectives throughout the Institute had an important influence in enabling AIT to develop mechanisms whereby it could catalyse its research performance and report on it in ways that would enable the institution to meet the guidelines for establishment as a university.

I engaged an assistant to collate the research records from 1996, and to audit and verify their authenticity over the period January-April 1997. This resulted in a significantly improved record of AIT's research. The report identified 468 verifiable research outputs of which 46 were in refereed journals, 49 in "other" publications (books, chapters of books, monographs, and non-refereed journals), 181 conference presentations, 19 theses, 87 multimedia presentations, 19 commissioned technical reports, and 25 "other" outputs including newspaper articles, broadcasts, and the like. Sixty of the conference presentations were presented in countries outside of New Zealand.
It was further agreed that the Institute would adopt in each faculty the Endnote software package for future recording of all research activity, whether completed or in progress, so that an analysis could be conducted of how many and what proportion of staff were engaged in research and had reported on it. This would enable AIT to demonstrate its conformity to the guidelines for interpretation of the section of the Act which requires most of a university’s staff to be active in advancing knowledge.

3 Developing a research culture within AIT

In addition to ensuring that research reporting and research activity could be better managed, it was also important to make apparent to all staff what in fact was already being done and to identify the process of establishing the conditions for a major shift in workplace learning and the workplace culture.

The essential elements involved in learning to develop research capabilities and establish a research culture were identified at RMIT (1994) as including

a Selecting research foci

b Finding links between research and teaching

c Developing research indicators, and

d Deciding on the postgraduate research profile for each faculty.

In the case of AIT, the core mission remained its teaching and learning, and while there was a need for significant workplace learning to take place related to research, this learning had to be developed within the context of the organisation’s uniqueness rather than in an attempt to copy or clone the research profiles of other institutions. This provided a very demanding challenge given the defensive stance the other universities were taking against a rapidly developing institution that now wished to “join the club” but also to retain its own distinctiveness.
Finding out what was being researched, and encouraging a culture of reporting research, however, were only two of a number of elements in the establishment of a research culture.

Other elements (discussed in chapter 3) included research skills development, the development of research centres, encouraging the establishment of research groups across the faculties, encouraging collaborative research projects, appointing new staff with research experience where appropriate, and generally raising the profile of research in the internal publications of the institution.

These, however, are not “quick fix” items in the sense that they can be addressed within a short time frame as improving the reporting of research can. They were therefore seen as longer term objectives to be addressed within the framework of a broader policy and strategy for research. These objectives were, however, incorporated in the annual strategic plans for each faculty and included in the targets against which the performance of the Deans would be measured.

Early indications were that measurable change was taking place.

Richardson (1997) conducted a longitudinal case study evaluation of the development of a research culture in one of the departments of AIT. This department was atypical of AIT's teaching departments in that it was one of the last to develop a degree programme (the degree was offered for the first time in 1996), and was one of the Institute’s smallest. Most of its staff had come from a background in the trade, although some had or were working towards a higher qualification as a result of the introduction of the degree. It was therefore a good environment for identifying the elements that would encourage a research culture amongst traditional polytechnic personnel.

This study found (p 64) that five of the eight lecturers in the department were involved in research, two in research related to teaching, and three in technical research related to their subject area. Questionnaires were distributed in March and followed up by interviews in August-September of the same year to see if
there was any measurable shift in the attitudes towards and understandings about research. The results were reported as showing, "A significant shift in the culture ... in the results of this questionnaire when compared to the earlier one. There is a great deal more understanding and knowledge of what research involves than there was previously, although a clear split as to its value," (p 72) but that "while they generally believe that research is for the Institute and it is not widely perceived that there are personal gains to be made as well, as a group they have shown both a willingness to get involved and an awareness of the issues". (p.78).

The goodwill towards the development of a research culture that emerges from this study reflects the importance of giving research a higher profile in the Institute, and providing greater support for researchers.

**ESTABLISHING AIT'S POLICY AND STRATEGY FOR RESEARCH**

As outlined above, concurrently with attempting to encourage a culture of undertaking and reporting research, I revised the Institute's policy and strategy for research (which I had first drafted in 1995). The revision was adopted by the Academic Board in November 1997 and subsequently adapted for inclusion in all planning documents.

This policy (AIT, 1997b) sets out the rationale for research development (sections 2.2 and 2.5) by specifically linking it to the enhancement of teaching as well as to the Institute's commitment to seeking university status (section 1).

AIT's history and the mechanisms by which it was funded until 1990 (described in chapter 1) had passively but effectively discouraged research by rewarding long teaching hours. As a result, AIT's culture was one of valuing teaching, though since 1991 with the development of degrees, research had taken a higher profile as a result of the degree accreditation requirement that there be plans to develop research in the disciplines for which the degree was being approved. The associated quality assurance processes requiring monitoring of these accreditation
requirements were also drawing attention to the need for planned research activity. Notwithstanding, promoting research as a means of improving teaching performance seemed to me to be a way of confirming an existing culture rather than attempting to introduce a new (and possibly threatening) culture.

AIT’s *Policy and Strategy for Research* (1997) also sets out clearly the Institute’s initiatives to reward research (sections 2.6.2 and 2.6.3), and the place of research in the institution’s longer term objectives (section 3).

Attached to the *Policy and Strategy for Research*, was a manual for academic managers suggesting ways and means to plan and manage the enhancement of a research culture. These included job descriptors for research co-ordinators (section 4.1), strategies for identifying research foci and links between research and teaching (section 4.2), suggestions on identifying and locating visiting researchers (section 4.3), hints on establishing networking and research teams involving researchers in other universities or institutions (sections 4.4 & 4.6), and suggestions for improving internal and external research communications (sections 4.5 and 4.7). Finally, the Staff Education and Development Centre was asked to set up ongoing training programmes for supervisors of postgraduate students in anticipation of significant development in this area.

It is probably premature in 1998 to attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of these initiatives, but there is little doubt that while they might otherwise have taken place, the context of AIT’s quest for university status and the need to be able to demonstrate a research culture with identifiable and peer-evaluated outcomes certainly hastened the process.

The changes involved are almost certainly irreversible for AIT, irrespective of the outcome of its application to become a university.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF KEY RESEARCH CENTRES**

The literature relating to the development of a research culture in new universities (Wood, 1990; Harman and Wood, 1990; Bazeley, 1994) suggests that one of the
factors contributing to enhanced research activity is the development of research centres through encouraging collaborative ventures with external agencies and providing seeding funding.

The NZQA panel had also proposed as a guideline for interpretation of characteristic 2 of a university described in section 162 (4) of the Act:

- development strategies at every level of the institution to encourage leadership and strategic planning for learning and research effectiveness, including the ability to identify areas of excellence. (Panel report, 1996. My underlining.)

This was further highlighted in the attachments to the Institute’s Policy and Strategy for Research (1997) section 4.2(a) which suggested that selecting research foci was an essential element in the fostering of a research culture.

AIT’s President drafted a discussion paper (Hinchcliff, 1996) to present to the AIT Foundation as an option for adoption as a project for external funding. The Foundation however, while not rejecting the task of finding sponsorship for research centre development, decided to adopt a “bricks and mortar” project for which it felt it would be more successful in attracting funds.

Acknowledging that the seeding funding would have to be raised internally, in July 1997 I proposed to the AIT executive that budgetary provision of $400,000 be made in 1998 for the establishment of a key research centre in each of the four major faculties. This was agreed to in principle. By September the Research Committee of the Academic Board had agreed to the following criteria and priorities for funding allocation to key research centres (AIT Research committee minutes, 17.9.97):

Priority will be given to proposals that:

1 Provide a link between research and a current or projected teaching programme (the research will inform the teaching);

2 Are based either around an existing infrastructure of staff resources and expertise that can be enhanced, or around Faculty strategic plans to develop an appropriate infrastructure;
3 Have plans to become Faculty supporting through significant levels of external funding within two years;

4 Demonstrate the capacity to develop into a centre of national or international significance which would have one or all of the following features:

- a centre that attracts international experts or post-doctoral researchers
- a centre conducting research that is reported in internationally refereed journals
- a centre that attracts interest and requests for information from other universities or research institutions
- a centre that attracts external funding
- a centre that is invited to present its findings internationally or to collaborate internationally

5 Offer good potential for interdisciplinary or institutional collaborative research.

Faculties were invited to submit up to two proposals to the committee, each including a management plan with time frames for the appointment of key staff, acquisition of facilities, an expected time frame for research reports, the names and CVs of the expected researchers, a two-year budget, a statement of the consultation that had taken place in developing the proposal, and three external referees.

This was not achieved without some debate, one of the Deans believing that research was an activity that should not be predetermined, but the majority of the committee agreed that the need for AIT to be able to establish and identify areas of excellence as part of its case for university status was a matter of immediate strategic importance to the Institute, and that it was reasonable for its internal funding to be targeted in line with AIT’s corporate objectives.

By the end of 1997, the following proposals had been agreed to in principle (AIT Research committee minutes, 22.1.98):
Faculty of Arts: A Maori and Cultural Tourism and Hospitality Services Research Centre which would draw on the research capabilities of 11 staff in six different schools in the Faculty, and focus on domestic and international partnerships for indigenous tourism, linking to the hospitality industry.

Faculty of Commerce: A Business Performance Research and Development Centre which would require the appointment of a professorial fellow to coordinate specific discipline research into business performance and development. The management plan indicated that about 20 staff would engage in research under the umbrella of this centre thus enabling it to establish a high public profile.

Faculty of Health Sciences: Two proposals requiring seeding funding of $50,000 each were approved: The New Zealand Centre for Evidence Based Nursing which would link to the Joanna Briggs Institute in Adelaide and a network of centres in New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria, Western Australia, Hong Kong, and the University of Auckland. This centre would focus on respiratory management and identify best practice for clinicians, relating to practice variability and costs. About 10 staff from three schools in the Faculty would have initial involvement. The Centre for Neuromuscular Research was also planned to link with research being carried out in the schools of Physiotherapy and Sport & Health Science, building on existing strengths and the capabilities of a number of research active staff.

Faculty of Science and Engineering: A Diagnostics and Control Centre which would initially focus on the areas of structural vibration, flow induced vibrations, and combustion diagnostics, drawing on the existing expertise of two established researchers in the faculty who would in turn involve a number of other academic staff in their work.

Final agreement to the management plans and budgets for these centres was reached in February 1998, along with plans to publicise the centres and raise the general awareness of staff within the Institute of these key centres. It was expected also that the four centres would be able to demonstrate their existence by the time that AIT was re-evaluated for university status, later in 1998.
As with much of AIT's research development through 1997-98, it can be argued that it might have happened in due course anyway, but the targeting of funds for the establishment of research centres in accordance with the policy and strategy for research revised in 1997 was a conscious and overt response to the need to demonstrate conformity to the guidelines for university status.

**Comparison of 1996 / 1997 Research Activity**

Evidence of a strengthening research culture can be found by comparison of the 1996 and 1997 Research reports.

The decision to publish an annual research report was made late in 1996 and was motivated by the NZQA's adverse report on the standard of AIT's research reporting. Putting the first research report together proved to be a significant challenge given that there was no precedent for this, and no history of staff routinely recording their research outputs.

The 1997 report, however, was collated with less difficulty and used the same formats and classifications of research outputs so that comparisons could be made. The 1997 report was also audited with greater rigour, many claimed outputs being rejected from the report on the grounds that there were insubstantial or deficient details of their existence. Some of these outputs would probably have been included in the 1996 report where the audit had not been so rigorous.

A quantitative comparison of the research reports for 1996 and 1997 is shown in table 2 below:
Table 2: Number of AIT research outputs in 1996 and 1997 by output classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Type</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>refereed journal articles</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other publications</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference presentations</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theses &amp; dissertations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commissioned reports</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multimedia presentations</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>426</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that there was an overall increase in research outputs of 24% in 1997 compared to 1996. More significantly, the quality of the outputs recorded had also increased as evidenced by the 33% increase in refereed journals publications, the 142% increase in commissioned research reports, and the more rigorous audit of the authenticity of the claimed outputs.

During 1996 and 1997, the number of permanent academic staff employed on a 0.5 pro-rata basis or higher remained relatively constant, varying between 450 - 470. In both years the number of individual staff reporting a research output was also relatively constant (307 in 1996 and 307 in 1997), indicating that approximately two-thirds of all permanent academic staff recorded a verifiable research output in each of these years.

These figures are significant. Not only do they demonstrate that most of the teaching staff of AIT were active in research (a requirement if AIT is to gain university status), but there is evidence of a slow move towards the kind of research outputs that are generally more highly rated in the hierarchies of research performance indicators (Linke, 1991; Hattie, 1990).

While no causal links are necessarily established between the strategies and actions that were taken to enhance AIT's research culture and the research outcomes reported here, there is every reason to conclude that in all probability...
the decisions taken in 1996 regarding research policy and strategy had been correct.

CONCLUSION

In response to the panel's evaluation of AIT's 1995 application for university status, two essential strategies were adopted: to increase the percentage of students in degree and postgraduate programmes by prioritising these for funding growth, and to establish an annual research report aimed at enabling the Institute to quantify its research.

The process of establishing an annual research report had the added benefits of focusing attention on the kind of research performance indicators that would be most suitable for AIT in its early stages of research enhancement, and of establishing a vehicle which would be seen by staff as a tangible means by which they themselves could demonstrate their research activity and compliance with the new professional requirements that had been placed upon them through the human resource policies that had been developed in recent years.
Chapter 8

AIT'S EXPLORATION OF AMALGAMATIONS:
1996-1997

INTRODUCTION

Shortly after AIT’s application for university status, the Institute entered into discussions exploring the possibility of a merger with two other organisations, the Auckland College of Education, ACE, and the Central Institute of Technology, CIT. The vision was to establish a new national university, and in so doing, provide AIT with an alternative pathway to university status.

In this chapter, the process and progress of these discussions is explored in detail. An evaluation of the merging partners in various combinations was conducted in order to determine how the merger would impact on AIT’s ability to achieve university status.

The outcome of these discussions was that one of the potential partners decided to merge with another institution, and the merger did not proceed. The reasons for this and the implications for AIT’s future development and its university status application are discussed.

BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSAL FOR A NEW NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

News of the proposed merger between AIT, CIT and ACE, ran in the New Zealand Herald under the heading “Three eyes on super campus” (NZH, 27.8.96).
The discussions with CIT began late in 1995 when the Chief Executives of the two institutions agreed that there could be some value in considering how their organisations might work together.

Two senior staff from each Institution met early in 1996 to make a preparatory assessment of the financial and academic viability of amalgamation.

From the outset there was debate within AIT surrounding the strategic implications of merging with an Institution that was not based in Auckland. No such merger had ever been contemplated in New Zealand previously, though for some years it had been proposed that AIT should consider a closer relationship with ACE which was the country’s leading provider of Teacher Education and was based just 5 km from AIT’s central Auckland campus (AIT, 1995a).

A number of informal discussions had taken place between AIT’s President, myself, and the Chief Executive of ACE concerning the general environment of mergers in the previous year. It was decided that AIT should make a more formal approach, and I met with the Chief Executive of ACE late in March 1996. Consequent to that meeting, he advised his Chairman that the management was considering the implications and possibilities of a closer relationship with AIT. This was agreed to, and a formal process to consider the issues was established.

Two senior academics from ACE met with AIT’s Director of Corporate Services and me on 1 May 1996 to explore questions including the strategic directions of ACE and AIT, their institutional values, common components in the respective academic profiles of the two Institutions, models of cooperation that could be considered, and structural issues that would need to be addressed. This meeting took place the day after the Minister of Education released a press statement (Creech, 1996) indicating that he intended to seek cabinet approval to allow the merger of the Palmerston North College of Education with Massey University to proceed.

At that meeting it was noted (field notes, 1.5.96) that AIT had set itself on a course to become a university offering professional degrees and engaging in
applied research and research into professional practice. We expressed our belief that AIT would be able to achieve university status on its own within the next year or so, but it would be enhanced in its aspirations if it included in some way a strong professional education dimension.

ACE for its part had recently set a national precedent in the college of education sector by developing its own three-year degree in teacher education. This had not only established that the Colleges could function without a neighbouring university to award degrees in teacher education, but also that a three-year degree in teacher education was viable, precedent being that only four-year degrees were offered by universities in collaboration with their local colleges.

AIT and ACE were, it was agreed, the two strongest institutions in their respective sectors and would probably be the two most able to survive in the future as independent institutions, but they could be even stronger together.

AIT had discovered that achieving university status would require a greater emphasis on research and certainly a stronger postgraduate profile than it now had. ACE for its part still needed to develop postgraduate work but would find it difficult to do so as a stand-alone College of Education. This development would occur more easily as part of a university where opportunities for interdisciplinary study were enhanced, and where research into professional practice was an established culture.

It was agreed that if ACE and AIT decided to work together, AIT could move its education programmes over to ACE and encourage a more multidisciplinary approach to developments such as a research centre for science education or health education, much as the Curtin University of Technology had done in West Australia for science education.

The implications of the Palmerston North College of Education merging with Massey, and the merger between the Hamilton Teachers College and Waikato University in 1991, meant that the futures of the Christchurch, Wellington, and Dunedin Colleges as well as ACE were now under question. It was agreed that
the continued integrity of ACE would be consistent with AIT’s management philosophy and practice, and that from both sides this would be a necessary component in any future relationship between the Institutions.

Discussions covered the various types of amalgamation that could be possible. Five models published in the Chronicle of Higher Education (September 18, 1991) were considered.

A possible model for AIT and ACE was developed in which the two institutions would agree to consolidate with a single Council formed by a restructuring of the existing AIT and ACE Councils. There would be a single EFTS base, and a single Vice Chancellor, the combined organisation operating from three campuses. The College would continue to be called the College of Education within the university and would continue with its present management structure including its own Principal.

It was agreed that the Academic Boards of AIT and ACE would both need to be reviewed and brought together, probably with an Academic Executive Committee, and that academic regulations would need to be reviewed to reflect the needs of the new organisation. AIT’s academic statutes, it was agreed, could umbrella the ACE degrees. The new university would also be required to draw up a new charter and mission statement which would incorporate both heritages.

Consideration of the literature concerning amalgamations (see chapter 2) convinced us that any move to consolidate would need to involve widespread consultation with staff at all levels, and fears would need to be dispelled early on with respect to redundancies and any downsizing of staffing in any area, but there were potential benefits in forming a new and stronger organisation.

Management units that would require attention were identified as including payroll and human resource management (probably taking 12 months to consolidate into one service); the finance division (a 6 month planning time would be necessary); corporate services (for academic records and enrolments management); marketing (considerable economies of scale seemed achievable
international students and projects (economies of scale with a much enhanced base were attractive); purchasing (there would be a need to phase in merged operations over the first year, leading to better bulk purchasing power); student associations (probably an early merger would suit both Associations but this would need to be discussed with the students); and library and information services. It was noted that AIT was currently involved in a major Information Technology development and that ACE’s input to this would be vital if consolidation occurred, as on-line linkage of the libraries would be essential.

There was broad agreement in principle to pursue a goal of consolidation, and that there needed to be an immediate move for both organisations to bring together a minimum of two people from each partner to join the three major committees, Council, Executive and Academic Board, while discussions continued.

This, however, never happened, and might well have been the earliest flaw in the process.

As indicated above, AIT had at the time also had preliminary discussions about the possibility of merging with CIT. Discussions therefore included the possibility of a three-way consolidation between AIT, ACE and CIT. It was agreed by the end of the meeting that data collection would begin with a view to developing a student enrolment profile of all three institutions as a basis for further discussion.

By 1 July 1996, the three Institutions had agreed to jointly pursue the issue further and appointed three senior staff from each institution to work through the issues and to appoint an independent facilitator for future meetings.

Analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for each institution and the possible combinations of them as perceived at the time can be summarised as follows:
AIT’s major strengths were its location both in Central Auckland and the North Shore, its diversity of programmes and reputation, the wide range of regional polytechnics seeking affiliation and academic articulation into its degree programmes, its bridging contracts with over 60 secondary schools, and its strong international links. On the other hand, it had major capital works to finance due to its poor inner city buildings, as a university without merging it would be small, and there were threats that Massey and the University of Auckland could move into its traditional markets.

ACE’s major strengths were its financial reserves, its excellent facilities, its own degrees, and the security of knowing that teacher education was a top government funding priority. On the other hand, it was not and could never become a university in its own right, there was little diversity in its programmes (essentially it was a monotechnic), it had no postgraduate students, and was restricted in its catchment to Auckland and Northland. Threats existed with Massey and the University of Auckland offering teacher education, and the possibility of a capital charging regime being introduced, the campus having above average value per EFTS.

CIT’s strengths included excellent facilities in Heretaunga, and a good reputation for the delivery of national programmes, while its weaknesses derived from severe under-utilisation of its Heretaunga campus, its lack of economies of scale, and the possibility of other Wellington institutions merging and developing a stronger market position.

This analysis indicated that there were strong reasons for ACE and AIT to merge and form a 12,500 EFTS university based in Auckland on three campuses. Teacher education programmes offered by both institutions would be rationalised, and the three campuses better utilised. If CIT was added to this mix, the combined organisation would have 15,000 EFTS and be pushing Otago for ranking as the second largest university in the country, with the capacity and experience to further develop through national delivery of its programmes.
The Working Group met with the appointed facilitator, Dr. David Culwick, (Minutes, 16.8.96) and agreed that within the tertiary sector in New Zealand there was considerable volatility, with a lean financial environment and increasing vulnerability for smaller organisations. Institutional mergers seemed inevitable, and it was agreed that this proposed combination could lead the way and establish itself at an early stage of any changes.

The vision was to create a national university with a difference and where education would be related to the needs of the work force.

Potential benefits identified included opportunities for enhanced research and scholarship, combined technology systems producing economies of scale, stronger marketing and branding, a better knowledge of markets and “customers” on a national basis, better matching of products and services through staircasing of qualifications, a distinctive focus on “work-place-relevant” learning, a critical mass to enable development of distance learning, and enhanced relationships with regulatory bodies.

While ACE and CIT were concerned about whether this was a merger or a take over, AIT’s concerns centred around any possible adverse impact on its ability to achieve university status.

In order to develop a Memorandum of Agreement as a basis for proceeding, the Working Group set about developing a statement relating to the following items:

1. The overall statement or vision
2. The strategic direction and positioning of the new organisation
3. The governance process
4. The organisational structure and management processes
5. A joint balance sheet
6. Ratification and timing

7. Transition management issues including:
   - the rights of existing students
   - the rights of existing staff
   - issues relating to the Student Associations
   - change management/communication processes

In a memo to the Chair of the ACE's Council, the CEO indicated that a number of merger discussions seem to be going on in New Zealand at the time. He listed (McGrath, 1996):

   a. Christchurch Polytechnic and Otago Polytechnic
   b. Christchurch College of Education, Lincoln University and UNITEC Institute of Technology
   c. The proposed New Zealand University of Technology consortium of several polytechnics
   d. Wellington Polytechnic, Wellington College of Education and Victoria University (or alternatively the latter two)
   e. Waikato University and Bay of Plenty Polytechnic

This memorandum was followed by a paper outlining the current merger proposal (McGrath, 1996a) which was received, the Council agreeing to support ongoing discussions with CIT and AIT to develop a framework for all heads of agreement, and to make a decision by April 30, 1997.

News of the potential merger was reported (Hotere, 1996) as likely to assist AIT's application for university status on the grounds that ACE had a relatively high degree profile with degrees for primary and secondary teaching. Hotere's report was based on comments by a senior spokesperson in the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, Dr. Alan Barker, who also pointed out that CIT was "a
different creature” to either AIT or ACE, but had “a quite reasonably high profile”.

**EVALUATION OF CIT**

Barker’s reservations about CIT were shared in private by a number of AIT’s senior management, but I felt that I needed a better evaluation of the situation at CIT. This would be especially required if ACE decided not to merge and AIT was left with a decision whether or not to merge with CIT on its own.

Accordingly, in September 1996, I gathered enrolment and research activity data from CIT, along with the Institute’s academic policies and procedures, to provide an analysis of the Institute’s quality management system. This was supplemented by interviews with the Deputy Chief Executive and Registrar of CIT, thus enabling an evaluation related to the legislative requirements imposed on AIT’s application to be reclassified as a university and the interpretation of these benchmarks as recommended by the NZQA’s “panel of repute” to be carried out.

This evaluation was applied to the first three characteristics of a university (see chapter 6) only, since it was not considered that merging CIT with AIT was likely to diminish AIT as a repository of knowledge and expertise, nor in its role as a critic and conscience of society.

**Characteristic (i) (that universities are primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence).**

To measure CIT’s conformity with the proposed guidelines, an analysis of projected enrolments for 1997-1999 was conducted. The figures used were based on existing approved programmes or new programmes expected to be introduced over the next three years and are summarised in table 3 as follows:
Table 3: Analysis of CIT enrolment projections 1997-99 and comparison with the benchmarks required for university status

From the enrolment projections summarised in table 3, it was clear that CIT would not meet the requirements of the guidelines to satisfy characteristic 1 until 1999 at the earliest, and then only with optimistic growth projections being confirmed.

The percentage of postgraduate students was actually projected to fall over these years, indicating no significant commitment to the development of postgraduate programmes while the undergraduate degree programmes were being prioritised. The postgraduate numbers provided by CIT were in any case, suspect, as the programme to which they were ascribed (an Advanced Diploma in Information Technology) appeared to be a national qualification which was actually a level 7 qualification, even though entry to the programme was normally restricted to graduates. It certainly was not a research-based programme.

It was clear that in this respect, a merger with CIT would not assist AIT to satisfy the guidelines in the context of its own application for university status.

Characteristic (ii) (that universities’ research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of their teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge.)

The research activities of CIT staff were collated in a research register developed for the purpose, using the definition of research set out in the guidelines. The
process of this evaluation enabled CIT for the first time to undertake an overview of its research, and the formats were expected to be used in the future to facilitate an ongoing co-ordination and systematic reporting of its research.

Degree development at CIT had not been as pervasive as it had been at AIT, and many of the degrees in the enrolment projections were not scheduled to begin until 1997. As a result, the need to demonstrate research activity and report on it had not been important to CIT in the past. It was not a feature of the Institute’s mission statement, and there was no reference to a research policy in the manual of Institute policies.

The Institute’s quality management system document (CIT, 1995) contained only one reference to research (in the CIT charter, sect. 2.8.4), though there was a research and scholarship committee of the academic board, and programme boards of studies had a responsibility to co-ordinate research activities within the department. The Ethics committee had no explicit role in giving ethical approval for research, and research did not appear at all in any of the eight essential criteria of the quality management system (pp 43-64).

In 1996, CIT had only four degrees: Bachelor of Education (Applied), Bachelor of Health Science (Podiatry), Bachelor of Applied Technology, and Bachelor of Design.

At the time of this evaluation, CIT had seven new degrees under consideration for approval, and the documentation for them indicated in each case where research was being developed to support them. But in an overall sense, the development of a research culture could only be described as being in embryonic form at this stage, and certainly behind AIT’s early stages of research development as described in chapter 7.

Of the ninety-eight staff teaching at higher levels in CIT, only eleven were able to demonstrate a research report that had been published or otherwise made available for peer review. This equated to approximately 7% of all academic staff – well below the benchmark figure of 50%.
This data confirmed a situation where research was still in its gestation phase. Degrees had been slow to develop at CIT, and had only been approved within the last year, with research really only developing as a result of the accreditation requirement to establish an environment where the research outcomes of staff would inform the teaching programmes.

CIT indicated that it was still working on the development of policies and practices to enhance research, to give recognition to research activity as a criterion for staff promotions, and to facilitate the dissemination of CIT's research in a wider context.

With respect to characteristic (ii) of a university, it was clear that CIT had not yet developed to the point where in its own right it could make reasonable claim to having demonstrated that it had this characteristic in accordance with the guidelines. There was insufficient evidence to suggest that the teaching programmes were being informed to any significant extent by staff research; there were no identified institutional policies and practices to ensure the interdependence of teaching and research (though these were outlined in individual degree documents); there were no human resource policies that recognised research as an activity to be rewarded; there were no agreed strategies for the development of a research culture or to identify areas of research excellence; and there was no regular forum for the reporting and discussion of research.

Characteristic (iii) (that universities meet international standards of research and teaching).

Evaluation against characteristic (ii) indicated that a research culture committed to producing demonstrable research outcomes had not yet been established at CIT, though it was expected that it would have done so within the next few years.
There was, however, a teaching and learning culture committed to producing competent and effective graduates. CIT's reputation has been built over its 35-year history as a teaching institution providing a number of national programmes at technician and paraprofessional level. Its graduates over this time have entered a wide range of professions and have in many cases become leaders and taken positions of prominence both in New Zealand and overseas. CIT's graduates are generally known for their high levels of technical competence, and the focus of the Institute has historically been in the provision of short upgrading courses designed to meet the needs of industry and the professions. As a national institution it has performed an important function in upgrading New Zealand's skill base, even though it has not historically developed as a research based organisation.

Being based in the Hutt Valley, it is sited close to a number of Crown Research Institutes, and has relied to a large extent on the part-time employment of research scientists and others for a significant input to its teaching. This in part explains why the Institute itself had not needed to develop its own research culture, but had been reasonably able to claim that much of its teaching was nevertheless informed by research.

There was no evidence of external grants and institutional funds being committed to research. CIT for the reasons advanced above had not traditionally committed significant levels of its own funding to research, and indeed its premature application in 1996 for approval to offer a PhD degree was based on the linkages it had with the Crown Research Institutes mentioned above. This was a unique situation which could provide future opportunity for research students to undertake their programmes in a research environment while enrolled at CIT, but jointly supervised by research scientists and CIT itself. This was an aspect of the guidelines that could be viewed as part of a wider context than that applying to a more traditional university. CIT clearly had no need to seek external funding for research where in fact the resources could be made available to the students through a collaborative arrangement with an organisation that is primarily devoted to research.
To assess whether there was a suitable number of qualified staff with postgraduate qualifications, the curricula vitae of all CIT staff teaching at level 6 or higher were collated and their highest academic qualifications summarised in table 4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Postgrad</th>
<th>Undergrad Degree</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>(Upgrading to Postgrad)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/H Sci</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Highest qualifications of CIT staff teaching at level 6 or higher in 1997

Analysis of this data shows that 40 out of 125 staff teaching at level 6 or higher (32%) had a postgraduate degree, in most cases with a research component. About 5% had a doctorate, and approximately 25% of staff were currently upgrading their qualifications to Masters or PhD qualifications. The percentage of staff with postgraduate qualifications was about the same as the percentage of students studying in degree level programmes.

With respect to the requirements of the Act, CIT could not be reasonably described as “being characterised by a wide diversity of research, particularly at the higher level”. The approval of degree programmes to be taught by CIT did require the Institute to demonstrate the capacity for research, and to give some evidence that this would further develop as the degree matures. But in the short period of time that had elapsed since CIT began teaching degrees, it was clear that the Institute had not had the time to develop a research culture. This is a process that normally takes some years. There was no evidence of a concentrated co-ordination and reporting of research, nor any guidelines or policies to develop a research culture.
Summary

On each of the criteria listed, CIT was some distance behind AIT in its ability to satisfy the guidelines for demonstrating the characteristics of a university. AIT was only just reaching the benchmarks for characteristic (i), but CIT was at least two years away from reaching a target of 50% of EFTS in degree level programmes even with very optimistic forecasts. Accordingly, it was concluded that an amalgamation with CIT would degrade AIT’s ability to demonstrate that it exceeded this benchmark or the benchmark for postgraduate EFTS.

Similarly, and of greater concern, there was no evidence that CIT came close to meeting the requirements to demonstrate that its teaching and research were closely interdependent and that most of its teaching was being done by people who were active in advancing knowledge. The small numbers of research-active staff and the low levels of research outputs achieved would make it hard for CIT to satisfy this guideline on its own, and this was the area that AIT itself was finding most difficult to develop quickly.

On the evidence presented, it was doubtful that CIT in its present state of development could come near to meeting the guidelines for these three characteristics, and there was no indication of where at any point an amalgamation with CIT was going to add strength to AIT’s application. As a result, any decision on AIT’s part to merge with CIT in the near future would probably result in a further delay to AIT’s achieving university status.

In spite of CIT’s inability to demonstrate conclusively that it had at this time these key characteristics, it had a number of potential academic advantages that AIT did not have, particularly with respect to its proximity to and relationship with the Crown Research Institutes.

In the context of the three-way merger with ACE and AIT, CIT was bringing the additional advantage of an existing national infrastructure, but it was not bringing an “academic dowry” with respect to the university status requirements as ACE.
with its high percentage of degree students and imminent development of a Masters programme would do.

But CIT's location in the Hutt Valley provided further liabilities. CIT had arguably the best polytechnic buildings in the country. But its student numbers were low and static, a wing of its student residences had had to be closed down as a result of low demand, and the spectre of capital charging being discussed by Government meant that CIT was facing the possibility of significant financial loss unless it either closed down its Trentham campus or could amalgamate with another institution and introduce a new range of programmes. The ACE-AIT merger offered this opportunity to CIT through the chance to expand on its adult teaching and counselling programmes. However, without ACE in the merger, CIT would, in the medium term, be both an academic liability in seeking university status, and a financial albatross that AIT could do without.

Accordingly, I recommended to AIT and it was agreed that if ACE was not a party to the merger, AIT would not merge with CIT on its own.

**Consultation**

By January 1997, the draft Memorandum of understanding between the three institutions was nearing completion. Two consultants, Dr Graham Lang and Mr Jack Hoadley (ex senior staff from RMIT) were appointed to visit the three institutions to explore issues and report on concerns broadly within them as part of the communication exercise and in order to inform the Working Group of issues that might not have been canvassed.

It was also agreed that in February, a three-day conference would be convened in the Central North Island to enable a wider group of the senior staff from all three institutions to meet and discuss the proposal further.

The initial report from Lang and Hoadley (1997) said:
"In the last week (we) have come to the view that in your deliberations of whether or not to merge your three Institutions, there appears to be a problem in achieving an appropriate level of preparedness for each Council to be able to make a yes/no decision by 30 April. The Councils need a process that will enable them to be quite clear about the information on which those decisions are made.

The CEOs by investigating the practicability of merging have developed fairly clear insights that we suspect are not yet shared by the Councils. There is a mismatch between the states of knowledge of the CEOs vis a vis their Councils."

Lang and Hoadley recommended the formation of a group comprising the three Chairs of Council and the three CEOs to carry the responsibility of supervising the process of data collection and analysis in the feasibility phase and to appoint a Project Manager from outside the three Institutions to drive the process of amassing the information that the three Councils would need.

The failure to follow through Lang and Hoadley's recommendation, in retrospect, lay at the heart of what was to become one of the fatal flaws in the merger negotiations.

**DEVELOPING THE CASE**

The management working group met on five occasions during September 1996 dividing into three groups to consider and develop papers centred on:

1. The academic issues
2. The financial issues
3. The structural and governance issues

The three sets of papers were put together into a first draft of a Memorandum of Agreement and simultaneously a round of consultation began with the Ministry of
Education, the Treasury, and a number of politicians, including a meeting with the Minister of Education.

These meetings all resulted in encouragement from those who would, in the end, be required to provide advice to the Minister on recommendations that might be forthcoming from the Institutional Councils. The Minister himself expressed considerable interest and support in principle for the concept of mergers, and indicated that he saw no political reasons to oppose greater efficiencies in the tertiary sector, though he was at this stage not wishing to impose such changes as Dawkins had done in Australia (Creech, field notes of meeting, 23 Nov. 1996).

With political and Ministry support for the concept assured, the final case for the merger was completed and submitted to the councils of the three institutions in April 1997 (ACE, AIT, CIT, 1997).

The case was presented as a shared vision from the three chief executives “for a new, learning focused, national university that is the leading provider of professional and vocational education in New Zealand” which would “transcend traditional academic versus vocational boundaries and be at the cutting edge of change in tertiary education” (p.2).

The academic case (pages 14-24) dealt in some detail with the ways in which academic capital could be combined, with particular reference to the combining of the two hospitality management degrees (AIT and CIT), joint research and teaching in social sciences, societal issues, and education (all three), connections between education and languages to further develop TESOL and linguistics (AIT and ACE), expansion of the successful AIT business programmes into the Wellington region, multidisciplinary research between education and science and technology, applied arts, and languages (AIT and ACE), the strengthening of health sciences through the formation of the country’s largest centre for health science education (AIT and CIT), the strengthening of the country’s delivery of mental health programmes (AIT and CIT), the enabling of a stronger network for
Maori and opportunities for research into Maori education (ACE and AIT), the combining of the engineering and applied technology degrees (AIT and CIT), the enhanced body of expertise available for research and consultancy for a wider range of industry and community organisations, and the increased pool of talent to secure international consultancy in specified curriculum development, and education policy development.

A full self-assessment of the combined institutions' capability to meet the guidelines for university status was also included. This was based on a detailed analysis of the current enrolments on a programme by programme basis which is summarised in table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFTS in programmes leading to qualifications at Level 6 or higher</th>
<th>Auckland College of Education</th>
<th>Auckland Institute of Technology</th>
<th>Central Institute of Technology</th>
<th>Combined University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2294 EFTS 92%</td>
<td>6042 EFTS 70%</td>
<td>1188 EFTS 58%</td>
<td>9524 EFTS 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFTS in degree (or level 7) qualifications</td>
<td>1789 EFTS 87%</td>
<td>3724 EFTS 44%</td>
<td>669 EFTS 33%</td>
<td>6182 EFTS 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EFTS in degrees doing Postgraduate degrees</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>114 EFTS 3.5%</td>
<td>3 EFTS 0.15%</td>
<td>117 EFTS 2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a sustainable percentage of degree students enrolled in postgraduate degrees.

---

Table 4: Summary of 1997 EFTS in higher level programmes: ACE, AIT, CIT, and combined university
This shows that while the combined university in 1997 would have a slightly lower percentage of students in postgraduate programmes than AIT on its own (2.2% compared to AIT's projected 3.5% of degree students), the overall percentages of degree enrolments would be higher than AIT's (50% compared to 44%), and the percentage of students in higher level programmes (73% compared to 70%) would also be an improvement on AIT's figures.

The weakening of the postgraduate profile from an AIT perspective was not considered to be any more than a short term issue as ACE had a Master's programme in the process of being approved. And the strengthening of the overall degree enrolment profile was a positive factor in attaining university status.

If CIT had not been a party to the proposed merger, the combined statistics for AIT and ACE would have been even stronger, but about half of the CIT programmes (particularly those in the health sciences, mental health, adult education, and applied technology) did bring new opportunities to the combined organisation.

The financial case for the merger (pages 25-35) considered financial projections based on a combination of the 10-year operating surplus and net assets forecasts for each of the three individual institutions, and included the transition costs and cost savings expected in the event of both a full merger and a federal model for the merger.

AIT's projections were based on an increased staff student ratio from 1:15.5 in 1997 to 1:16.0 thereafter, CIT's on a major restructuring of its administration and an improvement of the staff student ratio from 1:13.8 to 1:16, and ACE's on an improvement in the staff student ratio from 1:12.6 to 1:16. ACE had also the issue of projected decreases in funded EFTS after the year 2000 to contend with, as demographic trends and an expected change in government funding policy indicated that not only would the funding per EFTS for teacher education be
reduced to the levels of business and arts education, but also there would be a lower demand for teachers after that time.

The federal model for a merger (where each institution retained its council and a “super council” was established to govern the new institution) was shown to impose a net cost to the organisation of $0.3 million per annum compared to a net decrease in costs of between $7.3 million and $15.7 million (depending on the vigour with which restructuring was managed) per annum.

Risk assessment was also dealt with in the case, considering issues such as the reactions of competitors, branding of the new organisation, staff reactions to the merger and possible resistance to either it or the consequent restructuring, and reactions from traditional stakeholders.

Student and staff issues were also considered. It was noted that the respective student associations would need to consider how they would want to amalgamate, and consultation with the staff unions had identified the following matters relating to transfer of employment, redundancy, communication, and involvement in professional issues:

- Who would the employer be?
- What would be the mechanism to transfer employment contracts from the previous employers?
- How would post merger employment conditions compare to current conditions?
- What level of staff losses would there be and when?
- How would reductions in staff levels be achieved?
- How would relocations of staff be managed?
- How would similar courses at the different institutions be dealt with and would staff be involved in the process?
- Would the professional identity of present delivery units continue after the merger?
- How would staff be informed and consulted throughout the merger process?
• Which staff associations would continue with the staff?

Finally, the matter of governance was introduced. The case, which had been entirely assembled by the management, simply outlined the legal requirements for the establishment of a Council and outlined a number of options for a merged council that would meet these requirements.

It was recommended that the Councils themselves deal with this issue.

THE OUTCOME OF THE AMALGAMATION DISCUSSIONS

The three Council Chairs seemed unable to get together. Their meetings were reported to have been marked by a degree of posturing related to who was in charge, the meeting arrangements were poorly organised and few of the meetings were in fact attended by all three Chairs. The Council Chairs rejected the notion of having any of the senior staff involved with them and rejected also the suggestion that they have an external facilitator. No minutes or official records were kept. As a result, little was achieved and the vision that each of the senior staff involved had become committed to was not transferred to the Councils.

The ACE Council meeting on 22 April 1997 received the 216-page “Case for a Merger”, and deferred a decision for another month, citing the need for more time to consider their options, and to consider the forthcoming Government Green Paper on Teacher Education. The CEO was instructed to bring to the next Council meeting a paper setting out the arrangements that would be involved in a merger with the University of Auckland.

At the May meeting, the ACE Council again deferred a decision, but did pass a resolution agreeing to merge with another tertiary institution, and to announce its decision at its September meeting.
The Working Group was dismayed at the prevarication, the ACE members reporting that their council seemed to be evenly divided between a group who felt they did not need to merge with anyone, a group who favoured the AIT/CIT case, and a group who wanted any merger to be with the University of Auckland. The ACE executive, for their part, were adamant that the whole culture of ACE would be jeopardised by a merger with the University of Auckland, and the council requested discussions with Massey University to be initiated, the Council’s view being that any merger should be with an existing university.

Further attempts to convince the Council of the benefits of a merger into an organisation that would be a new University were not successful. Professors David Beanland (Vice Chancellor of RMIT) and Eddie Braggett (Charles Sturt University) were brought in from Australia, as independent experts to discuss the issues with the councils but their meetings were poorly attended by the ACE council, with only the “converted” turning up.

The ACE Council’s decision at its September 1997 meeting to merge with Massey University came therefore as little surprise to AIT which had already accepted the unliklihood of the proposal for a merger with CIT and AIT proceeding, and had agreed to revise its university status application for submission as soon as the NZQA had agreed to the guidelines for interpretation of the Act.

The evaluation of CIT had clearly shown that a merger with CIT on its own, in spite of its small size, would degrade AIT’s ability to meet the expected guidelines, and that a two-way merger with CIT would be likely to cause a further delay to gaining university status.

Further mergers, it was agreed, were off the agenda for AIT, at least in the immediate future. The process of giving considerable attention to a merger
proposal and the detailed consideration of the advantages to be obtained from having a wider diversity of programmes and a larger student enrolment profile, however, had focused the attention of the executive towards mergers as an important future development which would not be forgotten. But it was agreed that until university status had been achieved, the AIT would always be in a weakened position in entering into such discussions in the future.

For ACE, however, the decision to merge with Massey, had on the surface at least, much to commend it, even if the case lacked the rigour of the case for an AIT/CIT merger, and had no particular vision.

It was a pragmatic decision. The executive and staff at ACE could accept a merger with Massey where they would not have accepted a merger with the University of Auckland, they were combining with a university that had already merged with a college of education, there was intellectual capital to be added to and received from, they had merged with their major potential opposition in the Auckland market, and they would be part of the university which would now be offering over 40% of all teacher education in New Zealand.

Most importantly, their university status was guaranteed, unlike that of the AIT/CIT proposal where the decision to merge would not have had an automatic guarantee of university status, and would probably have taken some time to obtain Ministerial approval.

CIT for its part, still keen to find a partner, entered into a new round of merger discussions with the Waikato Polytechnic which had no aspirations to be a university but was seeking to establish a national presence.
CONCLUSION

While the failure of the merger was a deep disappointment to the management of AIT, a number of important lessons had been learned throughout the process. These had important implications for AIT’s future development.

Firstly, the process of entering into merger discussions had focussed the executive on AIT’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. In so doing, it become more aware of the need to be a larger organisation if AIT was going to function successfully as a university. AIT’s funded student base of approximately 9,000 EFTS comprised approximately 6,000 EFTS in higher level programmes, compared to the 10,000 - 20,000 EFTS in higher level programmes in the other universities (excluding Lincoln). Further, becoming part of a university sector where the others had significantly stronger postgraduate and research profiles was going to mean that AIT would have difficulty in promoting its different culture in this environment. The clear conclusion to be drawn was that a merger still needed to be sought at some stage in the future.

Secondly, reflection on the process of considering the ACE-CIT merger confirmed that from a management perspective the negotiations and the case developed had been very thorough. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to dissect the case in detail, but in the process of developing it, the working party had identified the issues of concern in amalgamations (see chapter 2) and attended to each one of them in a comprehensive way. No weaknesses in the case were ever identified by those who chose to reject it, and the case itself articulates a vision for a new university which was both novel for New Zealand and relevant to the context of tertiary education in New Zealand. The experience of developing and articulating the case had added significantly to the body of knowledge and experience in AIT. In the event that the Minister for whatever reason declines AIT’s application for university status, the experience of the merger negotiations will be important in the inevitable move to merge with an existing university.
The reasons for the failure of the merger reduced to two factors: the lack of representation from the governing bodies throughout the process of developing the case, and the lack of university status of any of the participating institutions.

In retrospect, if the perceptions of the ACE council had been clearer at an earlier stage, an alternate process might have been developed. But their need to ensure that ACE would definitely be part of a university after merging meant that they would be unlikely to agree to merge into an organisation whose university status was not guaranteed. This had not been sufficiently understood by the management.

This further confirms the key lessons that AIT learned from the process. An institution contemplating significant and radical change needs to have a unity of purpose between its governing body and its management. And before AIT enters into its next merger negotiations, whenever that may be, it would be best to be secure in its status as a university.

Both of these issues are explored further in chapter 11 where the implications of this research for the future of AIT are discussed.
Chapter 9

EXTERNAL CHANGES CAUSED BY AIT'S UNIVERSITY STATUS AND MERGER QUESTS

INTRODUCTION

One of the research questions in this dissertation asks how the decision by AIT to seek university status affected other institutions in the New Zealand tertiary sector. This chapter describes the different responses of AIT's nearest polytechnic (UNITEC), the Wellington Polytechnic, and other polytechnics within the Association of Polytechnics in New Zealand.

These changes came to affect the university sector also, with two of its members becoming embroiled in a merger dispute after the Wellington Polytechnic sought to follow AIT in seeking university status.

UNITEC'S APPLICATION FOR UNIVERSITY STATUS

In September 1996, ten months after AIT's application for university status, its nearest polytechnic neighbour, the UNITEC Institute of Technology, made application to the Minister of Education for "redesignation as a university of technology", stating (UNITEC, 1996a:vii) that there was a clear pattern of development in tertiary education in Australia, the USA, and the UK, of Institutes of Technology, polytechnics, and colleges becoming universities, and that it was preferable that UNITEC predict and lead this trend rather than being left behind by it.

While neither AIT nor UNITEC make reference in their respective applications to the other institution, there are a number of parallels to the AIT application (which
UNITEC had possession of when formulating its case) in the document submitted by UNITEC.

The benefits of university status as perceived by UNITEC in its application include (p.64) “the expectation that as a university of technology, UNITEC will:

- enhance its attractiveness to international and New Zealand students;
- encourage lower cost provision without compromising quality;
- increase the perceived value of its qualifications for graduates and their employers;
- enhance its ability to forge international linkages with comparable institutions in other countries;
- enhance its ability to recruit and retain high quality teaching and research staff and develop a community of scholars; and
- strengthen the linkages that it will form with external funders of research, and corporates”.

The UNITEC case, however, relied heavily on its record of rapid growth since its inception in the late 1970s, a favourable interpretation of the Act, and its potential to further develop towards a university profile. This is most clearly established on page 61:

“UNITEC’s case for redesignation as a university of technology is based on

- a belief that New Zealand needs a new sort of tertiary institution; an applied university which offers relevant, industry supported qualifications at all levels informed by applied research, and a flexible learning environment supported by the creative use of technology;

- UNITEC’s remarkable track record as an innovative tertiary institution for which university status has been a strategic objective for several years;

- a forward-looking interpretation of the definition of a university in the Education Amendment Act;

- a ministerial decision reflecting UNITEC’s capacity to meet this legislated definition.”

(bold in original)
AIT had noted in its application (pp 61-65) that the NZQA had previously published a document (NZQA, 1992) outlining the criteria that the Authority would apply in determining whether a training establishment (i.e. a private provider of education) could use the term university. This document had been developed following a move in 1990 by a small private establishment, the Asia Pacific Institute, to change its name to the Asia Pacific University, a move that eventually failed after the NZVCC successfully took legal action against it. The Asia Pacific application had been made under the provisions of section 264 of the Education Act which provides that NZQA can grant permission to a private educational establishment or facility other than a government-funded institution to use the term university. AIT had cited this piece of legislation and the NZQA interpretation of it, to indicate that it would have met university status requirements if it had been a private institution, but acknowledged that this legislation did not apply to state-funded institutions, and that it was applying under section 162 of the Act.

UNITEC, however, relied heavily (pp 7-8) on the NZQA’s statement in The Granting of Consent to Use Protected Terms that:

"submissions need to demonstrate that the (listed) criteria have been met in full, or that firm plans and resources exist for the establishment to meet them."

(bold in original)

Examination of the UNITEC submission shows why potential rather than demonstrated conformity to the characteristics of a university set out in section 162 of the Act were highlighted.

The current and projected degree programmes for UNITEC set out in figure 7 (p.34) of its application show that the number of EFTS in degree programmes in 1996 was 1281 with a further 18 in a postgraduate degree offered at UNITEC by the University of Technology, Sydney. This would equate to only approximately 22% of EFTS in degrees, while the percentage of EFTS in programmes at level 6 or higher of the NQF was projected at 39% for 1996, though rising to 70% by the year 2000.
The degree enrolment projections (fig.7) also revealed that the growth projections would depend on a doubling of existing intakes into some degrees (e.g. Architecture and Diagnostic Imaging), and the successful development and recruitment into a number of new degrees that had not yet begun (Design History, Performing Arts, Computing, Engineering, Yacht Design, Applied Science, Social Practice, and Teacher Education). Master’s programmes were not expected until 1997 (Design Management), 1998 (Education Management), and 1999 (Design, Business, Health Science, Applied Science, Teacher Education).

While the change of name to UNITEC from the Carrington Polytechnic in 1993 clearly signalled an intention by the institution to eventually seek the title of university of technology, the submission made by the institution was clearly premature, at least in terms of any reasonable interpretation of section 162 of the Act. AIT’s President Hinchcliff told me that UNITEC’s CEO had said to him that UNITEC felt compelled to make its case when AIT had done so, and asked if there was not some way in which the institutions could make a joint case to the Minister for establishment of a new category of tertiary institution. AIT, however, was clearly on its own path and had already discarded this as one of its options (see chapter 5 of this dissertation).

UNITEC’s CEO was one of the strong proponents of the NZUT proposal (see below) which also canvassed the possibilities of seeking a new class of tertiary institution.

When AIT announced in December 1996 that it had asked the Minister to defer any decision on its request for university status pending the outcome of its merger discussions with ACE and CIT, UNITEC followed suit a few months later. I do not have access to all the communications between UNITEC and the Minister on this matter, but a copy of the letter from the Minister to UNITEC (Creech, 1997) says:

*Thank you for your letter of 30 June and the background information about your institute’s application for university status.*
I am advised that until relevant current policy considerations are resolved, you have decided to put your application on hold in the meantime. I realise that you may wish to continue with the application once the outcomes of the tertiary review are known and the NZQA’s guidelines on criteria for university status are finalised.

Obviously this policy area will need to be closely integrated with other policy developments arising from the tertiary review.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that AIT’s application for university status, and its subsequent request for a deferral of the decision, had, together with the public release in May 1997 of the NZQA’s draft guidelines for interpretation of the Act, a strong influence on both UNITEC’s application and its subsequent decision to “put it on hold”.

**THE NZUT PROPOSAL**

While it was not in the true meaning of the term a merger concept, the establishment of a New Zealand University of Technology, NZUT, was an alternative proposed by the polytechnics in response to AIT’s announced intention to seek university status.

This initiative arose in APNZ within a month of AIT submitting its 1995 application for university status to the Minister. The first draft discussion paper (APNZ, 1995) includes the following in its rationale (page 2):

*"The impact of any polytechnic satisfying the case to become a university is significant:*

- competition will increase and compel other institutions to pursue university status
- those institutions which don’t will perceive themselves (or the public will) as inferior or second rate
- the public will begin to perceive polytechnic degrees as inadequate, unless the institution has university status
- confidence will be undermined
• the provision of “traditional” sub-degree education will decline as traditional providers put resources into university level activities

• the provision of polytechnic education would become unbalanced as larger centres which could arguably sustain another university lose a polytechnic provider

• there are major cost implications for polytechnics becoming a university

• concern arises in the international community as to how many universities a country the size of New Zealand should have

*By establishing a single entity many of these concerns could be accommodated.*

This rationale reflects the deep fear within APNZ that if AIT was successful in its bid for university status, it would weaken the rest of the polytechnics. It also reflects a lack of vision for the tertiary sector to be structured in any other way than the status quo, and a lack of self-confidence within some polytechnics.

Concerns about the number of universities and the ongoing provision of polytechnic education do not appear to be based on a clear comprehension or acceptance of AIT’s argument that it was the understanding of what a university means in the New Zealand context that had to change. And the worry about preserving the status quo in APNZ, which later became manifest in the decision to contest the decision of Wellington Polytechnic to merge with Massey, was clearly here from the outset of AIT’s university quest.

The proposed model was to establish a new university under the Act with its own Council, and an independent Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor would be one of the polytechnic CEOs appointed by rotation, with polytechnics being established as university colleges of the NZUT, each polytechnic appointing members of the academic board. NZUT’s function would be to approve degrees and other university level qualifications, accredit the member polytechnics as university colleges, manage the academic audit, and award the degrees taught by member colleges.

The paper lists the advantages of this approach as including:
• establishing a university link for polytechnics who were party to the arrangement,

• minimising the damage to degree-awarding polytechnics that were not “large enough” to be universities in their own right,

• reducing the domino effect of other polytechnics being dragged into the competitive cycle,

• elevating all polytechnic degrees to university status,

• improving the marketability and international recognition of polytechnic degrees, and

• allowing gradual growth and transition of polytechnics to university status in their own right as and when appropriate.

The proposal was reported in the Sunday Star Times (14.1.96) as having been “prompted by the Auckland Institute of Technology’s application to become a university, which means other polytechnics, such as the Unitec (sic) Institute of Technology, have to make their move to become a university earlier than planned”.

The draft proposal was sent to all polytechnic Council Chairs and CEOs and a selected group of other education community people including the previous Minister of Education, two Vice Chancellors, the Chair and CEO of NZQA, and Ministry officials.

The responses were summarised and circulated in a memo (Doyle, 1996a) indicating generally more support than opposition. A number of respondents, not only AIT, saw it as undermining AIT’s proposal, which they believed should be enabled to be heard in its own right, while others identified as a more global issue that the proposal was trying to cope in the wrong way with the fundamental problem that New Zealand had too many tertiary institutions already.

AIT’s view was that it did not want to be part of the NZUT, and that its own request for a status change was a separate issue.
The view that establishing an NZUT would give parity of esteem to polytechnic degrees is deficient. The reality is that the degrees would continue to be taught in polytechnics. The NZUT would be a paper university without any students or research, and seen as the "Claytons University" - the university you have when you don't have a university. Parity of esteem comes, as AIT was beginning to learn, not from a title, but from institutional conformity to a generally accepted notion of a university, albeit that, in AIT's submission, a new university with a distinguishing character was being proposed.

A memo to the APNZ Executive (Doyle, 1996b) said that it was clear that an application to establish an NZUT was likely to be made, and raised the question as to whether or not APNZ should be involved. The proposal could be pushed by the initiating polytechnics themselves, but, as Doyle pointed out, if APNZ coordinated it, this would minimise misunderstandings occurring within the sector.

Informally, the APNZ's Executive Director joined the group promoting the idea. A memo from the APNZ President (Scott, 1996) reported that meetings had been held with the Minister, the Chief Executive of NZQA, and Ministry officials who had advised that the university college model would be "difficult to have approved as each university college would need to be able to demonstrate it can meet the criteria in its own right. This would make it difficult to approve NZUT if any of the university colleges maintaining its own autonomy, employing its own staff, and developing its own programmes, fell short of meeting the criteria for university status." The alternative model of only having an amalgam of qualifications under the umbrella of a non-institutional entity would probably require some legislative change.

In November 1996, a further memo from the APNZ President (Scott, 1996a) said that NZUT was still a live issue, and that a consultant had been retained to draft a concept paper for wider circulation. The two key issues to be dealt with were identified in the memo as:
1. "The standing and credibility of qualifications and the benefits of university status for qualifications for students, and

2. The standing of individual institutions and their desire to have the title of university".

A concept paper was circulated (APNZ, 1996a) summarising all the issues that had previously been articulated in the memos about the NZUT concept, and proposed a legislative approach aimed at introducing a further category of tertiary institution to "provide for three generic types of state institution:

- a university, in a more traditional sense
- a university of technology which would have an emphasis on research and teaching with a more applied emphasis; and
- polytechnics"

The statutory criteria for a university of technology, the paper suggested, would need "to be flexible enough to accommodate institutions working jointly to offer university as well as polytechnic qualifications" (p.11).

The proposal, in essence, was to create a binary university system not conceptually unlike the binary systems discarded nearly 10 years previously in Australia and the UK, but more specifically, a binary university system as opposed to a binary Higher Education system.

A further draft submission was prepared by the consultant (Duncan, 1996) and circulated to the polytechnics.

The fundamental argument in this paper is that in a competitive environment, polytechnics are disadvantaged, and hence there should be a new sector (universities of technology) for some of them.

This was hardly going to help to change the current problems of perception for some polytechnics, but merely shift the focus of them. For not only would a separate class of universities clearly signal a division between A and B grade universities (with the B graders inevitably wanting to upgrade to A grade status in
due course), there would be further downgrading of the status of those polytechnics which could not meet the criteria for establishment as a “university of technology”.

It is no surprise that the concept foundered at this point. The notes of the NZUT working party (5.2.97) report that 15 polytechnics responded to the paper, with 7 supportive, 2 with reservations (the interests of small polytechnics were not being protected), 1 neutral, and 5 opposed (the proposal was legislating for second-class status, was there any reality to the distinction between traditional universities and the proposed universities of technology, costs and controls, and failure to address the status of non-degree polytechnic courses).

The NZUT working party, as a result, drafted an “options paper” which was circulated (3.3.97) and left the matter at that point in the “too hard” basket.

AIT was left with its own university status application on hold pending the outcome of its merger discussions with CIT and ACE, while the Wellington Polytechnic decided on a different direction as outlined below. The NZQA was still unresolved about how to set guidelines for interpretation of the Act, and the Minister was announcing his intention to publish a green paper in anticipation of a review of the tertiary sector.

It is not difficult to conclude that many in the sector wished the issues catalysed by AIT’s quest to seek university status would just go away and die.

**AMALGAMATIONS**

During the period in which the research for this dissertation was being carried out, a number of amalgamations in New Zealand came to be actively considered.

The first of these was between AIT, the Central Institute of Technology, CIT, and the Auckland College of Education, ACE. The details of the negotiations and outcomes of this proposal have been discussed in chapter 8 of this dissertation. The end result was that while the management of ACE was firmly in favour of the
The negotiations and debate about the ACE-AIT-CIT merger took place during a period of 20 months between February 1996 and October 1997. With the failure of the merger between the three parties, AIT decided not to proceed to merge with CIT alone on the basis that its case for attaining university status would be degraded (also discussed in chapter 8 of this dissertation), and CIT subsequently entered into discussions with the Waikato Polytechnic in December 1997, reaching agreement in June 1998 to merge on 1 January 1999.

The inevitability of a merger between ACE and either AIT or an existing university in 1996 had the effect of causing further discussions between the remaining Colleges of Education (Dunedin, Christchurch, and Wellington), and their possible suitors.

In Dunedin the University of Otago put some pressure on the College to merge with it, but on terms that were not acceptable to the College. The University's response was to quickly develop its own three-year degree in teacher education and offer it from the beginning of the 1998 academic year. This was clearly intended to destabilise the College by providing competition from a shorter degree (three years compared to four) which could be awarded by the more prestigious institution.

The two institutions subsequently agreed in late 1997 to the establishment of an independent working party chaired by Sir Ian Barker, Chancellor of the University of Auckland, to consider their future. The Barker report was released in February 1998, recommending a merger, and highlighting benefits that could be achieved, including enhanced career paths for general staff, improved academic and professional decision making, more effective and efficient use of resources and
infrastructures, and a Southland campus strengthened by the University contributions.

In the event, the College announced (NZER, 6.5.98) that it would remain independent with College Principal Lester Taylor saying the competition would provide better choice for students, and that the College’s reputation and financial status meant it “could continue to operate as a viable, independent institution.” According to the University’s Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Phil Meade, the University was disappointed with the outcome.

In Christchurch, Principal Ian Hall said at the Christchurch College of Education graduation (The Press, 6.12.97) that the College was not considering a merger with any of the other Christchurch institutions; “The College should not become a branch of a large supermarket chain” and would operate instead as a “boutique” institution through “a strategic alliance with Griffith University in Queensland which would strengthen the college’s position”. Degree courses from Griffith would be available through the College, while long-standing ties with Canterbury University would be retained.

In Wellington, AIT had some preliminary discussions in 1997 with the College of Education with a view to including them in the three-way merger with ACE and CIT. It was agreed, however, to leave this until the three-way merger proposal had been determined. This College taught its degree conjointly with Victoria University, and it was always possible that the College would agree to merge in due course with that University, though as yet there have been no definite signs of this happening.

The clear interest on the part of the universities in taking over the Colleges of Education and the resistance on the part of the Dunedin, Christchurch, and Wellington Colleges is a reflection of two competing pressures being experienced by tertiary institutions. On the one hand, there are powerful forces to achieve greater efficiencies while on the other hand, within the smaller colleges there is a perception that they will give away their independence and see their culture of
dedication to teacher education being eroded through being submerged in a much larger organisation.

The Wellington environment, however, was where the next agreement to a merger took place.

**THE WELLINGTON POLYTECHNIC - MASSEY UNIVERSITY MERGER**

The Chair of the Wellington Polytechnic, Mr. Devon Sutcliffe, approached AIT early in 1996, stating that the Polytechnic agreed with AIT’s strategic move to seek university status, and asked for a copy of AIT’s submission to the Minister. This was agreed to, but after full consideration of the case AIT had mounted, the Polytechnic concluded that it was not in a position to seek university status on its own.

The Polytechnic therefore invited the University of Otago, Massey University, and Victoria University to make proposals for a merger with it.

The Evening Post (Post, 29.7.97) described this as a clear decision by the Polytechnic to become a university for the reason that “if Wellington Polytechnic becomes a university it will be more marketable”, and quoted the Polytechnic’s Deputy Chair as saying “lower-level qualifications are dropping like flies”, citing recent closures to trade qualifications in hairdressing and horticulture.

The Polytechnic Council received written proposals and delegations from Victoria and Massey before announcing in October 1997 that they would be requesting the Minister to disestablish the Polytechnic and merge it with Massey University on 1 January 1998. This announcement took place just three weeks before the decision of ACE to merge with Massey from 1 January 1999, and was greeted with significant negative comment in the media from Victoria University, complaining that it was not necessary for an outside university to move into Wellington where there was only room for one. The editorial in the Evening Post (25.10.97) supported Victoria, describing the Massey action as “empire building and institutional self-aggrandisement”.
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Victoria had for some years offered a joint programme in Design with the Wellington Polytechnic, which it would in all probability now lose. And Massey with two former Colleges of Education incorporated within it, was about to move into a central Wellington site with the potential to undermine the Wellington College of Education and Victoria by opening teacher education programmes in Wellington.

Massey, it must be borne in mind, is held in high regard by members of the teaching profession in New Zealand. Even before it merged with the Palmerston North College of Education, it had a very strong Department of Education, and with its virtual monopoly on distance education, has a very large alumni, particularly in the primary schools throughout the country, of graduates who had entered the profession without degrees and subsequently upgraded their qualifications through Massey. Many Polytechnic staff throughout the country are also upgrading their qualifications through the Massey extramural programme.

These two mergers would make Massey the largest university in the country, with major campuses in Auckland (at Albany and Epsom), Palmerston North, and Wellington. The New Zealand Herald (9.12.97) and the Evening Post (9.12.97) both reported that the Chairman of the Commerce Commission was investigating the situation to ensure that the institutions were not breaching the Commerce Act, but that the Commission’s Commerce Act Manager had indicated the Commission would take a real interest only if the union of the organisations meant they would have more than 60% of the market. Massey still had a little way to go!

Senior tertiary managers spoke in the media on the proposed merger between Wellington Polytechnic and Massey. The CEO of UNITEC complained (NZER, 30.10.97) that Massey was acquiring the substantial real and intellectual assets of Wellington Polytechnic at no cost to itself, and the Government should have put the “sale” out for tender. He then went on to say that he found a certain irony in Massey’s action in taking over a polytechnic at the very time the NZVCC was arguing strenuously for the tertiary review to clearly differentiate the universities from other institutions in an attempt to stop polytechnics seeking university
status. This was a point that had not been lost on AIT, for it rather helped strengthen AIT’s argument that the distinctions were more blurred than the NZVCC had argued.

The NZ Education Review examined the merger in its 22 October edition, reporting that Massey’s first action would be to review all of the programmes offered by the Polytechnic, and that a memorandum had been signed with the Hutt Valley and Whitireia Polytechnics to take over the courses that Massey did not want. It was also reported that Massey would “ring-fence” a research fund for Wellington-based staff.

Victoria University, meanwhile, announced (NZER, 15.10.97) that it would be co-operating with the Wellington College of Education to cut Massey out of the teacher training market in Wellington, and later (NZER, 12.11.97) that it would split its architecture school from Wellington Polytechnic’s Design school if the merger with Massey went ahead. The Students’ Association president at the Polytechnic said (NZER, 12.11.97) that “Victoria’s actions were like those of a child who wanted to take his ball away because other children would not play with him.”

More was to come.

During Massey’s merger with the Palmerston North College of Education in 1995 there had been conflict between Massey and the Manawatu Polytechnic which shared a number of buildings with the College. The University (with support from the then Minister of Education) had expressed an interest in merging with the Polytechnic at the time, but was strongly resisted. The conflict was slow to resolve, and delayed the merger by a year until agreement had been reached with the Ministry of Education to provide funding to relocate the Polytechnic.

With this history, the Manawatu Polytechnic decided to contest the Wellington Polytechnic’s merger with Massey.
The Minister, in accordance with s.164(5) of the Act gave public notice on 28 October seeking submissions on the advice that he was considering disestablishing the Wellington Polytechnic. Manawatu Polytechnic's solicitors wrote to the Minister on 20 November 1997 advising him that in their view this was an illegal action on the grounds that the Minister cannot disestablish an institution (only the Governor-General can), and on the grounds that the recommendation of the Wellington Polytechnic Council to merge with Massey University was outside the powers of the Council.

The argument here was that section 192 of the Act limits the powers of an institution's council to “performing the functions of institutions of the class to which the institution belongs.” Thus, a polytechnic council has been appointed to ensure that the institution performs the functions of a polytechnic spelt out in section 162(4) of the Act (see chapter 5 of this dissertation), and that if the council wants to exercise its powers in order to amalgamate it with another class of institution, it is not acting legally as it is not resolving to take an action appropriate to a polytechnic.

The Polytechnic was supported in this by the Executive Director of APNZ in a letter (Doyle, 1997) to the Minister, and subsequently by agreeing to join the Manawatu Polytechnic in seeking in the High Court an interim order against the merger.

This caused a rift between the rest of the polytechnics in New Zealand. A letter to polytechnic CEOs and council chairs from the APNZ president (Cretney, 1997) acknowledged that he had received concerns from Chairs in the Wellington region and from three other CEOs, but defended the action on the grounds that the APNZ executive had resolved to oppose the disestablishment of the Wellington Polytechnic, and that in any case the legality of the Minister's proposal should be tested before a court hearing.

Cretney summarised APNZ's concerns in relation to the proposed merger as follows:
• "The loss of 3,000 EFTS from polytechnic delivery and the likelihood that this resource will focus towards degree and postgraduate delivery given the need for Massey to retain its university benchmark profile", and

• "the unresolved ownership issues involved given that universities do not accept that they are crown owned entities"

He further states;

"I can appreciate that there are individual institutions which may feel that the proposed merger could serve their interests and that certain understandings may have been entered into within the Wellington region to deal with outcomes for some students as a result of the merger. By the same token, some will view Manawatu Polytechnic as also having an interest in this issue from a different perspective ... My view is that in this case the best interests of the sector are at issue."

In other words, some of the other polytechnics in Wellington stood to pick up some of the lower level courses from the Wellington Polytechnic, but Manawatu Polytechnic was worried by the prospect of Massey bringing Wellington's courses to Palmerston North and entering into competition with it, possibly even trying to force another merger.

The expressed concern at EFTS being lost to "the sector" indicated further worries within APNZ that its funding base would be eroded. With AIT (13% of the total sector) and Wellington Polytechnic (another 4%) leaving the sector, and with the further prospect of other polytechnics deciding to merge with universities, there was a real chance of the Association coming under significant financial threat or even disappearance.

AIT, along with a number of others, opposed the APNZ supporting this action, believing that a polytechnic council had the right to decide to ask the Minister to merge the institution with a university, and that the Manawatu Polytechnic should be left to contest the matter alone. This was expressed in a letter from AIT's President to the Chair of the APNZ executive (Hinchcliff, 1997) questioning whether the action taken to support Manawatu was in the best interests of the polytechnic sector:
"...The issue is (also) whether it was appropriate to invest APNZ moneys in a litigious action against one of the members of APNZ, albeit a retiring member. Also, there will be some clear public relations fallout as a result. I think it is not appropriate to say that this action will 'strengthen the hand of the university sector at a time when a unified approach over the tertiary review is important'. The universities are as divided as we are on this issue, and I do not believe our utterance on this matter will affect the tertiary review one jot. Frankly, I think the public will consider that our stance is not in the best interests of tertiary education."

In a further letter to polytechnic CEOs, Hinchcliff wrote (Hinchcliff, 1997b):

"Wellington Polytechnic has determined to opt for their own different destiny. Arguments are stated that this action hurts our sector on several counts, e.g., reduced budget for APNZ, loss of EFTS for the polytechnic sector, and perceived preference for university status.

We should consider the reasons for this merger and measure these against the negatives. The pros include increased economies of scale, enhanced academic scope, improved access to distance learning, etc. These would seem to be more important for students in the long term - rather than the temporary protection of the identity we cherish."

AIT's council invited the APNZ's Executive Director and President to attend their March 1998 meeting in order to explain the APNZ position. This invitation was refused, but a letter to AIT (Doyle, 1998) sets out the APNZ position as follows:

"The litigation involving APNZ, Manawatu Polytechnic, Massey University, and Wellington Polytechnic is concerned with fundamental questions as to the effect of the Education Act 1989 ... The proposed 'merger' of Wellington Polytechnic and Massey University involves the disestablishment of Wellington Polytechnic and the transfer of its assets to Massey University. If the merger proceeds then Wellington Polytechnic will cease to exist as an entity...

I draw attention to the Wellington Polytechnic Charter 1994:

Wellington Polytechnic undertakes to fulfil its roles as defined in the Charter in respect of Government funded programmes, and

The Minister, working through the Ministry of Education, undertakes to respect and sustain the operation of the Wellington Polytechnic in accordance with the principles of the Charter, and
The letter concludes:

“For the avoidance of doubt I record that .... APNZ does not regard the litigation as having any direct bearing on the interests or aspirations of AIT as APNZ understands them to be.”

The contention that APNZ’s role in litigating against the Wellington Polytechnic’s decision to seek university status through a merger with Massey should not be seen as having any effect on AIT’s independent quest for university status is difficult to accept. Cretney’s clearly articulated concerns were indubitably linked to the loss of EFTS from the Polytechnic sector (a matter which AIT’s status change would further aggravate) rather than the technical concern as to whether the Wellington Polytechnic and the Minister were acting to sustain the operation of the Wellington Polytechnic in accordance with its charter.

On 15 December 1997 the case brought by Manawatu Polytechnic and APNZ was heard in the Wellington High Court, with Justice Doogue deciding there was a prima facie case to answer. This meant that the merger between Massey and the Wellington Polytechnic could not proceed until the full case had been heard in the High Court.

Mai Chen, one of AIT’s solicitors, summed it up in a conversation with me as interpreting the Act to say that polytechnics should limit their activities to what polytechnics do: “Boys should be boys and girls should be girls!”

All this was in spite of the ongoing blurring of the distinctions between the classes of institution prescribed in the Act, and presumably recognised as such by Massey, and the Wellington Polytechnic, alongside AIT.
But the matter at this stage became a concern to AIT. For if the High Court was to rule in favor of the Manawatu Polytechnic, a case could then be mounted by any of AIT’s opponents claiming that AIT’s council had also acted outside its powers in seeking reclassification. There was also considerable anxiety that the High Court could take years to convene unless the parties wanted an early resolution, and the Minister would be unlikely to rule on AIT’s case while this matter was before the courts, thus delaying AIT’s bid for university status indefinitely.

The Minister, however, intervened. In a press release (Creech, 1998) he announced plans to put amendments to the Education Act before Parliament to clarify the provisions that allow tertiary mergers;

"The policy of the Government is clear. Where educational opportunities for students can be improved by institutions joining forces, they should be allowed. New Zealand has a very high number of tertiary institutions (7 universities, 25 polytechnics, 4 colleges of education, and 3 wananga). Many are by international standards very small.

The legal challenge raises questions as to whether the current legislation governing the amalgamation of tertiary institutions is sufficiently clear. To avoid any confusion, and waste of taxpayer dollars intended for education on legal bills, I intend to urgently promote an amendment to the Education Act.

The amendment will make it clear that tertiary institutions, whether they are polytechnics or universities, are able to merge. That is the intention behind the current legislation."

Both APNZ and the Manawatu Polytechnic stated (NZER, 6.5.98) that they would not withdraw their legal proceedings until they were sure of the amendments to the Education Act, while Victoria University’s Vice Chancellor, Michael Irving, said that there was "little evidence that the proposed merger of Wellington Polytechnic and Massey University would benefit students, the Wellington region, or the tertiary sector ... The lack to date of a cost-benefit analysis of the proposal only reinforces the view that it is ill-conceived." He was quoted as having gone on to say that similar mergers in Australia had created major problems, increasing government expenditure and decreasing the amount of scholarship and research at tertiary institutions.
It is probably fair to speculate that if Wellington Polytechnic had chosen Victoria and not Massey as a merger partner, Irving might have had a contrary view!

Further opposition to the Minister’s stated intention to amend the Act was cited from the Association of University Staff, and the New Zealand University Students’ Association who claimed that the Minister was changing the law to suit his perception of the environment tertiary institutions should operate in, and that he should not be able to “undermine the judicial process as it suits him”.

This opposition, coming from the same groups as were opposing AIT’s university status application, again reinforces the thesis of this dissertation that the matter of what defines a university lies at the heart of the debate surrounding AIT’s request.

In spite of vigorous last minute lobbying by APNZ and the Manawatu Polytechnic, the legislation was passed under urgency on 19 May 1998. In the introduction to the amendments, it was stated:

> Since it is established Government policy that tertiary institutions should be able to merge where educational opportunities can be improved by their merging, then the law should allow that. The Government understood that to be the situation under the Education Act 1989, as previous mergers with universities and colleges of education had already occurred since 1990. The Government is proposing this amendment to clarify the law in this regard.

These amendments to sections 164, 192, and 193 of the Act made it clear that different classes of institution can be incorporated together, and that institutions can perform functions characteristic of other institutions.

This freeing of the way for the Wellington Polytechnic-Massey merger was perceived to support the argument that AIT was mounting: a university can perform the functions of a polytechnic as well as the traditional functions of a university.
CONCLUSION

AIT’s application for university status had a significant effect on the tertiary sector in New Zealand. Not only had it caused widespread discussion about the interpretation of the Act as described in chapters 5 and 6, but it caused other institutions to consider how they might also achieve university status.

The meaning of a university lies at the heart of this. The action of Massey University in seeking to merge with Wellington Polytechnic extended the argument further by raising questions about the broader policy implications discussed in chapter 5. Can a university also teach “polytechnic” programmes, and will the provision of polytechnic education be diminished if polytechnics become universities either through amalgamation (the Wellington case), or in their own right (the AIT case)?

The influence of the competitive environment discussed in chapter 4 is also evident. The UNITEC application and the APNZ proposal to establish the NZUT clearly represent attempts to ensure retention of market share of students within those polytechnics who believed that AIT’s action, if successful, would give AIT a marketing advantage.

At the time of writing this dissertation there are no further amalgamations being discussed between universities and polytechnics. It is highly unlikely, however, that the Massey – Wellington merger will be the last of these.

AIT has considered the literature (see chapter 2) on amalgamations, and discarded, for the time being, the option of merging with a university on the grounds that it would do so from a position of weakness as a result of its smaller size and lesser status. There are also concerns that its traditional culture of providing professional rather than discipline-based programmes would in all likelihood be compromised. Other polytechnics, however, may not have this luxury.

The further options for AIT are discussed in chapter 11.
Chapter 10

The 1998 Case for AIT to be Established as a University

Introduction

At the beginning of 1998, with the matter of the amalgamations resolved and with a stronger student enrolment and research profile, AIT sought to have its case for university status determined.

In this chapter, the processes relating to the 1998 submission by AIT are described and the 1998 Case compared to the 1995 application described in chapter 5.

AIT's 1998 Submission

By the end of 1997, it was clear that the NZQA was close to reaching agreement on the guidelines for interpretation of the Act. The time elapsed had allowed AIT to improve both its student enrolment profile and its research activity and reporting (see chapter 7).

AIT wrote to the Minister on 9 December 1997 to advise him that the merger negotiations had been concluded, but ACE had decided to merge with Massey University and the merger between ACE, AIT, and CIT would not be proceeding. Accordingly, the Minister was asked to determine on the 1995 application by AIT for university status.

A 44-page submission accompanied this letter, setting out the current enrolment profile of AIT with projections for 1998 and 1999, stating how AIT now met
each of the guidelines, and attaching a copy of the 1996 research report which had been developed, in large part, in response to the panel’s draft report and the clear need for AIT to improve the manner of it’s research reporting.

The submission stated (p 1 - 2)

*The panel which reported on AIT’s 1995 application concluded that AIT was a repository of knowledge and expertise, and accepted a role as critic and conscience of society, but it was not at that time able to recommend that AIT be established as a university, as it failed to meet all of the guiding criteria for the characteristics of a university set out in section 162(4) of the Act as a result of*

- inadequate enrolments in degree and postgraduate programmes, and
- weaknesses in its research activity and associated outputs.

*The panel did however conclude that AIT was on a developmental path which, in time, would enable it to meet the statutory criteria.*

*AIT submits that its development in the last two years has been such that it now meets the guiding criteria, and seeks approval from the Minister for reclassification as a university.*

The submission also pointed out that the Minister had received 101 submissions on the matter in December 1995, implying that it did not believe further submissions would need to be sought, though Sir Geoffrey Palmer indicated (Palmer, 1997) that it was unlikely that the Minister would not consult again.

I became engaged in further discussions with senior Ministry officials over the process that should be followed. Within AIT we had expected that a further panel evaluation of the application would be needed at a time when the institution was more able to meet the guidelines, but we did not want this to be seen as a new application which would imply that AIT was continuing to apply and fail.

The Ministry accepted our position and negotiated with me the wording of the subsequent letter from the Minister which was received on 25 March 1998 inviting AIT to present its case as an integrated package containing updated information based on the NZQA guidelines which were released in January 1998.
Concurrently, NZQA had initiated a process of consultation on the process by which it would establish a panel to evaluate any applications for university classification. This was completed within two months, the Board releasing its policy on this matter on 18 May 1998 under the title “New Zealand Qualifications Authority Process for the Evaluation of a Ministerial Request for Advice on an Application for the Establishment of a University.”

This policy follows closely the process used by NZQA to consider AIT’s application in 1996. A panel of up to six persons would be appointed including two senior academics from reputable institutions outside New Zealand, with NZVCC, APNZ, the New Zealand Council for Teacher Education (NZCTE), and Te Tauihu o nga Wananga being invited to suggest members for the panel.

During April and May 1998, I therefore rewrote the case in line with the Minister’s request. This was written with the expectation that it would be released into the public arena, and dissected by AIT’s competitors during the process of consultation. The case (appendix II of this thesis) was completed and given to the Minister on 14 May 1998.

This was the first time during the three years since AIT had decided to seek university status that all of the processes had seemed to come together. Guidelines for interpretation of the Act had been published after lengthy consultation in January, the process for evaluation of the application had been released in May 1998, the Minister had expressed an interest in having the matter heard, the Minister had announced his intention and amended the Act in order to clarify the law regarding the activities that universities and polytechnics could engage in, and AIT appeared to now be able to demonstrate conformity to the guidelines.

The case was in effect the culmination of almost three years’ work on my part, beginning with the original application of November 1995, establishing strategic objectives for conformity to the guidelines after their likely form became apparent in 1996, developing research policy and improved processes for research reporting, and encouraging postgraduate activity.
I also took the opportunity in writing the case to reiterate the rationale for AIT being given university status, to address the definition of a university set out in section 162(4)(b)(iii) of the Act, and to make submissions on the wider policy issues of national interest which seemed to be of importance to the political decision making. None of these issues are raised in the NZQA guidelines which focus exclusively on section 162(4)(a) of the Act.

Compared to the 1995 application, the 1998 case is much stronger.

The case that AIT conforms with the guidelines for characteristic 1 (being primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence) is substantiated by evidence of its having obtained approval, accreditation, and Ministry funding for four postgraduate degrees, four postgraduate diplomas, and two postgraduate certificates spread through each of its four faculties, supported by nineteen bachelor's degrees offering forty subject specialisations and nineteen graduate diplomas and certificates. These qualifications were expected to enrol just on 50% of all EFTS in 1998, with approximately 5% of these enrolments being in the postgraduate programmes. A further 23% of all EFTS were projected to be enrolled in programmes leading to level 6 qualifications. Growth patterns over 1997-1999 were graphed to indicate trends of continued conformity with the quantitative guidelines provided that the interpretation of the guidelines would allow graduate diplomas to be considered as equivalent to degrees, graduate diplomas being one-year programmes at a level equivalent to the final year of a degree, and mostly designed to meet the up-skilling of graduates and others after a period in the workforce. The case also asserts the validity of the guideline definitions of higher education, and points out that many of the students enrolled in “lower level” programmes exit with qualifications that they use for entry to advanced levels of degree study, further supporting the contention that most of AIT's students are enrolled in programmes of study that will result in degree graduation.

Demonstrating conformity with characteristic 2 (that research and teaching are closely interdependent and that most teaching is done by people who are active in
advancing knowledge) required heavy reliance on the 1996 and 1997 research reports and the extensive review of institutional policies (including the newly established policy for professorial appointments) that followed from the revision of the Policy and Strategy for Research (1997). Significant upgrading of the Institute’s library systems had greatly expanded access to electronic databases (p.20), research was a key performance indicator for every teaching department (p.24), and the 1996 and 1997 Research Reports had demonstrated (p.26) that approximately 60% of AIT’s permanent academic staff had a recorded research output, with an even higher percentage having research activity recorded in the Faculty research registers.

The guidelines associated with characteristic 3 (meeting international standards of research and teaching) were all dealt with in detail. External funding for research had risen by over 500% between 1995 and 1996 (albeit from a small base of $534,000), with further improvements in 1997 and predicted for 1998 based on current applications pending. Over 60 presentations by AIT staff in 1996 rising to 86 presentations in 1997 in international forums were cited (p.49) along with student and staff exchanges involving 28 different universities within New Zealand and overseas. It was asserted that the newly established key research centres would, from 1998, further enhance the Institute’s capacity to acquire external funding for research and to identify and focus on its research strengths.

The panel in 1996 had been satisfied that AIT conformed to the guidelines associated with characteristics 4 (being a repository of knowledge and expertise) and 5 (being a critic and conscience of society). The 1998 case expanded on these issues, citing further evidence of AIT staff participating in community and wider academic activity, including supervising and examining postgraduate work in other universities, working on the editorial boards of journals, reviewing articles for refereed publications, and engaging in consultancy with industry and the professions. Further evidence of AIT’s acceptance of a role as critic and conscience of society was also given through examples of submissions AIT staff had prepared on government and other social policy issues, and the inclusion of social action in many of its teaching programmes.
Demonstration of conformity with the broader definition of a university (section 162 (4)(b)(iii) of the Act) was by reference to the wide range of programmes taught with associated research activity in each of the faculties and an analysis of 1997 enrolments that would have met the UK criteria of 3000 EFTS enrolled at degree level or higher with at least 300 EFTS in each of five broad subject disciplines as follows (p.63):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>EFTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Management</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages &amp; Communications</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Studies</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postgraduate programmes, it further points out, are available in each of these broad subject disciplines.

In summary, the 1998 submission to the Minister was referenced to the 1995 application, and requested the Minister to follow the processes set out in that application before determining whether to recommend to the Governor-General that AIT be granted a change of status to a university. In seeking this determination, AIT also advised that its student enrolment profile and research activity now met the guidelines established by the NZQA, with the single exception that it was not able to offer a PhD degree because its application for approval and accreditation to do so, lodged two years previously, had still not been considered in the absence of agreement to the guidelines for this by the NZVCC.

At the time of writing this dissertation, it is not clear when the case will be evaluated. I have been trying to establish a time frame for the process with the NZQA and the Minister’s office, but the expectation of litigation by AIT’s competitors in the event of a favourable outcome means that the NZQA is taking legal advice at every point of the process, and will not make any moves until each step has been confirmed by its Board which only meets bimonthly. It is hoped, however, that the Minister will receive advice from the NZQA by October 1998, and that a Ministerial announcement will follow soon after.
CONCLUSION

The case submitted in 1998 was not technically a reapplication, and was sought by the Minister as a “recasting” of the original application. This allowed the case to be presented with up to date information on AIT and for the case to be formatted against each of the guidelines for interpretation of the Act as promulgated by NZQA.

This case is significantly more robust than the 1995 application, and provides a stronger *prima facie* argument that AIT both conforms to the requirements of the Act and to the expectations of a university in both Australia and the UK. The case has also taken account of much of the research described in this thesis in addressing the broader policy issues that will be faced by the Minister in the event that NZQA advises that AIT meets the guidelines for interpretation of the Act.
Chapter 11

Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

In this chapter, the research questions are discussed. The implications and future possibilities for AIT’s strategic development are then considered in the context of the 1997 Green paper and the Government’s budget announcements of May 1998.

The Research Questions

The research questions posed in this dissertation were:

1. What is a university and how is it to be distinguished from any other tertiary institution?

Chapters 4 and 5 have shown that a combination of historical and contextual forces lay behind AIT’s university quest. The political, economic, and social environment of New Zealand from the late 1980s through the 1990s was one of deregulation and competitiveness which spilled over, through the legislation enacted in the Education Amendment Act (1989), into the tertiary sector. Universities no longer had the privileged rights to be the sole providers of degrees, and caught up in the global trends toward massification of higher education and internationalisation, AIT’s need to compete and respond to student demand compelled it to develop the higher end of its educational programmes, and to seek university status in order to secure its domestic and international growth and reputation.
The granting of university status to Polytechnics in the UK and the Colleges in Australia in the last decade further blurred the distinctions between universities and other institutions. For in becoming universities, they brought different traditions and values to the university sectors.

Charlesworth (1998) develops the theme that the role and future of universities at the end of the twentieth century can only be understood in the context of contemporary market ideologies. Universities in Australia and New Zealand during the 1960s and 70s were led in the main by academics who completed their doctoral studies in Oxford, Cambridge, or some other prestigious British university. The system was, as a result, doomed to maintain Oxbridge values. The universities became anglocentric rather than indigenous or Asia-Pacific oriented. They were made elitist and became insulated from taking a role in social critique. Charlesworth claims that broadcasting has performed the role of critic and conscience of society to a greater extent than the universities.

Aitkin (1998) expands on this theme in considering the development of research in universities. He contends that the concept of research in universities rather than the CSIRO in Australia has really only developed since the 1950s. Prior to this, universities were more concerned with knowledge, scholarship, and learning. Again, he sees this as deriving from the roots of the Australian university system being based in the UK where research is nurtured in industry.

The real changes in the last decade can therefore be seen as deriving from the imposition of government agendas demanding connection with trade and industry, and providing wider access to the population as a whole.

There is now, therefore, a more diverse understanding about what a university is or can legitimately be concerned with. While there is a consensus that universities exist to provide higher education, degrees being the fundamental qualifications, that they comprise communities of people engaged in scholarly and research activity, and that academic freedom is an essential part of a university (at least in the context of the UK, Australia and New Zealand), the reality is that universities
can be significantly different to each other in terms of their mission and strategic directions.

Robinson (1998) illustrates this point in disputing the claim that financial and legislative changes in the 1990s in Australia led to convergence of the universities, citing Ballarat and Monash as two Australian universities with quite different missions. Thus, Ballarat is concerned with the offering of degrees linked to the needs of professions, providing a local orientation to its activities, and engaging in applied research. Monash by comparison is concerned with offering degrees that are discipline-based, has a global orientation, and encourages engagement in pure research. The AVCC, according to Robinson, is rarely able to be a representative body of all universities, and increasingly acts instead as a federation of different groups (the group of eight, the ATN, the regionals group, and so on).

The AIT application for university status described in chapters 5 and 10 was made against the definition of a university set out in the Act as described in chapter 2. But the definition in the Act is a somewhat mechanistic description of a university. What this dissertation has claimed is that the controversy and debate about AIT’s application has been as much about the legitimacy of a university which includes programmes with strong components of co-operative education, applied research, and even trade training in its portfolio of activities as it has been about the definitions and benchmarks of the NZQA guidelines. This debate has centred at times on the validity of the NZQA definition of research which includes consultancy and professional practice (albeit under certain circumstances) and at times on whether an institution that teaches vocational skills to a significant proportion of its students can be described as a university.

The reality is, however, that while the challenges presented to the New Zealand university system have yet to be accepted, they have to a significant extent been adopted already in Australia. The merging of universities with TAFE is no longer novel, and seems to be gathering even greater momentum. The West report (DEETYA, 1998) appears to encourage this in spite of the difficulties that dual funding systems impose.
In New Zealand the incorporation of “TAFE” and university education in a single institution is more simple to achieve because both are funded by the same EFTS mechanisms, while in Australia, universities are funded by EFTS but TAFE by student hours. This actually makes the integration of a seamless tertiary system very difficult, because a student-hour funding system encourages institutions to keep students in class for as long as possible, resulting in courses that are not oriented towards self-directed learning, and teaching staff who do not have time for research. Linking and articulating such courses to university courses is therefore very challenging as they have been derived from very different philosophies of teaching and learning.

The challenge for New Zealand therefore, lies in accepting the legitimacy of a multi-level university. There are no policy, funding, or other barriers to proceeding in this way. To date, only Massey University has taken up this challenge through its merger with the Wellington Polytechnic and its reported interest in merging with other polytechnics in the future. AIT, it is to be hoped, will continue to promote this issue.

Chapter 4 has shown that the environment in which AIT had to gain its university status was different to that in which the Australian CAEs and British polytechnics gained their university status in the late 1980s and early 1990s respectively. For New Zealand did not have a binary system of higher education which incorporated a significant group of institutions seeking a status change. In AIT’s case it was rather a matter of a single institution concluding that it had reached the point where university status was a natural step in its evolution and in advance of any other institution, though the move by AIT undoubtedly spurred the subsequent responses by UNITEC and the Wellington Polytechnic to consider how they might follow suit.

The presence of a legislative framework which had attempted in 1989 to distinguish between a university and a polytechnic was also an important difference between the New Zealand and the Australian or UK environments. At the time of the enactment of this legislation, there were significant differences between AIT and any university, for AIT at that time had no degree-awarding
powers, little research, and no postgraduate studies. AIT’s application for a status change six years later in 1995 was therefore challenging to the politicians who undoubtedly had never conceived of this happening when the legislation had been enacted.

Chapter 5 has also outlined the legal options and associated processes that were open to AIT in seeking university status, and chapter 8 with appendix II provides a full overview of how these may be understood in practice. But AIT’s decision to seek establishment as a university under section 162 of the Act was not the only possible path to follow. It is ironic in a sense that Wellington Polytechnic will have achieved university status before AIT through the act of merging with an existing university, even though in the process it will have lost its autonomy. Others will almost certainly follow in due course.

2 How did AIT in 1995 match up against the characteristics of a university set out in the Education Act, and what changes did AIT have to make in order to demonstrate conformity to these characteristics?

The recasting of the case for AIT to be established as a university (appendix II) outlines its position against each of the guidelines for interpretation of the Act as published by NZQA. While these guidelines are still disputed by some in the existing universities, they do represent a reasonable and defensible interpretation of the Act.

It is, however, the Act itself rather than the guidelines for its interpretation that AIT has to conform to. Whether or not litigation will result from any political decision to establish AIT as a university remains to be seen. The University of Auckland’s Vice Chancellor has consistently indicated that the University will litigate because it does not accept the interpretation of the Act set out in the guidelines. However, that Vice Chancellor recently retired, and the attitude of his successor towards AIT will be a key factor in this matter in the future.

In a technical sense, all of the guidelines do meet a literal interpretation of the Act, but one’s understanding of what a university is needs to transcend the literal or
technical meaning of words such as “most”, “higher”, and “advanced”. Question 1 above has highlighted the issue that the understanding of what a university is goes well beyond technical description, for the traditional concept of a university is rooted in perceptions about its history and its ethos, and the very act of AIT requesting university status was threatening the monolithic culture of New Zealand universities that had been established and built upon over 150 years.

Chapter 7 has described the changes that took place in AIT subsequent to its application. These were mostly related to conscious and determined efforts to improve the research performance and reporting of the institute, and to speed up the rate at which degree and postgraduate programmes were being developed. It can be argued that these were changes that would probably have happened anyway, but there is little doubt that the process of seeking university status propelled them to a position of greater priority than if the institution had not embarked on the exercise.

From an early point, the process of political lobbying also indicated to those of us involved that priority needed to be given to changing the image of AIT. Members of the executive regularly commented in meetings that “we must try harder to look like a university and think like a university”.

The development of professorial positions (chapter 7), the publication of annual research reports from 1997 onwards, and the publication of an Institute Calendar for the 1998 academic year can all be seen as part of a coordinated effort to dress the institution in the “trappings” of a university.

One of the senior academics in a nearby university expressed in a letter to AIT his opposition to its university quest (Hinchcliff, 1997: 343):

“Mark Twain in a somewhat sexist remark, is said to have noted that women swear badly because they know the words but not the music. That’s how AIT’s research appears to me. I have no doubt that, on a number of performance indicators, they will be able to point to things that look like research. But it lacks the soul, the essence, the “music” of research. It is not difficult to see why. The initial research culture went around the scholarship inherent in the humanities. Their presence now in
all of the universities is, in the words of Tillich, the ground of a university's being."

When this letter was circulated around the executive of AIT, it was greeted by comments of disbelief. I think, however, that it struck an uncomfortable chord in many of us for on numerous occasions since it has been quoted in support of endeavours to ensure that AIT developed the "music" and the image of a university.

Of the changes that took place in AIT during the years 1996-1998, the development and emergence of a research culture was probably the most marked one, and derives from the deliberate strategy described in chapter 7, but with the encouragement of the executive which strongly supported the university status application. This strategy was almost entirely informed by the literature review (chapter 2) which provided an insight into the issues surrounding the development of research in new universities.

The effect of the political lobbying, however, should not be underestimated. Senior staff were all fully briefed on the university application, and most were involved at some point in lunches and other planned lobbying strategies with politicians. This lobbying was supported by a public relations strategy aimed at bringing the issue into all of the media, television, radio, and the newspapers. Internally, the issue has been a regular item in newsletters and staff forums. As a result it has a strong sense of ownership by staff at all levels of the institution where there is a strong and growing support for the quest. This has been manifest by a higher than expected level of acceptance of a developing research culture.

It is possible also that the strong opposition from the University of Auckland has further increased the determination of AIT staff to resist the notion, inherent in the University's opposition, that they and the programmes they teach are inferior and not worthy of university status.

3 What challenges did AIT's application present to the traditional concept of a university in New Zealand, and how did the other New Zealand tertiary institutions respond to this challenge?
AIT’s application not only raised the question of whether or not an institution could change its status from polytechnic to university, but also the question of how the process of such a change should be addressed. Chapters 5, 6, and 10 have shown how the practical and legal issues were addressed, and precedents set for other institutions to follow.

Perhaps more importantly, AIT’s application has posed a challenge to the wider conceptual understanding within New Zealand of what a university is or can be. Even within AIT itself, a major shift in thinking was necessary for many staff who had until that time thought of a university only within the confined styles and profiles of the existing New Zealand universities.

When the matter first came into the public domain, I invited all staff to email me with their comments or questions, either positive or negative, and promised to reply to them. A number of them did so, a common reaction being “Why are we trying to be a university when we are already the country’s leading polytechnic? MIT is arguably one of the world’s most prestigious institutions but is not a university. Why can’t we aspire to be the same?”

This kind of response reflected a misunderstanding about the names and functions of an institution. There would be few informed people who would question that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is a university even if it does not use the word “university” in its name. And as chapter 5 has pointed out, the quest by AIT initially began not as one of seeking university classification, but of seeking approval to use the protected term “university”. If the Minister had agreed to allow this and the universities had decided not to contest it, it is likely that AIT would have continued without seeking a reclassification, though a large number of polytechnics would inevitably have followed suit and raised the question as to whether or not the term should after all have been protected.

The document containing AIT’s application very clearly reflects the decision of the AIT council that university status was only an option if its traditional values relating to vocational education and the provision of its “low level” courses which
were seen to be essential to its commitment to equity could be retained. This is a laudable objective, and only time will tell whether or not it can be sustained. Certainly in the life of the current executive and council of the institution, attempts will be made to continue with a range of trade and foundation programmes, but it is probable that this commitment will be eroded over time as the university end of AIT’s course offerings continues to grow.

It can be argued that the environment of mergers will inevitably see AIT amalgamating with other polytechnics, promoting a need for the university to establish a community institute within its structures where these courses can be maintained and encouraged. The pattern of development (Karmel, 1992; Bradley, 1993) in the CAEs and Polytechnics in Australia and the UK which became universities in the last decade is that their traditional balance of courses was altered over time, making them more and more like traditional universities. This does not necessarily mean that AIT will follow these same patterns in its future development, but this study has shown that the factors causing AIT’s quest for university status have followed strong parallels in Australia and the UK, and there is therefore a strong likelihood that the driving forces that moulded change in the new universities in these countries will in the same way influence AIT.

Current amalgamation activity in Australia is seeing universities and TAFE institutions coming together, often with the establishment of a TAFE institution within the university structure.

AIT’s action in seeking university classification also, as described in chapter 5, focused on the status of qualifications awarded by universities as opposed to those awarded by an institution. The anecdotal evidence offered by AIT in appendix XIV of its 1995 application was confirmed by the Association of Polytechnics in the papers that were circulated pertaining to the NZUT proposal (described in chapter 9). The concept of the NZUT was not essentially for a new university as an organic institution, but for a qualifications awarding authority which had the name of a university. The intent of the proposal was quite clearly to establish this organism primarily to provide parity of status to the degrees awarded by the polytechnics.
The Minister affirmed to me in a private conversation (fieldnotes, Jan 1997) that in his view the problems raised by AIT’s quest for university status would be overcome if there was some mechanism to accord equivalent status to the qualifications.

All of the polytechnic academics that I have discussed this with are adamant in their views that the processes for degree approval and accreditation imposed by the NZQA have far more rigour in their application than those used by the Committee for University Academic Programmes (CUAP) which gives approval to the universities in New Zealand seeking to offer a new degree. This view has been expressed consistently to me also by the majority of university academics who sit on the NZQA panels. But the public does not understand the detail of these processes, and there is a widely held belief outside of academia (and to a lesser extent within it) that university degrees are more difficult and demanding of students, while polytechnic degrees are in many cases, “soft”.

This is an issue that existed before AIT’s university status quest, but which was highlighted in the application and which has been the subject of ongoing debate in many national polytechnic forums. AIT’s application, while attempting to solve the problem for AIT, has probably made the matter worse for those polytechnics who cannot or do not wish to achieve university status themselves (Doyle, fieldnotes, March 1998).

4 What were the factors that led to AIT considering a merger with CIT and ACE, and why did the merger fail?

Chapter 8 has explored the factors involved in AIT’s failed merger discussions with AIT and ACE. The decision to enter into these discussions was driven initially by a desire to widen the scope of the institution both geographically (through the merger with CIT) and academically (through expanding to include a major division associated with teacher education).
The issues surrounding the university quest were never far from the surface in these discussions. As chapter 8 points out, the vision was from the outset to establish a national university with a difference, and the evaluation of CIT, which showed that it would not be of assistance to AIT’s university application on its own, was a critical component of the decision not to merge with CIT when the three-way merger failed.

The Vision for a Merger prepared for the councils of the three institutions spoke clearly about the opportunities for the core values of the three institutions to be promoted in a new university which was focused on education at university level to meet the needs of the related professions. It was the synergy of these values that led in the first instance to the discussions proceeding. In my earliest talks with the senior managers at ACE, the parallels between nursing and other health science programmes at AIT, and the teacher education programmes at ACE, were used as illustrations of the ways in which the two institutions would understand each other’s respective cultures of teaching and learning.

This merger, had it succeeded, would have enabled the retention of the vocational cultures of ACE, AIT, and CIT whereas, for ACE, merging with an established university provides a more threatening environment for this culture.

In the end, however, it was AIT’s lack of university status that lay behind the failure of the ACE council to accept the recommendations of its senior management. The primary evidence for this has come from private conversations with senior managers and the Chief Executive of ACE, and this is borne out by the way in which the ACE council reached its decision to merge with Massey University. For while the management of ACE was recommending a merger with AIT and CIT, a majority of the council wanted to merge with a university, and favoured the University of Auckland. But given the adamant opposition to this by the management, the compromise of another university was sought at a very late stage in the process, and agreed to with little consideration of the wider vision that had been inherent in the ACE/AIT/CIT proposal.
With the benefit of hindsight, AIT would probably have been best to have focused only on its university quest, and left the question of merging with ACE until that had been achieved. The loss of the opportunity to merge with a college of education is a serious setback to AIT's long-standing commitment to develop its range of programmes to include teacher education at postgraduate level for practising teachers and educators in wide variety of settings. Further, there was no evidence at the time of AIT’s approach to ACE that it was contemplating any sort of amalgamation, and it is probable that had the matter not been placed before the council as it was, the College would still be independent.

These research questions are not unrelated.

In the preface to this thesis it was posited that AIT’s action in seeking university status triggered a chain of consequential events, and that if AIT had not sought to become a university:

- it would not have been so focused during the years 1996-98 on strengthening its research and postgraduate capabilities;
- the merger between Massey University and the Auckland College of Education would not have taken place;
- a merger between AIT and the Central Institute of Technology would have taken place;
- the proposal for a New Zealand University of Technology would not have arisen;
- the UNITEC Institute of Technology would not have sought university status in 1996;
- the merger between the Wellington Polytechnic and Massey University and the consequential High Court litigation would not have taken place;
- the New Zealand Qualifications Authority would not have developed guidelines for interpretation of the sections of the Education Act which describe the characteristics of the various types of tertiary institution in New Zealand, and
- Government’s Green Paper on the future of tertiary education would not have included discussion on the issue of “protected terms” (which include the word “university”).
What are the implications of impending university status for AIT and its strategic options for the future?

While the previous four research questions are important in leading to an interpretation and understanding of what happened, how, and why, the research in itself is only of academic interest without some brief discussion of its implications.

The inevitability of AIT’s university status in the future raises issues that are far reaching. For while AIT at the time of writing this dissertation was further advanced towards meeting the criteria for university status than any other polytechnic in New Zealand, other polytechnics will eventually reach the same point in the future. And there will always be some that are testing the boundaries, whether or not the criteria are changed or other categories of institution (such as universities of technology) are established.

The Green paper (p.42) acknowledges that some commentators believe there is no need for continued protection of the word “university”, and that any institution wishing to use the term should be permitted to do so. It is my belief that the New Zealand public is not ready for this, and would not accept some of the polytechnics calling themselves universities when they have very small student numbers, offer only one or two degrees, and have little demonstrable research. The concept of unprotected terms evokes images of the Californian system where mail order degrees are available, and where, while on the one hand some of the world’s best education is available, credentials that are not worth the paper they are written on can also be acquired. Some consistency of standards is therefore necessary. There will, as a result, be ongoing debate about the meaning of a university and how it is to be understood and defined in New Zealand.

These are not issues that are confined to New Zealand.

The 1998 review of Melbourne TAFE's (OTFE, 1998) has drawn attention to similar issues. Theme 6 of this report identifies inconsistencies in transfer arrangements between TAFE and universities with recommendation 16 proposing
the allocation of $1 million to promote improved pathways and credit transfer between sectors, especially from TAFE to university. If substantial improvement is not achieved within two years, it is further recommended that legislative amendment be enacted to provide the capacity for TAFE institutions to award vocationally based degrees.

In the event that this transpires, some kind of degree approval authority will need to be established and to develop its approval and accreditation systems, possibly along the lines of the NZQA. And some TAFE institutions in Victoria will inevitably follow the path that AIT has pursued. Degree development will take place to the point at which some institutions reach the decision to also seek university status when their degree activity begins to dominate their overall endeavours. Debate will ensue as to what constitutes a university, and how the process of determining whether or not an aspiring institution can credibly use the name should be managed.

The New Zealand experience may therefore have much to offer to the State of Victoria, or to any other state that follows suit.

The AIT case study has not only raised the issue of how many universities a country like New Zealand should have, but also how the boundaries between the polytechnic and university should be defined, if indeed they are capable of definition.

The APNZ concerns raised in the context of the Wellington Polytechnic-Massey merger (discussed in chapter 9) focused on the transfer of funding from the polytechnics to the universities. Just how valid is this concern? From the perspective that education is being made more widely available, it is difficult to see how the classification of the institution a student chooses to enrol in matters, particularly in New Zealand where the funding for similar courses is the same, whatever the institution.

The fundamental issue is probably therefore one of public perception. If a university is seen as an elite organisation where learning is largely theoretical and
abstract, rather than applied and vocationally relevant, then these concerns will continue to be expressed.

It can be argued, as a result, that what is needed is an improved image for vocational education, and that this is most likely to occur if some of the institutions with the highest status (the universities) begin to more overtly value applied learning and research. This is most likely to happen if other New Zealand universities follow the Massey example and merge with polytechnics, but only if the polytechnic component of such a university is nurtured and given equal internal status. Perhaps the most avid apologists for polytechnic education should more actively promote the amalgamation of polytechnics and universities!

At the heart of many concerns is an anxiety that the move by AIT and other polytechnics to become universities will dilute the provision of vocational education. Those who have expressed these concerns include many of the politicians that AIT has lobbied over the period 1995-98. Discussion with them about their concerns, however, reveals that in most cases they have a preconception that university education is elitist and does not cater for the training needs of industry. Many on reflection have shifted their thinking and expressed an acceptance that it is the traditional paradigm of what a university is that needs to be changed. The reality, in any case, is that in a competitive environment there will always be an institution willing and ready to provide courses that are sought after – market forces will prevail.

Whether AIT’s entry to the university ranks will help to change that paradigm, however, is a matter that only the future will tell. There is little evidence that the entry of the British polytechnics and Australian CAEs into the university cartels of their respective countries caused such a shift in the public mindset. For in both cases, especially in Australia, the new universities were forced to compete with the established universities for research funding and institutional rankings that were based on the inherent characteristics of the pre-existing university sectors. And the requirement for the new universities in Australia that did not merge with an existing university to have a “mentor” university ensured that convergence
would take place, particularly through the development of a research culture of a traditional nature.

The reverse concern that the emergence of new universities will dilute the reputation and international standing of the established universities is groundless. There is no research literature or any other evidence that this has happened in either the UK or Australia. If it does, a system of university rankings in New Zealand will inevitably follow.

New Zealand in 1998 has no system for establishing institutional rankings, and there is not to my knowledge any current move to establish them. This probably reflects the demography of New Zealand which has only one city (Auckland) large enough to sustain more than one university, though with the merger of Wellington Polytechnic and Massey University, university competition will be introduced to Wellington as well, and some form of ranking system will inevitably be introduced, probably at the behest of whichever university feels it has the most to gain by it.

This will create further challenges for AIT. For if the rankings are to be based on the traditional performance indicators including research, it will be forced to compete in an environment where its traditional strengths do not lie.

Davis (1996) reviewed the use of performance indicators in the UK, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa, listing (p.14) the following key institutional indicators:

**Student indicators**
- Population
- Entry qualifications
- Progression and completion rates
- Destination
- Student satisfaction

**Staff indicators**
- Qualifications
- Gender balance
- Age ratios
- Academic/support staff ratios
Resources/Financial statistics indicators
Operating funds
Research funding
Other income
staff/student ratios
Expenditure - academic centres/central administration/library
ratios of income: expenditure

Research
Number of research students
Research funding
   public sector research funding
   industry research funding
   total research income per academic staff member
   research expenditure per academic staff member
   ratio of research expenditure: income
Publications
   number of journal articles
   number of books
   other publications/conference papers
Patents and licences
   income earned

Estate management/Physical resources indicators
Space utilisation
Performance in maintenance, improvement and capital expenditure

An institution such as AIT whose traditional values have been focused mostly on the quality of student learning and student employment outcomes as opposed to research will probably score highly on the student indicators, and should be expected to perform creditably on the resources and estate management indicators. But it will be starting from a disadvantaged position if the rankings are based around the research and staff qualifications indicators as is the case in the UK.

Skuja (1996) comments that there are other troubles with university league tables. Comparative information is often misleading, easy to manipulate, and tends to obscure genuine differences between universities. He hypothesises an example:

"Suppose that University A has a retention rate of 85% compared with 65% for University B. On face value, one would conclude that University A is performing better; it certainly would have a better graduation rate."
But, say that the league table also showed that University A attracts the top 10 percent of school leavers, while University B attracts less able students from the top 40 percent.

Controlling for the "quality" of student in a regression analysis, it might be shown that the expected retention rate for University A was 90 percent while the expected rate for University B was 50 percent.

From these figures, it would be appropriate to conclude that University B was performing better than the raw indicator value would suggest. Its reported rate was 15 percent better than expected (65 minus 50) given the nature of its student body.”

The challenge for AIT, then, will be to take the initiative in developing the indicators that should be used in establishing university rankings in New Zealand and ensuring that they are not weighted towards the strengths of the existing universities. Public debate will be necessary in this process, again focusing on what the community as a whole wants from its universities rather than what the universities themselves believe they should be all about.

This debate needs to be focused on the changes that universities can be expected to bring to the lives and futures of their stakeholders - measures related to the university’s responsiveness to the community’s economic and social goals.

The Australian practice of nominating a “university of the year” award using different performance indicators each year would also be a helpful way for a new university such as AIT to establish its reputation and credibility in the university sector.

**Future changes for AIT**

“Strategic positionings are often not obvious, and finding them requires creativity and insight.” (Porter, 1996:65)

This thesis has focused on the transition of AIT during the years 1994-98. The spectre, however, is for further change, not just in achieving and consolidating its university status, but also in determining its future size and scope. The failed merger between AIT, ACE, and CIT in 1997 compelled the institution to not only
focus on its university status, but also to consider how it might develop as a new university.

The issue of the curriculum has arisen in 1998, focused by AIT’s President in a paper to an Executive retreat (Hinchcliff, 1998) titled *Do traditional university subjects have a role to play in stereoscopic vocational education?*

Hinchcliff argues that AIT’s traditional lack of interest in teaching subjects such as literature, history, philosophy, and anthropology has been derived from a belief that its programmes should be employment oriented, but that;

“There is evidence to suggest that the employee of the future will be a flexible generalist rather than a particular specialist. The employee will have to be able to contextualise specialist knowledge. Subjects such as philosophy, literature, history, political science, sociology, and anthropology can all enable the inquiring mind to gain a greater understanding of the issue at hand. For example, a student studying psychotherapy or nursing could gain a deeper appreciation of the fundamental humanity of people in distress by reading some of the great literature.”

He concludes;

“In this era of turbulence, variety, and opportunity, synergistic learning that interrelates wisdom and knowledge from a variety of sources is becoming an increasingly important attribute. Perhaps it is being anachronistically precious to separate dimensions of learning into separate compartments, i.e. vocational and academic.”

The concept of AIT expanding the curriculum to incorporate the humanities is probably an inevitability in its future as a university.

Mergers and strategic alliances will also continue as current issues in the foreseeable future. AIT has as a result of the negotiations with CIT and ACE some corporate knowledge to rely on when the matter next arises.

Current scenarios in New Zealand include the future amalgamation of the Dunedin College of Education with Otago University (although this has for the time being at least been rejected by the College), with the real possibility of the Otago
Polytechnic being included. Massey University has had further discussions about its future with a number of polytechnics in the central North Island region, while the Manukau Institute of Technology has already established an institutional affiliation with the University of Auckland.

AIT’s options are somewhat limited. Mergers with other polytechnics would be easy to achieve, AIT being an attractive option for them, but AIT’s ability to sustain the EFTS and research profiles necessary to retain its university status would be severely compromised in any merger with another polytechnic unless it can gain approval to establish a “Polytechnic Institute” within the university. This, however, would lay the university open to judicial review if it no longer conformed to the requirements of the Act.

AIT may be forced therefore to remain a relatively small university or to consider either an amalgamation with another New Zealand university or to seek meaningful links with another university outside of New Zealand.

The latter is perhaps the most fruitful option. The Australian tertiary sector has a number of universities whose roots are similar to AIT’s, and almost every other industry has become globalised in recent years.

In chapters 2 and 8 of this dissertation, the major gains from mergers were identified as the enabling of wider opportunities for students to progress between faculties, the provision of broader curriculum development opportunities, economies of scale in marketing and other administrative functions, and the expansion of research capabilities. It can be argued that a multinational merger could achieve these ends even more successfully than a domestic merger.

Amalgamation of AIT and an Australian university with a history similar to AIT’s (UTS, RMIT, and QUT all spring quickly to mind) could provide distinct advantages to both parties. The challenge would be to develop a homogeneous set of academic regulations and structures with an agreement to share freely all intellectual property. The same degrees could then be offered in two cities on both sides of the Tasman with links and opportunities for national and international
research and development greatly expanded. The two merging partners could develop a shared strategic objective based on the respective communities of Auckland and the Australian city, with the operations in New Zealand and Australia funded by the respective Governments.

The New Zealand Government’s budget announcement on 14 May 1998 makes this a practical possibility for the first time. Providing funding based on actual enrolment on an equal basis to all institutions whether they are state owned, private, or registered foreign organisations means that any university anywhere in the world is now able to operate in New Zealand on the same grounds as any New Zealand university. Whether or not the Government intended that this be the case is not clear, but it is consistent with the continued moves by Government to deregulate most state funded enterprises, banks, airlines, the media, property ownership, and the like.

There is a possibility that the Australian Government may do likewise. Chapter 4 of the West report on higher education funding and policy (DEETYA, 1998) clearly favours a funding system that is “student centred”, the identical phrase used by the New Zealand Government, and understood by most as a voucher system. If this is the case, and if the Australian Government accepts the recommendations of the West report, then a merger between an Australian university and AIT becomes a logical step towards the establishment of the first Australasian university.

Given the background and context of AIT’s entry into the New Zealand university sector, it is probably from within a model of a global university such as this that AIT’s future will be best assured.

And doubtless someone else will write a dissertation on the process.
APPENDIX I

SECTIONS 160-164, THE EDUCATION ACT, 1989

160. **Object** - The object of this Act relating to institutions is to give them as much independence and freedom to make academic, operational, and management decisions as is consistent with the nature of the services they provide, the efficient use of national resources, the national interest, and the demands of accountability.

162. **Establishment of Institutions**—

(2) Subject to subsections (3) to (5) of this section, the Governor-General may, by order in Council made on the written recommendation of the Minister, establish a body as a college of education, a polytechnic, a university, or a wananga, as the Governor-General considers appropriate.

(3) Before deciding whether or not to recommend to the Governor-General the making of an Order in Council under subsection (2) of this section, the Minister shall-

(a) Give the Qualifications Authority a reasonable period in which to give advice to the Minister on the matter and consider any advice so given; and

(b) Consult with such institutions, organisations representing institutions, and other relevant bodies, as the Minister considers appropriate.

(4) In recommending to the Governor-General under subsection (2) of this section that a body should be established as a college of education, a polytechnic, or a wananga, the Minister shall take into account-

(a) That universities have all the following characteristics and other tertiary institutions have one or more of these characteristics:

(i) They are primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence;

(ii) Their research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of their teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge;

(iii) They meet international standards of research and teaching;

(iv) They are a repository of knowledge and expertise;

(v) They accept a role as critic and conscience of society; and
(b) That -...

(ii) A polytechnic is characterised by a wide diversity of continuing education, including vocational training, that contributes to the maintenance, advancement and dissemination of knowledge and expertise and promotes community learning, and by research, particularly applied and technological research, that aids development; and

(iii) A university is characterised by a wide diversity of teaching and research, especially at a higher level, that maintains, advances, disseminates, and assists the application of knowledge, develops intellectual independence, and promotes community learning.

164 Disestablishment of institutions -

(1) Subject to this section, the Governor-General may, by order in council made on the written recommendation of the Minister, disestablish an institution.

(2) The Governor-General shall not disestablish a university specified in Part I of the Thirteenth Schedule to this Act unless the House of Representatives has passed a resolution approving the disestablishment of the university.

(3) The Minister shall not recommend the disestablishment of an institution unless the Minister -

(a) Is satisfied on reasonable grounds that there are good reasons to do so; and

(b) Specifies the reasons in the recommendation.

(4) When an institution is, or 2 or more institutions are, disestablished, the Governor-General may, by Order in Council made on the written recommendation of the Minister, incorporate the disestablished institution or any one or more of the disestablished institutions in another institution, whether the other institution is an existing institution or is a new institution established for the purpose.

(5) Before deciding whether or not to recommend the making of an Order in Council under subsection (1) or subsection (3) of this subsection, the Minister shall -

(a) Give to the council of the institution or the councils of the institutions concerned, and to every other body that the Minister considers is likely to be directly affected, written notice -

(i) Setting out the action that the Minister is considering whether to take, and the reasons for that action; and

(ii) Inviting each Council or other body to make a written submission to the Minister in relation to the matter; and
(b) Publish such notices as the Minister considers appropriate inviting members of the public to make written submissions in relation to the matter; and

(c) Consider any submissions made within a reasonable period in response to the notices referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection.

(6) If an Order in Council is made under subsection (1) or subsection (4) of this section, the Minister shall lay before the House of Representatives a copy of the Order in Council and a statement of the reasons for the making of the Order in Council.
THE CASE FOR
THE AUCKLAND INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
TO BE ESTABLISHED AS A UNIVERSITY

11 MAY 1998
THE RATIONALE FOR CHANGING THE STATUS OF AIT FROM POLYTECHNIC TO UNIVERSITY

Auckland Institute of Technology has for over 100 years been one of the nation's most respected providers of vocational education.

This submission establishes that due to changes occurring over the past decade, AIT meets all characteristics of a university as defined by the Education Amendment Act 1989, and seeks a change in its status.

Most of AIT's 15,000 enrolled students (both full-time and part-time) are studying in higher education, including bachelor and postgraduate degree programmes. An applied research culture has been established which complements AIT's position as an excellent teaching institution that serves and is served by the professions and industry. And, despite the handicap of not having university status, AIT has developed some strong relationships with universities around the world, to the benefit of students, staff, and New Zealand.

For several years, AIT has seen the need to be known as a university. The pressure to change the status of the Institute has come from two main sources, students and a globalisation of education that demands internationally recognised qualifications.

The initial impetus for change came from the students who proposed a name change to the AIT Council in 1992. They believed that changing AIT's status would benefit the large number of graduates seeking employment, particularly overseas, where they were being disadvantaged because their qualifications were not from a university. They also believed the change would end such discrimination in New Zealand.

AIT commissioned Forsyte Research to study this matter in 1995. Domestic research found that 80% of employers thought that polytechnic education was relevant to business, compared to 73% for universities. A significantly greater proportion of employers thought that polytechnic graduates had confidence with tasks (94% v 64%) and practical understanding of their business (90% v 53%). Yet only 40% of employers considered that polytechnic graduates had intellectual abilities, in comparison to 97% who considered university graduates had intellectual ability. This unfavourable and inaccurate perception confirmed our students' contention that the status of the body awarding their qualifications was of critical importance to employers.

AIT is aware that its graduates are even further disadvantaged in the international marketplace. For example, the Physiotherapy qualifications from AIT and Otago University are of the same standard. However, Otago's were recognised by all fifty states in the USA and AIT's were only recognised by four states until the Institute made extensive submissions on behalf of its graduates. Similar inequities are found in other countries.

Present students are also disadvantaged by AIT's lack of university status. The Institute has developed a strong international focus in recent years, arranging...
student exchanges to many parts of the world. Some governments, however, will not allow their university students to gain credit for work done at AIT because it is not a university.

The inability of AIT’s Business students to exchange with students in universities in Singapore and other countries is a significant disadvantage both to AIT students and to the companies that will eventually employ our graduates. With university qualifications, AIT graduates will have improved opportunities for further employment and for postgraduate study.

The negative impact of AIT’s lack of university status goes beyond education and into economics and intellectual capital derived from the provision of education and educational services overseas. AIT currently enrolls approximately 700 fee paying international students annually, generating an income for the Institute of approximately $10 million per annum and bringing a further $10 million into the New Zealand economy. The Institute, however, is handicapped in this, particularly in Asia, because Asian students and families put great weight on the status of a qualification, and students are reluctant to study overseas other than at a university. AIT is regularly asked why it is not a university and when it plans to become one. Within five years of being granted university status, AIT expects to double the number of international students and the income they provide.

In Malaysia, AIT was the founding partner for the country’s largest Design and Communications Institute in which 1500 students are currently enrolled in AIT programmes. Sadly, the number who transfer to AIT to complete a degree, is approximately 30. Most who complete a degree go to Australian or UK universities which, as a result, have reaped the benefit of AIT’s endeavours in Malaysia solely because they have the word “university” in their name. AIT has been told constantly by its Malaysian partners that it will remain difficult to convince students to transfer to AIT until it becomes a university, a situation that is costing New Zealand and AIT millions of dollars in lost revenue.

AIT’s major competitors in Asia are the “new” universities in Australia and the UK which ten years ago were Colleges of Advanced Education and Polytechnics, respectively. Changes to the tertiary systems in these countries enabled institutions with very similar profiles to AIT to become universities. In almost all cases they have been more successful in their internationalisation than AIT because they have such a significant market advantage by virtue of their status or name. It is ironic that, were AIT located in Sydney, Melbourne or London, it would have gained university status years ago.

The lack of university status has also impaired AIT’s efforts to secure research and development contracts with overseas governments who are seeking to develop their tertiary systems. New Zealand is losing out on significant long-term opportunities to be involved in the human resource development of its major trading partners because it does not have a university with the characteristics of AIT to play its part in this crucial area of international endeavour.

Overall, AIT believes that the change to university status will bring major benefits both to the Institute, its students and other stakeholders, and to New Zealand. The Institute’s own research into the new universities in Australia and the UK
indicates the following broad impacts arising from their changes in status and name:

1. increased enrolments of overseas students, without a decline in domestic student enrolments;

2. an arresting of the "drift" or net loss of students to other institutions;

3. improved staff morale and higher retention rates, particularly of younger staff;

4. easier recruitment of staff, particularly senior and experienced research-active staff, who are required to supervise postgraduate and research students;

5. improved access to research and consultancy opportunities.

All of these benefits are seen by AIT to be important to its ongoing development. In particular, AIT has a growing postgraduate and research profile, the sustaining and management of which requires the ability to attract experienced and competent staff from overseas universities. This is an area in which AIT is very significantly handicapped by its current lack of university status.

In summary, the rationale for AIT's decision to seek university status has arisen from a desire to meet the aspirations of its students who want greater international recognition of their qualifications, the need to compete internationally without the handicap of non university status, and the need to be able to support the development of its teaching and research in an institution which has parity of status with the other institutions with whom it seeks to work and collaborate.

AIT believes that the quality of its teaching, and the diversity of its programmes and research compare favourably with that of any of the new universities at the time of their establishment in Australia or the UK in recent years. As such, it is, de facto, a university already.
THE BACKGROUND TO THIS CASE

In November 1995, AIT made an application to the Minister of Education to be established as a university under section 162(2) of the Education Act 1989.

Pursuant to section 162(3)(a) of the Act, the Minister referred the application to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) to consider the application and provide advice to him before he made any recommendation to the Governor-General to establish AIT as a university by Order in Council.

In April 1996 the NZQA established a panel of experts to recommend guidelines for interpretation of the Act, to consider AIT's application, and to report on it.

On 19 December 1996, AIT advised the Minister that it was considering a merger with two other tertiary institutions, the Auckland College of Education (ACE) and the Central Institute of Technology (CIT), and requested the Minister to defer any decision until the discussions with these institutions had been concluded. This was because any decision in favour of AIT's application to be established as a university might have been challenged if the merger proceeded and AIT changed its character at any stage between the date the Minister received advice from the NZQA and the date of the Order in Council. In addition, the three institutions were planning to merge into a wholly new organisation that would be seeking university status.

However, the Council of the Auckland College of Education announced on 30 October 1997 that it was seeking to merge with Massey University, and accordingly, AIT decided to seek to have the matter of its application for university status determined.

In December 1997, AIT requested the Minister to determine on the application made in November 1995 to establish AIT as a university, to note that the reasons for the request and the legal processes set out in the application were unchanged, but to note that AIT itself had progressed in the two years since the application was made. The Minister subsequently wrote on 25 March 1998 inviting AIT to present its case as an integrated package containing updated information based on the NZQA guidelines which were released in January 1998.

AIT submits that it meets the guiding criteria, and seeks approval from the Minister for reclassification as a university.

This case includes details of student enrolments and research activity demonstrating that AIT's enrolment profile, and research activity and reporting have changed significantly since the original application was made in 1995. Degree programme development and enrolments have been strong in the last two years, postgraduate programmes are now offered in all Faculties, while research activity and research reporting have been considerably strengthened.

The 1995 application set out fully the processes required by the Act which would need to be followed in order for AIT to be established as a university.

In summary, the Minister needs to
take advice from the NZ Qualifications Authority, and

consult with relevant bodies

before exercising discretion as to whether or not to recommend to the Governor-General that AIT be granted a change of status to a university.

AIT understands that the Minister will be seeking advice from the NZQA based on this case. The panel that convened in April 1996 reported that AIT was on a developmental path to meet the statutory criteria set out in the Act. The information provided in this case supports AIT’s belief that it now meets those criteria.

The Ministry of Education consulted widely on the matter in December 1995 and received a total of 105 submissions from interested bodies and members of the public.

AIT submits that these submissions should also be taken into account in reaching a decision as to whether AIT should be reclassified as a university in 1998.

The case which follows is based on the statutory definition of a university as set out in the Education Act and the guidelines for interpretation of that definition published by the NZQA in 1998. AIT believes that it currently meets this definition and conforms to these guidelines, and that it will not need or be compelled to change its commitment to vocational education, student centred learning, and equity of access to higher education as a result of becoming a university.
THE DEFINITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF A UNIVERSITY

Section 162(4)(a) of the Education Act, 1989, requires a university to have each of five characteristics which are identified in the Act. These characteristics are:

1. they are primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence;

2. their research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of their teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge;

3. they meet international standards of research and teaching;

4. they are a repository of knowledge and expertise; and

5. they accept a role as critic and conscience of society.

The following is a summary of how AIT currently exhibits each of these characteristics, and conforms to the overall definition of a university as described in section 162(4)(b)(iii) of the Act.

It should be noted that throughout this document, where numbers of staff and students are referred to, these are equivalent full-time numbers as at November 1997 unless otherwise stated.
“[Universities] are primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence”

Education Act 1989 section 162(4)(a)(i)
AIT is primarily concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence.

1.1 AIT students completing more advanced learning programmes demonstrate the following:

- a substantial knowledge of a discipline or a group of related disciplines;
- investigative skills appropriate to the discipline(s);
- the capacity to think critically;
- the ability to work independently and with others; and
- the ability to apply the knowledge and skills acquired through the programme to different situations.

Overall, the completing students have the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that will provide for continued, independent learning, and the capacity to perform responsibly in appropriate employment.

Section 253 (3) of the Education Act 1989 defines a degree as an award that recognises the completion of a course of advanced learning that:

a. is taught mainly by people engaged in research; and

b. emphasises general principles and basic knowledge as the basis for self-directed work and learning.

This establishes a set of requirements linked to the aim of developing intellectual independence which AIT has had to meet in having its degrees approved and accredited.

In addition to the legislative requirements for a degree, the following criteria for the approval and accreditation of degree and related programmes also apply. These were developed by the NZQA in consultation with the New Zealand Vice Chancellors’ Committee (NZVCC) in accordance with the requirements of section 253 (2) of the Act.

An approved and accredited degree must show:

1. The acceptability of the proposed course to the relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities, in terms of stated objectives, nomenclature, content and structure.

2. The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations which specify requirements for admission, recognition of prior learning, credit for previous study, course structure, assessment procedures, and the normal progression.
3. The availability of appropriate academic staffing, teaching and research facilities, and support services.

4. The adequacy of the means of ensuring that assessment procedures are both appropriate, given the stated objectives, and fair.

5. The adequacy of the provisions for monitoring course quality, reviewing course regulations and content, and determining whether courses shall continue to be offered.

These five criteria have since been further developed by the NZQA in its booklet *Quality Assurance for Degrees and Related Qualifications, July 1995* and by the NZVCC in its regulations governing the Committee for University Academic Programmes. These further developments apply to AIT and have been met by all of its accredited degrees.

The main quality assurance processes operated by the NZQA in relation to degrees are: approval and accreditation; monitoring; and the review of approval and accreditation.

The NZQA has developed criteria for accreditation which focus on the provider’s quality management systems. The first of the ten criteria requires an overall quality management system which demonstrates that the provider has assumed corporate responsibility for the oversight, maintenance and development of its academic work. The remaining criteria require demonstrable policies for programme design, development and evaluation; assessment; financial and administrative infrastructure; staff selection, appraisal and development; general regulations; student guidance and support systems; practical and work-base components; external involvements; and research.

The NZQA also has criteria which focus on the specific programme for which approval and accreditation is sought. These require the programme to have: objectives and learning outcomes; programme organisation and structure; acceptance by the relevant wider community; specific regulations; a degree title; appropriately qualified teaching staff who are engaged in research; support staff; information for students; and programme specific application of the quality management systems.

The seeking and gaining of approval and accreditation through the internal and external processes takes, on average, between two and three years from the time of inception of the programme.

A panel is established to evaluate the provider’s application. It consists of an independent chair; two university academics endorsed by the NZVCC; one senior Academic from the applying institution; one senior academic from a provider with accreditation for a degree in a similar subject area; two representatives of industry, commerce or the professions; and the Authority’s quality systems analyst.

Acting together, these legislative requirements for a degree (set out in the definition in section 254 (3) of the Education Act); the joint Gazetted
criteria of the Authority and the NZVCC (set out under section 253 (2)); and the criteria and processes of the degree guidelines: *Quality Assurance for Degrees and Related Qualifications, July 1995*, make up a comprehensive regulatory framework which providers offering degrees must meet.

AIT has already met the requirements of this regulatory framework for its 23 accredited degrees and also for its 24 graduate and postgraduate diplomas and certificates. Consequently, the assessment of AIT against the requirements of the legislation must be read in the light of this achievement. AIT also points out that none of the existing universities are required to undergo a similar process for approval and accreditation of new degrees, and many of the professors from both New Zealand and overseas universities have commented on the rigour with which AIT's degree programmes have been scrutinised. The universities' system for approval of a new degree in New Zealand involves the other universities commenting on the broad objectives of the proposal but does not necessarily involve a detailed scrutiny of its philosophy and curriculum.

1.2 AIT has over 60% of total enrolments (measured in EFTS) leading to qualifications at level 6 and above on the National Qualifications Framework, with half of its total enrolments (measured in EFTS) in degree level programmes and 5% of total degree level enrolments being at postgraduate level.

Programmes leading to qualifications at level 6 on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) are the recognised benchmark for Higher Education qualifications in the United Kingdom which has a long history of providing Higher National Diplomas in its university system. These diplomas are equivalent to qualifications at level 6 of the NQF in New Zealand.

NZQA's descriptors for level 6 qualifications describe these as qualifications which lead to certification for technological or para-professional occupations and to subsequent completion of professional certification. Graduates with such qualifications are expected to be able to carry out processes that require a command of wide-ranging highly specialised technical or scholastic skills and to be employed in highly variable non routine tasks.

AIT's range of Higher Education programmes includes level 6 qualifications together with its degree level and postgraduate qualifications. AIT's awards at degree level or higher are as follows:
Postgraduate Degrees

- Master of Arts (Art and Design)
- Master of Arts (Communication Studies)
- Master of Health Science
- Bachelor of Business with Honours

Postgraduate Diplomas

- Applied Science (International Practice)
- Applied Science (Research)
- Engineering (Research)
- Health Science

Postgraduate Certificates

- Health Science (Nursing)
- Health Science (Midwifery)

Bachelor Degrees

- Applied Science (Majors available in Biochemistry, Chemistry, Environmental Studies, Food Technology, Human Anatomy and Physiology, Microbiology)
- Arts (Chinese)
- Arts (Fashion Technology)
- Arts (Japanese)
- Arts (Social Sciences)
- Business (Majors available in Accounting, Advertising, Information Technology, International Business, Management, Marketing, Tourism)
- Communication Studies (Majors available in Journalism, Public Relations, Radio, Television, Multimedia)
- Engineering (Majors available in Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering)
- Graphic Design
- Health Science (Midwifery)
- Health Science (Nursing)
- Health Science (Occupational Therapy)
- Health Science (Physiotherapy)
- Hospitality Management
- Maori Studies (Majors available in Te Reo me Nga Tikanga, Social Services, and Maori Economic Development)
- Medical Laboratory Science
- Spatial Design
- Sport and Recreation (Majors available in Sports Science, Outdoor Education, Sport and Recreation Management)
- Visual Arts

Graduate Diplomas
• Acupuncture
• Advanced Nursing Practice
• Clinical Child Psychotherapy
• Communication and Public Relations
• Computer Publishing and Design
• Health Science (Health Management)
• Journalism
• Language Teaching to Adults
• Mental Health Nursing
• Multi Media
• Psychotherapy
• Teacher Education (Secondary)
• Teacher Education (Tertiary)
• Teaching English as a Foreign Language
• Translation (English - Chinese)
Graduate Certificates

- Research and Analysis
- Specialist Anaesthetic Nursing
- Specialist Paediatric Nursing
- Teacher Education (Career Development)

All of the above programmes have been approved and accredited, with EFTS funding approved by the Ministry of Education for all degrees.

The actual and projected EFTS profiles of AIT in 1997, 1998, and 1999 are attached in appendix I and summarised in figure 1 below. This shows that in the years 1997 - 1999, AIT’s percentage of EFTS enrolled in programmes leading to qualifications at level 6 or higher of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) has been rising at a steady rate from 60% up to a projected 68%. In 1998 half of all EFTS (i.e. over 80% of all EFTS enrolled in Higher Education) are enrolled in degree level programmes, with approximately 5% of the EFTS in degree level programmes being in postgraduate programmes. The figures for enrolment in degrees have also grown steadily over the last few years and will continue to grow in 1999 as students enrolled in new degrees and postgraduate programmes move into their final years of study.

The majority of AIT’s students enrolled in lower level programmes exit at level 5 of the NQF. These programmes are not counted as “higher education” in the guidelines, but level 5 corresponds to the first year of a degree, and many level 5 diploma graduates proceeding to degree studies do so with advanced standing. For example, AIT’s largest programme at level 5 is the New Zealand Diploma in Business in which 940 EFTS are enrolled in 1998. Students completing this diploma regularly gain entry to the second year of the B Com degree at the University of Auckland or the BBS degree at Massey University, as well as to the BBus degree at AIT.

FIGURE 1: AIT ENROLMENT PROFILE: % EFTS BY LEVELS OF STUDY, 1997 - 1999
These percentages are based on enrolments in the actual programmes concerned. They do not include enrolments in lower level programmes that in many cases are articulated or “staircased” into higher levels. AIT has not sought to survey and quantify the proportion of its students enrolled in lower level programmes who expect to progress to degree programmes, but the numbers are known to be considerable and if included would significantly raise the percentage of enrolled students intending to complete degrees.

It should be noted that many qualifications classified by AIT at level 5 contain modules at level 6, and that some of the level 6 qualifications contain level 7 modules. AIT’s Academic Regulations, however, do not classify whole qualifications at the level of the highest modules contained in them. There must be a minimum of 75 credits out of 120 credits at the level for the specified qualification. This required proportion of higher level study is equivalent to over 60% of the final year of the programme concerned, and is higher than the requirement for most university qualifications.

AIT believes that on current trends there will be a plateau of between 20% - 25% of EFTS being enrolled in lower level programmes which provide staircasing opportunities for students who do not meet the requirements for degree entry. AIT will continue to offer short courses to meet the needs of the community and the professions even though these are not always at degree or higher levels. This is consistent with AIT’s belief that it can better meet the equity and social policy goals of Government as a university providing such opportunities.

The enrolment profiles of many universities in other countries including the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, the USA, and Singapore support this view. In Australia where there is a dual system of tertiary education (the University and TAFE sectors) a number of universities include both sectors. In the state of Victoria these include the Victoria University of Technology, (VUT), The Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), and Swinburn University of Technology. At present further amalgamations are proposed, with VUT likely to amalgamate with the Western Melbourne Institute of TAFE, and Swinburn discussing amalgamation with the Outer Eastern Institute of TAFE. In Victoria, Ballarat University recently merged with a TAFE College, the Ballarat School of Mines and Industries.

AIT believes that it is totally appropriate for a university to offer technical and further education programmes at sub-degree level. This is current international practice, and occurs to a lesser extent in New Zealand universities. It is also consistent with the overall definition of a university set out in section 162(4)(b)(iii) of the Act which requires a university to promote community learning.
1.3 The postgraduate programmes are in a range of disciplines appropriate to the character of the institution.

AIT's postgraduate programmes have been developed in each of its four major Faculty groupings as follows:

**Faculty of Arts and Te Ara Poutama:**
- Master of Arts (Art and Design)
- Master of Arts (Communication Studies)

**Faculty of Commerce:**
- Bachelor of Business with Honours

**Faculty of Health Studies:**
- Master of Health Science
- Postgraduate Diploma in Health Science
- Postgraduate Certificate in Health Science (Nursing)
- Postgraduate Certificate in Health Science (Midwifery)

**Faculty of Science & Engineering:**
- Postgraduate Diploma in Applied Science (Research)
- Postgraduate Diploma in Applied Science (International Practice)
- Postgraduate Diploma in Engineering (Research)

Further postgraduate programmes (Masters degrees) are currently being developed for approval and accreditation in Social Sciences, Business, and Maori Studies. In April 1998, an NZQA panel recommended a Masters degree in Applied Science be approved and accredited for introduction in 1999. The present range of 3-year graduate diplomas in Psychotherapy, which normally require a bachelor's degree for entry, are being submitted in 1998 for approval as postgraduate diplomas. Preliminary discussions are under way to prepare for the development of Masters programmes in Applied Languages, and it is inevitable that the new engineering degree will eventually lead to further postgraduate programmes in engineering.

Application was made to NZQA in 1996 for approval and accreditation for a Doctor of Philosophy degree, but the Authority has not yet considered this application. AIT has been advised that the delay has arisen because the Authority had no mandate to approve degrees at doctoral level without agreement from the NZVCC who have been slow to provide the necessary input so that AIT's case could be considered. It should be noted, however, that a number of PhD students in both New Zealand and Australia are being supervised at present by AIT staff, and that a number of AIT staff are examiners for PhD students in other universities.
Characteristic 2

“[Universities’] research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of their teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge”

Education Act 1989 section 162(4)(a)(ii)
AIT’s research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of its teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge.

AIT has adopted the following definition of research, adapted from the Tertiary Action Group Report to the Board of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, April 1996:

"Research activities play a vital role in creating an environment in which the optimum teaching and learning processes occur, and in which staff and students are stimulated by the interplay of new ideas and the spirit of enquiry. Learning, at graduate and postgraduate levels, takes place in an environment of developing and advancing knowledge, problem solving, critical evaluation, investigation, and an awareness of the limits of enquiry and understanding.

This definition recognises that for some subjects or disciplines, a broad interpretation of what constitutes research is necessary. All research activities are conducted in accordance with recognised ethical standards and are open to peer and public scrutiny. The following kinds of research may be distinguished although they are not mutually exclusive:

a. **Basic or fundamental research:** Experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge without any particular application or use in view.

b. **Strategic research:** Work which is intended to generate new knowledge in an area which has not yet advanced sufficiently to enable specific applications to be identified.

c. **Applied research:** Work which develops or tests existing knowledge and is primarily directed towards either specific practical objectives or towards the evaluation of policies or practices. Work which involves the routine application of established techniques on routine problems is unlikely to constitute research.

d. **Scholarship:** Work which is intended to expand the boundaries of knowledge and understanding within and across disciplines by the analysis, synthesis and interpretation of ideas and information, making use of a rigorous methodology.

e. **Creative work:** The invention and generation of ideas, hypotheses, images, performances or artefacts, including design, in any field of knowledge, leading to the development of new knowledge, understanding or expertise.
Activities which may be equivalent to research if they meet one or more of the definitions (a - e) outlined above include:

f. Consultancy: Which involves the deployment of existing knowledge and the application of analytical and investigative skills to the resolution of problems presented by a client, usually in an industrial, commercial or professional context; and

g. Professional practice some of which overlaps with consultancy when conducted at an advanced level: In certain subject areas and professions the theorisation and effectiveness of professional practice are advanced by academic staff who practice and participate in it.

AIT does not regard activity mainly concerned with keeping abreast with new developments in subjects as “research”. It is assumed that all teachers need to keep abreast of new developments both in their subject areas and in methods of teaching and assessment.”

2.1 There is curriculum and pedagogical evidence that research outcomes, including those of staff, inform teaching programmes.

AIT acknowledges that teaching has traditionally been the primary or even the sole goal of many of its departments. However, the commitment of AIT to research and its relationship to teaching is identified at the highest level in the values expressed within its Charter which include “creativity, innovation, scholarship, research and excellence in teaching”. These values underpin AIT’s educational goal of “providing learning opportunities of quality and relevance which help prepare people for vocational roles”. This goal is pursued, among other things, by “providing staff with educational and development opportunities to enable them to maintain the highest standards of teaching, research, scholarship and skill” and by “promoting research, particularly by those engaged in degree programmes” (Quality Management Systems in respect of Degrees and Related Qualifications, July, 1997, AIT).

AIT’s 1996 and 1997 Research Reports (appendices 3 and 4) list numerous examples of research activities which have a clear connection to the programmes offered. These activities both inform the curriculum and challenge pedagogical practice.

They include research into teaching practice, research related to professional practice in New Zealand, research into social and economic policy issues surrounding the programmes taught, research into student assessment processes, physiological and health practice research which is related to health science programmes, research into the application of new technologies and energy usage, and relevant research into aspects of youth development.
Specific examples include the following:

The research of Hocking, Wright-St Clair, and Hancock into home vs hospital rehabilitation has been developed to provide assessment instruments for use by students in Occupational Therapy; Whiteford’s research into the development of cultural competence has been included in the cultural immersion workshops for first and second year Health Science students; Costain’s research into data modelling is incorporated into systems analysis and design courses; Sharp’s research into fuzzy logic concepts is incorporated into the intelligent business systems paper of the BBus degree; Adamson’s work in hypermedia and multimedia concepts is incorporated into the intelligent business systems paper of the BBus degree; Law’s research into migrants’ transition into New Zealand has been used in the design of the curriculum in the Faculty of Science and Engineering; Wright’s work in operations management has been incorporated into Lotus notes for teaching on the Henley MBA; the research of Harbidge, Bygrave, McConchie and Myers into integrated curriculum innovation was captured in the development of integrated studies for the BBus degree; Le Fevre’s research into quality assurance has been incorporated into applied management; four books written by AIT staff are used as texts in economics and banking; the assessment programme used in commercial law is based on research by Wilson; the brand management module of the BBus degree is based on research by Glynn and Pryor; books by Waiters, Inch, and by Gerbic and Lawrence are widely used as texts in marketing, advertising, and commercial law; and Russell’s field research studies sponsored by Air New Zealand, QUANTAS, and United Airlines have been incorporated in the Tourism curriculum; Peart has written the major New Zealand textbook on Public Relations; and Hope has co-authored Critical Theory. Post Structuralism and Social Context, used by most New Zealand universities in the humanities and social sciences.

This list is by no means exhaustive. There are numerous other examples that can be cited where the research of AIT staff has been incorporated in the curriculum.

As the foreword to the 1996 Research Report (p.6) says, “Our research, for the main part, makes no claim to be purely theoretical, for we believe that research applied to real problems requiring solution is highly appropriate to an Institution offering degrees and other programmes designed to meet the needs of specific professions and industries”.

2.2 AIT’s policies and practices promote the interdependence of teaching and research.

The interdependence of teaching and research is stressed more explicitly in AIT’s Policy and Strategy for Research, 1997. This states (section 2.2) that a primary intention of the Institute is to “encourage and foster research to support the development of curricula and the provision of high quality teaching .....”, that “The Institute requires appropriate levels of
research in major programme areas”, and that “Research is an essential and integral part of academic staff and student learning”.

The Policy goes on to state (section 2.5) that this intention is to be achieved through “increasing the expertise of teaching staff”, through “demonstrating to the public that the work of staff is subject to external critical appraisal” and “determining new subjects and topics for inclusion in the curriculum”. The Policy also includes the objective of researching teaching methods and learning support, in order to enhance the Institute’s reputation as a learning institution. The success of this policy is demonstrated by the numerous examples, cited in 2.1 above.

AIT has a target of at least 70% of research projects developed being able to directly benefit the teaching programme, e.g. by being applied to teaching innovation, adding data or information to the body of knowledge, development of new technology, and preparation of text books. As stated in section 2.1 of this submission, there are numerous examples of such research reported in the 1996 and 1997 Research Reports. The Institute is currently considering the inclusion of the benefits to teaching as a measure of the quality of research outputs as part of the ongoing development of AIT’s Quality Management System.

2.3 Human resource policies and practices, including staff promotion, give appropriate recognition to both research and teaching, and their interdependence at AIT.

Staff policies and practices reflect the emphasis that is placed on the teaching and research priorities.

The staff recruitment policy is to appoint staff with the right mix of academic and professional qualifications. Where this includes the need for staff to supervise or engage in postgraduate research, applicants with PhDs and research backgrounds are sought. In recent years senior staff appointments have increasingly included experienced academics from other universities, as have appointments to teaching positions in degree programmes. The two most recently appointed Deans previously held the position of Professor and Head of School of Social Sciences at Monash University, and Dean of Science at the University of Auckland respectively. The most recently appointed Heads of Department (Languages and Social Sciences) were professors in universities in Australia and Canada respectively. The staff attrition rate which has historically run at 6 - 8% per annum aids this policy by enabling AIT to continuously improve the number of senior staff with previous senior experience in other universities.

Staff employment conditions, including staff development and promotion, support the achievement of AIT’s teaching and research objectives. A variety of leave opportunities are available to academic staff, including professional development leave of 10 days a year, lecturer’s discretionary leave of 4 weeks a year, special study/development leave available on
application, and an employment option where 1 year in 5 can be taken as leave for staff to follow their own research interests.

Monitoring and appraisal procedures require all new staff to have their performance appraised three monthly at least during the first nine months of employment. This probation period may last for up to two years for lecturing staff.

Staff development policies and practices include opportunities for staff exchange to other institutions and secondment into the workplace, initial teacher training for new staff, support for obtaining advanced teaching and other postgraduate qualifications, a programme of exposure to New Zealand and international experts in teaching and learning practices, support of classroom teaching practices, support for programme evaluation and assessment systems, and a development programme for postgraduate supervisors. Collective and individual employment contracts at the Institute also make specific provision for staff development.

These activities are funded from 1.25% of the annual staff salary budget. Faculties also fund development activities from discretionary accounts in their own budgets. Professional development activity is supported by specific staff in the Faculties, and in the Institute’s Centre for Staff and Educational Development.

This Centre has an annual budget of approximately $300,000 from which it supports a wide range of in-service training aimed at teaching enhancement, research development, training in research supervision, management development, and assistance to Faculties in matters relating to quality assurance processes.

In addition the Centre for Professional Education offers formal programmes leading to the award of a Graduate Diploma in Teacher Education (Tertiary). Enrolment in the early stages of this programme is mandatory for new teaching staff, thereby equipping them with skills in teaching, assessment, programme development and evaluation, and research.

The criteria for academic promotions explicitly recognise performance in teaching. But teaching competence alone is not considered sufficient for promotion, the demonstration of dual or multiple competencies is required. Depending on the promotion sought, research, and professional leadership are also included as promotion criteria. The Academic Staff Promotions policy extensively defines the promotion criteria.

In 1997, the Institute developed a set of rigorous criteria for professorial appointments to key positions involving research and educational leadership. Provision has been made for staff in academic leadership positions who meet the qualifications and research requirements to apply for these positions, and for Faculties to appoint up to 1% of their teaching staff at professorial level, subject to the appointee meeting the criteria.
At the time of writing this case, AIT is in the process of making a professorial appointment as Director of Research.

The Academic Promotions Policy and Professorial Appointments Policy documents set out further details relating to the interdependence of research and teaching at AIT.

2.4 AIT provides access to physical resources, information resources and services, which are adequate to support research and teaching.

AIT has allocated over $1 million per annum to strengthen its existing capital purchases (books, journals, and other learning materials) over the last five years.

In 1997 a major upgrade of the Library and Information Technology systems was commenced. A DEC Alpha box has been installed running UNIX and the URiCA 6.0 library application software. This allows all AIT Library users to benefit from the Windows environment and provides internet access facilities. This is the first such installation in a New Zealand Polytechnic. The in-house Library computer system is housed in the Wellesley Library and provides a network service to the Akoranga Library via the intranet. The Library has a computer research laboratory with 20 new PCs for use by students, staff, and researchers to provide ready access to information and for facilitating teaching and learning in an electronic era.

Users of the Library system can perform searches to the catalogue, electronic journals, databases, and CD-ROMs via the Library homepage. The Library’s homepage has been the most visited site each month since its inception. Information can also be accessed remotely from the desktop and directly from the student computer laboratories throughout the Institute. Both AIT and the Library use Netscape as the internet browser. The browser also drives the URiCA Spydus application for the online public access catalogue.

The provision of remote library access or virtual library technology allows both students and staff to gain information without physically visiting the Library. This also provides a major tool for researchers who can access materials not held in the AIT Library. Planning is under way for a new student learning centre where information and electronic facilities will be integrated to provide library users equal access to information resources to support their learning and intellectual needs regardless of location, learning style, or economic circumstances.

The Library’s collection development policy has been reviewed for the collection to support research and teaching. A conspectus of the Library based on the Wothwest Collection Assessment has been adopted. This will assist with the ongoing evaluation of the Library collection.
Library staff collaborate with the faculties to provide instruction, training and assistance in developing information literacy skills as an essential part of life-long learning and scholarship.

Concurrently the Institute is upgrading its networks and cabling existing buildings to enable access to information resources and services by staff and students from all parts of the Institute.

In 1998, there are 20,000 student computer user accounts, and 1200 staff accounts. All computer users have access to AIT email.

There are 1980 PCs and Macs, and 45 servers connected to the network. There are 4 open access computer labs with 30 computers in each, and there are between 40 and 50 classrooms for computers around the Institute with an average of 20 computers in each. The open access laboratories are open 7 days a week during semester times for up to 15 hours per day. A microwave link is used to transfer data and for the telephone service between the Wellesley and Akoranga campuses.

Currently the Institute is upgrading its network to ATM (Asynchronous Transfer Mode) technology. AIT was the first tertiary institution in New Zealand to have chosen this leading-edge technology and since installing it, hospitals and other educational organisations in New Zealand have followed suit.

The network backbone is fibre optic cables between buildings and category 3 or 5 structured cabling within buildings.

AIT is an Internet service provider in its own right. This is similar to the service provided at universities in New Zealand and by commercial providers.

In 1998 there are approximately 8100 students and 900 staff with full internet access. There is Internet email for all postgraduate students and their supervising staff. Remote access to the Internet via AIT is also available with 150 users connected in 1997. These numbers will increase significantly later in 1998 when the network upgrading is completed.

Over the last year there has been growth in Internet publishing with departments and staff creating and maintaining their own homepages. AIT corporate web pages are in the process of being redesigned for 1998.

The majority of Internet traffic in New Zealand passes through the New Zealand Internet Exchange web cache run by the University of Waikato and in June 1997, 10.3% of all the traffic from New Zealand originated from AIT.

AIT recently established a video conference centre and equipped it with the latest technology. Staff can link up with other video conferencing centres anywhere in New Zealand and the rest of the world for face-to-
face meetings. This enables staff and students to discuss issues with experts off-site, and to meet others researching in their discipline areas.

AIT has an educational technology centre, and an international multimedia centre, equipped with leading-edge technology. Technical assistance is available to staff for the development of teaching and learning resources such as interactive CD ROMs and Internet pages. Further research and development is underway to utilise the www for more courses at AIT.

The multimedia centre provides resources, advice, and assistance to staff and students in the design and development of multimedia applications. It is equipped to enable the capture of still images, audio, and video. These resources are used by undergraduate and postgraduate students in the Faculties of Arts and Commerce. Many students produce their own CD ROMs for their coursework requirements.

More recently the work of the multimedia centre has expanded to promote and develop on-line learning and distance education in the Institute, and building an infrastructure for this. This has led to the development of courses which use standard Internet technology (e.g. HTML/CGI) as well as the sophisticated learning environment provided by Lotus Learning Space.

AIT has a commitment to on-line learning which is demonstrated by:

- making a substantial investment in a high-speed state-of-the-art network based on ATM technology
- developing a cost effective Internet service for staff and students
- making many of its Library catalogues available on-line via the web
- investing in a state-of-the-art video conference centre
- funding the development of the multimedia and educational technology centres
- providing internal grants of $100,000 annually for staff to develop innovative uses of technology for teaching
- joining the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) to gain exposure to the latest developments in the USA
- developing hardware and software infrastructures to support the development of asynchronous learning programmes which are leading to the development of on-line learning materials on CD and for distance education students who study via the Web.

In addition to the AIT library, students also have access to the adjacent Auckland Public Library, and the University of Auckland Library.
Discussions have commenced recently with the latter to initiate a formal agreement for borrowing rights for AIT postgraduate students.

2.5 Corporate management plans and development strategies at every level of AIT encourage leadership and strategic planning for learning and research effectiveness, including the ability to identify areas of excellence.

There is clear evidence in AIT’s policies and practices of sustained development strategies for learning effectiveness.

To help manage the development of its research culture, AIT has developed a generic strategy for planning and management of its research activity and outputs (Research Policy and Objectives at AIT, revised September 1997). This policy was developed after widespread internal consultation and agreement to specific objectives for AIT to establish itself as a university with national standing for applied research in collaboration with industry, commerce, government, other education sectors, and the wider community as appropriate.

Recommending the broad policies and strategies for research is the responsibility of the Research Committee of the Academic Board. Within these policies adopted by the Academic Board, leadership for the promotion and development of research has largely been devolved to the Faculties.

Each Faculty has a Research Committee which is chaired either by the Dean or by a Research Coordinator. The Research Committees are responsible to their respective Faculty Boards for the further development of a research culture within the Faculty according to AIT’s research management plan. The Deans and Coordinators oversee this function as well as supporting and collating research activities and outputs. The coordinators are typically allocated between 50% and 100% of their time for this function.

The research management plan requires each Faculty to determine its focus for: research; its postgraduate profile; links between its research and teaching, the development of research indicators, monitoring and evaluation of research outputs; programmes for visiting researchers; the development of research teams within and across Faculties; the development of collaborative partners and funding outside the Institute; and the development of communication mechanisms to inform staff and students, both within and across the Faculties, of research activity and outputs. Each element of the generic strategy requires Faculties to identify targets relating to that element.

In order to assist the coordination of research reporting, in 1997 the Institute agreed to a set of protocols for research records using the Endnote software package which enables a more accurate audit of research activity against the targets that have been set.
These structures enable research activity to be monitored across the Institute. Each Faculty, in developing its postgraduate programmes, has developed research management plans, and Research Committees are included in the quality management systems.

In 1998 a sum of $800 000 over two years was committed to the establishment of key research centres in each of the Faculties. These centres have been established with the specific objectives of producing useful research outcomes of national or international significance within two years, and in so doing, to become self-supporting through the attraction of external funding from the related industries.

In establishing these centres, priority was given to proposals that would establish links between research and current or projected teaching programmes, attract international experts or post-doctoral researchers, report their findings in internationally refereed forums, and offer good potential for interdisciplinary or inter-institutional collaborative research.

In the Faculty of Arts and Te Ara Poutama, a Maori and Cultural Tourism and Hospitality Services research centre has been established to draw on the capabilities of 11 staff in 6 different schools within the Faculty, focussing on domestic and international partnerships for indigenous tourism, linking both to the hospitality industry and the area of art and design.

In the Commerce Faculty, the Business Performance Research and Development Centre is currently seeking to appoint a professorial fellow to coordinate specific discipline research into business performance and development. Approximately 20 staff from the Faculty are expected to engage in research under the umbrella of this centre, enabling it to establish a high public profile.

In the Faculty of Health Studies two research centres have been established.

The Neuromuscular Research Centre is engaged in research into the control of motion in individuals who have physical impairments. The focus is on rehabilitation and the control of movement, especially for those with neurological problems, back problems, and problems related to changes with age. The centre combines the disciplines of biomechanics and neurophysiology and is collaborating with the Universities of Auckland, Montana, and Waikato.

The Evidence Based Nursing Research Centre is engaged in research related to the increasing demand for health services and the rising costs of these. It is being conducted in conjunction with Auckland Health Care and is focussed on a systematic review of the literature surrounding best practice and seeking to develop international guidelines for improved health care practice. The Centre is internationally linked in this research to six Australian Centres and one in Hong Kong.
In the Faculty of Science and Engineering there are three research centres.

The Diagnostics and Control Research Centre is developing new technologies which are computer assisted to investigate fault diagnostic techniques aimed at diagnosing existing problems or predicting future problems in machines, structures, and systems.

The Glycoscience Research Centre (established in 1996) is focusing on the connection of cell-bound glycolipids with the mucins of the gastrointestinal tract and on a xenotransplantation strategy which draws together the AIT, the University of Goteborg, and other European research centres. The research involves the isolation of chemical characteristics of glycolipids from the stomach and various sections of the human intestine, and the phenotyping and genotyping of these glycolipids.

The Centre for Mathematics, Engineering, Science and Technology Educational Research is aimed at exploring a unique area of expertise in tertiary education - the development of teaching excellence in the above disciplines which is aimed at the transforming of poorly performed students exiting the secondary system into graduates with high quality degrees. This Centre operates with the support of the University of Waikato and the University of Toronto. A number of AIT staff are engaged in problem-solving applications to teaching through this centre.

2.6 **Teaching at AIT is undertaken by staff, most of whom are actively engaged in research.**

Analysis of the 1996 Research Report (Appendix 2) shows that there were 468 research outputs. The number of individual staff recording one or more research outputs (either collaboratively or singly) was 307.

In 1997 the Research Report (Appendix 3), which was subjected to a more rigorous internal audit, shows that the number of research outputs had risen by 13% to 530. More importantly, the quality of the research reported in 1997 was higher than that of 1996 with the number of refereed journal articles increasing by 33% to 61, and the number of commissioned research reports rising by over 100% from 19 to 46, while the numbers of research outputs in the categories of conference presentations, theses, and multimedia presentations remained relatively constant.

The research registers held in the Faculties indicate that over 500 staff members are actively engaged in research, some of these being staff who primarily teach at lower levels or whose work does not include timetabled teaching.

In March 1998, the number of permanent academic staff employed by AIT was 532. Of these, 460 were full time with the remainder being employed on a permanent part time basis.
The 307 individual staff reporting research outputs in 1996, and 306 individual staff recording research outputs in 1997, show that there has been a consistent record of completed research activity being reported by approximately 60% of permanent academic staff over recent years.

These figures clearly reflect an environment in which most teaching staff are engaged in research.

These data reflect an active research culture within the Institute and that the culture is not linked only to the levels at which academic staff are teaching. AIT encourages research as an academic activity to inform the teaching programmes and the pedagogical processes.

2.7 There is regular and wide reporting of AIT's research activity.

The 1996 and 1997 Research Reports show that there is a wide range of research reporting. Of the 468 research outputs recorded in 1996, 46 were in refereed journals, 49 in "other" publications (which included books, chapters of books, monographs, and non-refereed journals), 181 conference presentations, 19 theses, 87 multimedia presentations, 19 technical reports related to commissioned research, and 25 "other" outputs (which included newspaper articles, broadcasts, and the like). Of the 530 research outputs recorded in 1997, 61 were in refereed journals, 43 in "other" publications, 195 conference presentations, 18 theses, 99 multimedia presentations, and 68 "other" outputs.

Section 3.7 below further elaborates on the type and range of research reporting that has taken place, and the wide range of forums in which this has occurred.

Internally, each Faculty holds its own research seminars at which staff present their research to their peers. These seminars commonly include academics invited from other universities in New Zealand or overseas.

The Institute also holds and promotes a research enhancement week each year to encourage and promote research, and to enhance research methodology. During this week a wide range of speakers and researchers present their work for the scrutiny of others.

Each Dean is required to produce an annual plan for research within the Faculty and to report twice annually to the President, General Manager, and Vice President on progress toward meeting that plan.

2.8 AIT's research outcomes are reported and subject to peer or other appropriate review.

As stated in section 2.6 above, AIT publishes annually a research report that is widely circulated.
These annual research reports indicate where the research was reported including details of journal publications, the publishers of books, and the dates and locations of conference and multimedia presentations.

The only research that is not subject to peer review is that which is performed for organisations where the outcomes and findings have commercial value and where confidentiality has been imposed by the commissioning agent. This research is not published in the Institute’s Research Reports.

2.9 **Collaborative and multidisciplinary research at AIT effectively utilises resources and sustains selective centres of excellence.**

Collaborative and multidisciplinary approaches to research are prominent in AIT’s research objectives, priorities and practices. Specifically, the research management plan for each Faculty has set the target of establishing at least one new collaborative activity each year with staff in other Faculties or in other universities. The plan also requires each Faculty to commence at least one major research project with an outside organisation, particularly from industry, the professions or the wider community.

Several collaborative projects exist between Departments in the Health Studies Faculty and Medical Departments at the Universities of Auckland, Otago, Harvard, and other international universities. The Commerce Faculty is currently engaged in a number of collaborative research projects with a consortium of European universities, and is engaged in a joint research project with the Victoria University of Wellington in Tourism. Comparative research with the University of West Virginia is being conducted in entrepreneurship.

A collaborative research project with the University of Central England (funded for 3 years by the British Council) is investigating the impact of quality monitoring on student learning. Collaborative research activity between staff within and to a lesser extent across Faculties is evident in the conference papers and publications prepared by multiple authors as recorded in the 1996 and 1997 Research Reports.

Examples of collaborative research with other organisations are to be found in the Research Reports from all Faculties, and include work in such diverse areas as ESOL, critical theory, foreign investment, sports medicine, anatomy, mental health, adolescent behaviour, glycoscience, student achievement, and course design.

As described in section 2.5, the Institute has identified some selected centres of research excellence and has provided targeted funding to enable them to become established and to link with allied centres in other universities, both nationally and internationally. The Institute has required specific plans from these centres to enable them to be sustained within two
years through external research funding so that the "seeding funding" can later be applied to other areas.

2.10 Individual, team and collaborative student research projects with staff supervision and, where appropriate, in collaboration with staff, are a feature of AIT.

Student research at undergraduate level is a feature of all degree and graduate diploma programmes and is commonly performed in a team environment as well as by individuals. Most undergraduate degrees include a module in research methodology which includes a research project.

At postgraduate level, research is more commonly performed by individuals pursuing separate interests, and with the recent growth in postgraduate degrees, the quantum of student research is increasing rapidly. The Faculties themselves are increasingly identifying areas for student research which link to the research interests of the staff and the available resources of the Faculty. This is inevitably leading to greater levels of collaborative research involving both staff and students.

AIT’s postgraduate diplomas are designed for graduates in the professions, and the research is strongly oriented towards investigations into professional practice that involves collaboration in the workplace.

Examples in 1997 included a study of suicide in the North Health region, a determination of Pholcodine in a specific type of cough mixture, studies into dental health in the critically ill, a comparative study of Lysteria detection methods, a study of olive oil authenticity, a microwave digestion method for the determination of metals in Shellfish, a carotenoid pigment-astaxanthin analysis, investigations into personal air-conditioning systems, a groupware project on the use of Lotus notes as a cross institutional generic collaborative support environment, research into human computer interaction, investigation into an Auckland healthcare handheld physiotherapy system, computer simulations in marketing, software development for eight different external organisations, local area network evaluation for a range of external clients, research into eco-tourism for the Waitakere City, an investigation into the impact of privatisation on a conservation estate, a study of the impact and behaviour of tourists in Fiji, a study in geriatric depression, investigation into attitudes towards participating in melanoma detection, a study into the benefits of exercise in the elderly, disability questionnaires in the management of back pain, the effects of light exercise on delayed muscle soreness, the influence of gender and dominance on active range of motion of lower limbs, process evaluation of peer sexuality programmes, parenting in the 1990s, and a longitudinal study of Pacific Islands families: the first two years of life.

The above list is not exhaustive. There are numerous other examples available to support AIT’s contention that there is widespread evidence of individual and team student research projects that are being undertaken either with staff supervision or in collaboration with staff.
"[Universities] meet international standards of research and teaching"

Education Act 1989 section 162(4)(a)(iii)
3 AIT meets international standards of research and teaching.

3.1 AIT has a research culture committed to producing demonstrable research outcomes.

The previous section of this submission has outlined the policies and strategies by which AIT has assured the establishment of a research culture. The existence of this culture is confirmed not only by the scope of the research outcomes reported in the 1996 and 1997 Research Reports, but also by the diversity of programmes in which they arose. These are not confined to the degree and higher level programmes. Many of the research activities have taken place in the environment of sub-degree programmes including prison education and refugee education where the teaching is, in large part, conducted at levels of basic literacy and numeracy, but where the knowledge gained from research is an essential prerequisite to offering effective programmes.

The pervasiveness of a research culture throughout AIT has (in the last two years particularly) occurred in parallel with a significant growth in postgraduate and research-based programmes including postgraduate diploma programmes designed specifically to enhance the research capabilities of students. Examples of the latter include the Postgraduate Diplomas in Engineering (Research), Applied Science (International Practice), and Applied Science (Research). Students enrolled in postgraduate programmes are mostly graduates of other New Zealand universities.

The 1996 and 1997 Research Reports also reflect a research culture which is oriented towards applied research, producing outcomes which are not only demonstrable, but which also provide useful new knowledge for the teaching programmes, student learning, and the industries and professions for which the students are being educated.

With the current strong growth in postgraduate enrolments (expected to reach 9% of degree enrolments in 1999) the embedding of a research culture in AIT will be further consolidated in the future.

In 1997, the Academic Board adopted a policy for the establishment of professorial positions to further enhance the research capabilities of the Institute. This policy will see the appointment of approximately 1% of the academic staff as professors with a further 1.5% at associate professorial level. Heads of Department and Deans with the requisite qualifications, research, and leadership records can also be appointed at professorial or associate professorial level.
AIT has a teaching and learning culture committed to producing competent and effective graduates.

In 1996 the Institute prepared a "Learning and Teaching Development Plan", with priorities and actions identified for 1997 and 1998. This plan is currently being revised for 1999-2000, through a process of internal consultation.

The plan focuses on goals and objectives that will facilitate AIT graduates to be effective and competent in a changing world.

The current goals and objectives are:

**GOALS**

To achieve excellence in learning and teaching and produce graduates with the knowledge, attitudes, capability and skills to enable them to participate effectively in the global economy. Graduates will be confident, skilled learners with power in and over an unpredictable future. This goal will be achieved by scholarly personal and professional development of staff and students.

**OBJECTIVES**

The learning and teaching goal translates into six objectives which form the basis for planning and evaluating the Institute’s learning and teaching processes:

- To produce graduates who have professional capabilities and competencies;

- To foster in students deep, life-long and critically reflective learning, and the ability to cope with continuous change;

- To provide an environment where students from all cultural and social backgrounds can succeed;

- To promote the development of flexible learning opportunities and practices to meet varying student needs;

- To promote, recognise and reward excellence in teaching and learning;

- To promote quality enhancement in operational and educational activities throughout the Institute.

As part of the plan benchmarks were established to assist the Institute to evaluate achievement towards the six objectives, and three strategic enablers were specified:
• The development and maintenance of appropriate policies, structures, budgets, management and administrative practices, physical environment, resources and services;

• The development and implementation of curricula consistent with the learning and teaching plan;

• The development and maintenance of processes for monitoring and reflecting on activities and performance in order to continually improve learning and teaching.

The benchmarks against which these objectives can be measured are as follows:

**TO PRODUCE GRADUATES WHO HAVE PERSONAL CAPABILITIES AND COMPETENCIES**

The benchmarks relate to each graduate's capacity to be:

• Adaptable - rapid, flexible learners, creative and innovative employees who are team players and adaptive to changing environments;

• Analytical thinkers - able to think logically, conceptualise quickly, deal with unfamiliar information and complex issues;

• Critical thinkers - able to think laterally to synthesise information, to be self-critical and reflective, and to engage in critical dialectical thinking;

• Capable, professional communicators - with effective interpersonal skills, written and oral communication skills, up-to-date technological skills and international language skills;

• Committed, reliable and co-operative - responsible for own life-long learning and ethical behaviour;

• Equipped with vocationally relevant knowledge and technical skills and competence.

**TO FOSTER IN STUDENTS DEEP, LIFE-LONG AND CRITICALLY REFLECTIVE LEARNING AND THE ABILITY TO COPE WITH CONTINUOUS CHANGE**

The benchmarks relate to each student's capacity and perception of their capability to:

• Discover, develop and apply their own strengths and capabilities;

• Understand their own learning styles and study needs;

• Set goals for their own learning;
- Work independently towards the achievement of learning goals;
- Share responsibility for monitoring and evaluating their own learning;
- Become skilled in accessing and using a variety of knowledge sources and information systems;
- Value and prepare themselves for life-long learning.

**TO PROVIDE AN ENVIRONMENT WHERE STUDENTS FROM ALL CULTURAL AND SOCIAL BACKGROUNDS CAN SUCCEED**

The benchmarks relate to measures of equity and access as specified in the Institute’s Statement of Objectives.

**TO PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF FLEXIBLE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES AND PRACTICES**

The benchmarks relate to measures based on programmes which:

- Provide flexibility and elective study options;
- Are multi-disciplinary;
- Integrate theory and practice;
- Take account of different cultures;
- Take account of different learning styles;
- Allow students to design their own programmes;
- Facilitate credit transfer and recognition of prior learning;
- Have different entry and exit points;
- Provide for innovative teaching and a range of technologies.

**TO PROMOTE, RECOGNISE AND REWARD EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING**

The benchmarks relate to measures based on:

- Staff perceptions of the importance placed on learning, teaching, and teaching innovations in the Institute’s planning, operations and review processes;
- Evidence in the Institute’s recognition and reward systems;
- Staff perceptions of the value the Institute places on learning and teaching relevant to other activities;

- Evidence of best practice in curriculum, learning and teaching, on and off campus programme delivery.

**TO PROMOTE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT IN OPERATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES THROUGHOUT THE INSTITUTE**

The benchmarks relate to measures based on:

- Staff and student perception that quality monitoring focuses on quality enhancement;

- Staff and student perceptions of the AIT environment and learning experiences;

- The extent to which staff adopt reflective practice and constantly seek to improve their teaching/postgraduate student supervision;

- Staff adopting collegial approaches to work;

- Staff participation in developmental and monitoring activities.

**EVIDENCE**

The plan is translated into action or is evident in a number of ways:

- Programme approval criteria reflect the objectives of the plan as described in the *1998 Academic Policies and Procedures Manual*;

- External “industry” representation is included on programme approval panels;

- Annual programme reporting from the programme team requires a reflective report which details intentions for ongoing improvement and enhancement;

- Institute academic regulations allow for credit transfer and recognition of prior learning, together with different entry and exit points as set out in the *AIT 1998 Calendar*;

- Co-operative education or “internship” components are included in all undergraduate degree programmes;

- Promotion of lecturing staff requires that teaching excellence is demonstrated, with criteria for teaching excellence based on learning facilitation;
- Two sources are available to support and/or reward innovative teaching practices: the Rewarding Innovative Teaching Grant and the Educational Technology Fund. Both funds are available on a contestable basis;

- A centralised system (Student Evaluation of Modules, SEM) has been established, providing analysis of feedback from students on modules or programme components;

- Annual student feedback on the total experience of learning undertaken at an institutional level (the Student Satisfaction Report) is fed directly into management action plans;

- Biennial staff feedback on their perceptions of the AIT environment undertaken at an institutional level (staff satisfaction), is fed directly into management action plans;

- Biennial survey of perceptions of employers of AIT graduates, is fed directly into management action plans (introduced in 1998);

- Graduate destination and programme satisfaction survey undertaken at an Institute level 6 months after graduation is used as an indicator of programmes achieving vocational outcomes;

- Programme Advisory Committees have responsibility to advise on the relevance of programmes for “industry” and advise on programme outcomes. These are established for every programme.

- Faculty developmental reviews and academic audits, of which the first (Faculty of Arts) has just been completed by a panel including members of the NZVCC Academic Audit panels.

The documentation in which AIT’s teaching and learning culture is set out includes:

- 1998 Academic Calendar
- Student Satisfaction Survey Reports
- Staff Satisfaction Survey Reports
- Graduate Destination Survey Reports
- 1998 Project Plan for Employer Survey
- Academic Staff Promotions Policy
- Policy for the Induction of New Staff
- Criteria for Innovative Teaching Grants
- Criteria for Educational Technology Grants
3.3 External grants and institutional funds are committed to support research at AIT.

The nature of the research activity typically undertaken at AIT, and its current non-university status, restricts its ability to gain access to the larger publicly resourced funds which are available to research organisations. To date attracting external funding to the Institute has largely been confined to the Health Studies and Science and Engineering Faculties. The reclassification of AIT as a university is expected to have a major influence on the likelihood of research funding being obtained.

The listing of individual research grants in the 1995 Annual Report showed that $97,500 was received from external sources. Of the external funding, $49,000 was for collaborative work with partners outside AIT. Three grants were obtained from the New Zealand Health Research Council by the Science and Engineering Faculty. The Faculty of Health Studies received $38,300 from six different external sources.

In the 1996 Annual Report, external funding received for research rose to $534,706, an increase of over 500%, albeit from a small base. The Health Studies Faculty attracted approximately $400,000 of funding from external sources in 1996. Of this total, $70,000 was part of a $198,000 grant for a 3 year period and $50,000 was the year’s proportion of a $100,000 grant spread over 1996 and 1997.

One staff member in the Faculty of Health Studies in 1995 was a partner to two research projects which gained US National Institutes’ grants of $US2.2 million and $US1.9 million respectively. AIT has made an application to the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology for a major research grant worth $1.3 million for a longitudinal multidisciplinary study into child health and development with the involvement of international university partners. The Foundation reviewers have shown interest in the application and additional funding is being sought from the Health Research Council and other sources.

The Dean of Health Studies, in a consortium with colleagues in Government Departments and private research companies in New Zealand, Sweden, and the United States, has recently obtained research grants totalling $1.5 million to undertake nationwide research in New Zealand and Sweden into gambling.

In 1997 the Glycoscience Research Centre in the Faculty of Science and Engineering was an associate with the University of Goteborg in receiving a European Union grant of US$1.3 million for collaborative research. The principal researcher, Dr Steven Henry, has recently won the prestigious Jean Julliard prize awarded by the International Society of Blood Transfusion for his work in Polynesian enzyme pathways.

The Institute is focusing its attention more firmly on external funding. In its research objectives AIT seeks to increase the Institute’s interaction with government, industry and other agencies to attract new funds and
resources for research with a view to broadening the existing range of research opportunities in which staff may participate. At Faculty level, the Science and Engineering Faculty is adopting a strategy of subcontracting work from larger applicants to improve its access to funding grants which it does not have the capacity to obtain at present. The Faculty has research currently supported by the New Zealand Health Research Council and it has applications with the Marsden Fund. In April 1998 it received funding of $100,000 over 18 months from Technology New Zealand for a research consultancy with an industry partner.

In 1997, the Faculty of Science and Engineering established a joint venture with the University of Waikato to offer a postgraduate science and technology education qualification over the next two years, with AIT taking full responsibility for the programme after that time.

AIT has established internal contestable funds of $350,000 for research and innovative teaching on an annual basis since 1994. The contestable research funds are commonly targeted towards applicants seeking to undertake pilot studies for applications for external funding.

Budget provision has been made over the two years 1998 - 1999 for $800,000 to assist in the establishment of a key research centre in each of the four Faculties. The detail of this has been set out in section 2.5 of this case. These centres are being developed to assist the Institute to focus on research which will be of national significance, and to attract researchers with a proven record in the field. Among the performance objectives for these centres is the acquisition of external funding for their ongoing support after two years.

While consultancy and professional practice provide the context for a significant amount of research that is carried out by AIT staff, the funding of these activities is not recorded by AIT as research funding.

3.4 AIT has a suitable number of qualified staff with postgraduate qualifications, and high professional standing in the community and with their peers, and,
3.5 AIT has an active programme of staff development to enhance the qualifications of its staff.

At present most of the Institute’s Faculties have between 30% and 40% of their staff who teach at Levels 6 and above qualified with a Masters degree containing a research component. Across AIT a further 7% of staff possess a Doctoral degree. 22% of the staff in the Science and Engineering Faculty have Doctorates, as do 7% of staff in each of the Arts and Health Studies Faculties. In the Commerce Faculty, 57% of the 80 staff teaching the BBus degree have a Masters degree or higher, with 17 of these currently enrolled in Doctoral programmes, and a further 12 enrolled in Masters.

Current employment practice is to seek new staff with Doctoral qualifications and experience of postgraduate supervision when filling vacant positions, particularly where educational leadership is sought. While the Institute has been fortunate to secure the services of some very talented staff from other universities to vacant HOD positions in the last year or two, the current lack of university status is a serious handicap in attracting staff at this level. Concurrently, a comprehensive plan for upgrading staff qualifications is being implemented.

The plan for upgrading staff qualifications indicates that the numbers of staff gaining Masters or PhD qualifications will continue to rise steadily across the Institution. On the basis of the planned upgrading of qualifications of existing staff, 35% of staff will have attained a Masters degree as their highest qualification and 17% will have a PhD by 1999. The growth of higher qualifications among staff is expected to be relatively constant over the next few years. The enhancement of staff qualifications is not limited to Masters and PhDs. Significant numbers are also seeking postgraduate diplomas. The staff development policies and an extensive programme of development activity are funded from 1.25% of the salary budget. This and the commitment of staff seeking to improve their qualifications provide strong evidence of a successful developmental strategy.

With the exception of the Health Studies Faculty, the proportion of staff with Masters or PhD qualifications is greater than the proportion of student EFTS enrolled in Bachelor programmes. AIT’s projections through to 1999 indicate that this ratio will improve across all faculties and continue to be ahead of the growth of Bachelor level enrolments. Ratios in the Health Studies Faculty are also expected to improve rapidly with over 30 staff currently enrolled in PhD or Masters programmes.

AIT’s practice is that staff involved in postgraduate supervision hold Masters or PhD degrees. Other requirements are that these staff have research experience and experience in research project supervision. Attendance at a training seminar or workshop for potential supervisors is required. Supervisors are approved by the Postgraduate Committee of the Academic Board.
The staff development programme is not limited to the upgrading of staff qualifications. There is a comprehensive series of policies and strategies to improve the postgraduate supervisory capacity of staff, as well as a plan to increase expertise for those teaching research methodologies and processes. Specialised training sessions for postgraduate supervisors take place alongside staff development seminars and workshops for all staff on postgraduate supervision and research development in taught programmes. Many of these seminars are led by New Zealand and international experts. The total postgraduate supervisory development programme is reviewed annually. A long-term research project is being set up to evaluate the implementation of, and training for, postgraduate supervision.

The Centre for Staff Education and Development assists Heads of Department in the development of individual staff development plans to increase staff knowledge of research and to ensure that research practice remains current. There is also extensive staff development activity in improving assessment and teaching methodologies, particularly with the recent development of degree programmes. Furthermore, a number of staff are undertaking the AIT Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Tertiary) which provides up-to-date training for teachers of programmes at all levels.

3.6 AIT has a quality assurance system throughout the institution to ensure effective maintenance of international standards of teaching and research.

TEACHING

Formal quality monitoring\(^1\) of academic programmes and teaching is considerable with extensive informal monitoring. Lecturers interact with students at an informal level to continually monitor their teaching and students' learning. This informal monitoring is not documented or acknowledged, but is readily verified with staff. The range of formal internal quality monitoring processes include:

- “Approval in Principle” by the Academic Board to develop a new programme, where the focus is on ensuring that an intended new programme is in accord with the Institute mission and goals, and that resourcing (financial, library, staff, space) will be available and appropriate;

- “Approval in Detail” by the Academic Board of new programmes, a process which allows detailed scrutiny of the proposed new curriculum; the intent is to ensure that the design of the curriculum is in line with

---

\(^1\) The term Quality Monitoring is used to refer to the whole range of “quality” related activities which are internal or external to the Institution.
“quality” expectations, and that plans for ongoing development, monitoring and enhancement of the programme are in place;

- Monitoring by a programme Board of Studies, and maintenance of the curriculum in terms of learning, teaching and assessment standards, student performance, and appropriateness and adequacy of available resources. Each Board of Studies receives module or programme component review reports compiled by lecturers, teaching and appraisal reports, student feedback summaries, Examination Board reports on student achievement and student assessments, professional body and external monitor reports and reports from Advisory Committees;

- Annual reporting on programmes in order to analyse the student profile and student outcomes, and consider curriculum, learning, teaching, research and resource issues. This involves a reflective process by the programme team, who take account of the reports referred to above, benchmark with other programmes or institutions where appropriate, and results in a written report and an annual plan which details intentions for ongoing improvement and enhancement;

- Internal moderation of student assessment processes and outcomes, and in higher level programmes also external moderation, together with programme Examination Board monitoring of individual student achievement;

- The use of external examiners to examine all postgraduate research degree theses;

- The use of visiting lecturing staff to facilitate benchmarking with other programmes and institutions;

- Staff and student exchanges with overseas institutions;

- Programme Advisory Committees that report on relevance of programmes for “industry” and advise on programme outcomes.

- Oversight of Institute academic policy and regulations by the Academic Board and its subcommittees, the Academic Standards Committee, and the Faculty Boards;

- Monitoring by an Executive Board of annual key performance indicators established as part of the service performance agreement with the government funding body;

- A centralised system for providing analysis of feedback from students on modules or programme components;

- Annual student feedback on the total student experience of learning at an institutional level (student satisfaction), fed directly into management action plans;
• Graduate destination surveys undertaken at an Institute level as an indicator of programme vocational outcomes;

• Biennial employer surveys on employer perceptions of the AIT graduates;

• Monitoring of teaching staff performance at a faculty level;

• Review and audit of individual Faculties and divisions in accord with Faculty or division development plans;

• Internal research into specific aspects associated with the student experience at AIT, e.g. the first year student experience, postgraduate students;

• Internal audits of aspects of the Institute’s academic systems, regulations and practices in accord with an annual plan, with the intent of improving systems, regulations and practices.

The relationship between various academic committees and structures together with lines of responsibility and accountability are shown in Figure 2. A senior position has designated responsibility for the development and maintenance of the Institute’s quality processes. Accountability for “quality” lies ultimately with the President, but in practice is with the Deans of Faculties and Heads of Service Units.

External quality processes mesh with internal processes, but in a sense add a further layer to the extensive internal processes. External quality monitoring requirements have grown and continue to grow or undergo revision rapidly. These currently include:

• Accreditation achieved through evaluation of the Institute’s quality management systems in order to offer national qualifications (sub-degree level);

• NZQA approval of individual undergraduate degree and postgraduate qualifications and accreditation of the Institute’s quality management systems as they relate to the individual qualification, both as a requirement prior to funding being granted for a new programme at this level, and in order to comply with legislation for degree programmes;

• Approval of individual programmes that require professional body recognition or “high” categories of funding prior to funding being granted;

• Approval of individual programmes and/or external examination of students by some professional bodies prior to admittance of graduates to a profession;
• Government funding agency monitoring of performance agreements and performance measures;

• Other funding agency (e.g. industry through the Education and Training Support Agency) monitoring of specific performance agreements;

• External moderation of student assessment processes and tasks in respect of national qualifications (sub-degree);

• A requirement for external moderation of student assessments, and overall appointment of an external monitor for undergraduate degree and postgraduate qualifications. Generally external monitors are appointed from New Zealand or overseas universities with international standing.

The full range of internal and external processes is outlined in Figure 3 together with their focus of attention.

RESEARCH

Formal quality monitoring for research activities is in place, and to some extent overlaps with monitoring of academic programmes. For the purpose of this submission research monitoring is detailed separately. The responsibility for ensuring that quality systems for research are in place currently lies with the Academic Director, but in practice is with the Faculty Deans. A new position of Director of Research has recently been established and is in the process of being filled.

The range of formal quality monitoring processes for research includes:

• Peer review of faculty staff research proposals by faculty research committees;

• Peer review by members of the Institute’s Research Committee for research proposals seeking external funding;

• Approval by the Ethics Committee for all research involving human or animal subjects;

• Internal peer review and external referee review of all research proposals seeking funding from the Institute’s Contestable Research Fund;

• Internal peer review and external referee review of applications seeking Institute support to establish a research centre;

• Staff exchanges with overseas institutions in order to facilitate joint research projects;
- Benchmarking of practices with other institutions through joint research activities;
- Appointment of visiting research fellows to individual faculties;
- External referee review by external agencies for all applications seeking external funding;
- Categorisation of research outputs for publication in an annual research register.

**SUMMARY**

The underlying principle of quality monitoring at AIT is the encouragement and facilitation of continuous improvement. The Institute has a commitment to its stakeholders, and thus a determination to ensure that academic activities are continuously monitored and improved. The general principle, that processes for maintaining and enhancing the quality of the Institute’s activities should be systematic, negotiated with stakeholders and should be explicitly stated, is included in the description of the Institute’s quality management systems.

Particular features of the AIT quality monitoring processes include:

- The principle of peer review and professional judgement in order to provide both inter and intra-institutional comparisons nationally and internationally;
- Concern with programme outcomes through the specification of graduate profiles and learning outcomes and consideration of how these can best be attained in a context for learning;
- Ensuring that planned resourcing for teaching programmes and research is appropriate for intended outcomes;
- Ensuring that academic processes are constantly reviewed, using amongst other things peer and student feedback;
- The encouragement of self-evaluation and reflection, and the promotion of enhancement of quality through the sharing of good practice.

The documentation setting out AIT’s quality assurance systems includes:

- *Quality Management Systems for Degrees and Related Qualifications (Overview document) July 1997*
- *Auckland Institute of Technology Calendar 1998*

Further evidence of the operation of these systems can be found in:
- Academic Board Minutes
- Faculty Board Minutes
- Programme/Curriculum Documentation
- Programme Annual Reports which include
  - External Moderators' Reports
  - External Monitors' Reports
- Student Satisfaction Surveys
- Staff Satisfaction Surveys
- Graduate Destination Surveys
- Research Project Plans
- Internal Audit Reports
- Annual Reports of Boards of Studies and Examination Boards,
- Annual Reports of Advisory Committees.
- NZQA/NZPPC Reports on New Programmes and/or Accreditation Reports
- Institute Annual Reports and Research Reports
FIGURE 2: INTERNAL QUALITY MONITORING AT AIT: LINES OF ACCOUNTABILITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL</td>
<td>Accreditation of quality systems</td>
<td>NZQA / NZPPC</td>
<td>Institute-wide systems - accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval and accreditation of undergraduate and postgraduate degrees.</td>
<td>NZQA</td>
<td>Individual programme approval - accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional body accreditation</td>
<td>External professional body</td>
<td>Profession- accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of Service Performance</td>
<td>Govt. Funding Body</td>
<td>Performance Indicators (inputs) - accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Agreements</td>
<td>Industry Funding Bodies</td>
<td>Performance Indicators (inputs and outputs) - accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderation of student assessment</td>
<td>NZQA</td>
<td>Standards and consistency of assessment tasks and performance - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring of undergraduate and postgraduate degrees</td>
<td>NZQA</td>
<td>Overall standard of programme - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External examination of thesis</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Standard of graduate attainment - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL - INSTITUTION / FACULTY</td>
<td>Institutional audits</td>
<td>Academic Directorate</td>
<td>Academic policies, regulations and practices - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student satisfaction</td>
<td>Academic Directorate</td>
<td>Institute-wide student views - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff satisfaction</td>
<td>Academic Directorate</td>
<td>Institute-wide staff views - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate destination</td>
<td>Academic Directorate</td>
<td>Performance indicator (outputs) - accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of new programmes</td>
<td>Faculty Boards</td>
<td>Curriculum, learning, teaching, assessment and resources - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodic review of programmes</td>
<td>Faculty Boards</td>
<td>Continuing relevance of curriculum, learning, teaching, assessment and resources - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching evaluation</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>Teaching quality - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL - PROGRAMME LEVEL</td>
<td>Annual programme report</td>
<td>Programme leader/Board of Studies (Staff and students)</td>
<td>Overview/self-evaluation of programme; plan for enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Module evaluation - student feedback</td>
<td>Programme leader/Board of Studies (Staff and students)</td>
<td>Student feedback on modules - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme Committees - Board of Studies and Examination Board</td>
<td>Programme Leader (Staff and students)</td>
<td>Oversight of programme quality and student performance - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>Relevance to industry - accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderation reports</td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Student performance and standards - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderation of student assessment</td>
<td>Programme Leader</td>
<td>Validity and reliability of assessment - improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Monitor reports</td>
<td>External Monitor</td>
<td>Oversight of programme quality and student performance - improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL QUALITY MONITORING AT AIT: TYPES AND RESPONSIBILITY
3.7 There is external evaluation of degree courses and external examination of all postgraduate theses at AIT.

All degrees offered by AIT are evaluated by panels drawn as appropriate from other universities and educational establishments, industry, commerce, the professions, Maori and other communities. The panel membership always includes two senior university academic staff endorsed by the NZVCC.

All degrees and related qualifications approved by the NZQA are subject to a monitoring process which is administered by the Authority until the provider has the capacity to administer the process without external oversight, at which time delegated authority for the process is granted to the provider. In most cases monitors have recommended after one year that Authority supervision and independent external monitoring of AIT programmes is no longer required. AIT has nonetheless maintained independent external monitoring of its degree and related programmes.

AIT degrees are monitored and moderated by independent experts from New Zealand universities [Auckland, Waikato, Massey, Victoria and Otago] and overseas universities [South Australia, Glasgow Caledonian, McMaster (Ontario), Monash, Curtin, Swinburne, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Sydney, Flinders, Queensland, Queensland University of Technology, Hong Kong, Brighton, and Sheffield] as well as from the professions, and industrial and commercial sectors. The reports of monitors and moderators of several programmes have praised the performance of programmes and staff involved in their delivery.

Typical of their comments is the summary by Professor Joy Higgs of the University of Sydney following her monitor’s visit in February 1997; “I consider that the (Occupational Therapy) curriculum should be regarded as one of high national and international standing, given the nature of the curriculum, the qualifications and expertise of staff, the effectiveness and calibre of clinical education, the attractiveness of the programme to local and international students, and the commitment of the School to quality assurance and development”.

Professor Roger Hopkins (Victoria University) reported to the NZQA in 1996, “The BBus degree programme continues to develop and mature. There are now some 1000 students and over 60 academic staff involved...the first group of some 100 students have just graduated. The quality of the students interviewed at various stages continues to impress.....the BBus programme is meeting a strong demand with credibility.”

Professor Tony Webber (Queensland University of Technology) reported in 1997, “It is my view that the Bachelor of Applied Science is meeting the expectations of students in providing them with a qualification to enter the world of work and the base for further education. The School of Applied Science is to be commended on its efforts to expand the Institution’s reputation in research....Students were interviewed in three
discussion groups and as a whole they expressed strong satisfaction with their experience at AIT and with the Department of Applied Science.”

Professor Trevor Barr (Swinburne University of Technology) wrote: “The Masters programme in Communications is unique in New Zealand Higher Education... The management and staff are to be commended for the success of their inaugural programme. They offer a valuable range of programmes, are generally well aware of key debates in their respective fields, and are clearly dedicated to the programme’s success.”

Professor Bruce Brown (University of Brighton) wrote: “I found the aims of the MA to be laudable and innovative. I also found a willingness amongst staff to address aspects of the programme where its delivery seemed to offer room for improvement - this openness in confronting such matters I felt to be a good indication that quality standards would be developed and maintained through the process of annual critical appraisal.”

Robert Boyd-Bell, General Manager, Communicado wrote: “I have recently had reason to view a range of student productions from throughout the country. In my judgement there are only two other institutions whose students consistently demonstrate similar levels of craft skills - the University of Auckland and South Seas Television. Both courses are different from the BCS, which is in good company and compares well.”

AIT’s General Academic Statute requires the appointment of external examiners to the Examinations Board for all programmes leading to the award of an AIT undergraduate degree or postgraduate diploma or degree. This statute also requires student assessment to be moderated externally for these qualifications and other diploma programmes, and for all Masters and Doctoral theses to be externally examined.

3.8 AIT staff participate in international research programmes and present research results at international forums.

A number of staff are involved in collaborative research with international partners.

Within the Health Studies Faculty, the School of Occupational Therapy is currently working with the University of British Columbia’s Faculty of Rehabilitative Medicine. Staff from the Physiotherapy Department are conducting collaborative research with the Universities of La Trobe, Woollongong, Curtin, Western Australia and Auckland in one project. Another involves the University of Newcastle. There are also other collaborative research projects with the Universities of Auckland, Otago, Stockholm, Curtin, and Harvard.

The Science and Engineering Faculty is engaged in collaborative research with the Goteborg’s Universitet in Sweden (in Glycoscience), the
University of Auckland (where the AIT Dean was previously the Dean of Science at the University), the University of Toronto (which is collaborating in the development of a Centre for Mathematics, Engineering, Science, and Technology Education Research (CEMESTER), the University of Waikato (for science and technology education research), and the Technical University of Vienna (investigating fuel and environmental technology).

In institutional research, the British Council is supporting a three year collaborative research project with AIT, the University of Central England, and Victoria University of Wellington on Quality Assurance in the United Kingdom and New Zealand universities.

The Commerce Faculty has been engaged in consultancy projects in Vietnam (Tourism), Fiji, and Tuvalu (Training and Development), and is engaged in a collaborative research project in Denmark under the Danish Social Policy Research Funding Programme for "developing tourism in peripheral areas of Europe". This programme is led by an AIT staff member and involves four PhD students from Denmark. AIT has also worked with the World Travel Organisation in developing a Graduate Tourism Aptitude Test which is used to establish criteria for tourism and hospitality programmes internationally.

In 1996, participation in international forums by AIT staff resulted in over sixty contributions to conferences where AIT research was presented in countries outside of New Zealand. These venues included Perth, San Bernadino, Sydney, Kuala Lumpur, Switzerland, Rennes, California, Florida, Banff, Wollongong, Bangkok, Fraser Island, Melbourne, Dublin, Bournemouth, Coffs Harbour, Taiwan, Concepcion, Adelaide, Brisbane, Brighton, Newcastle, Harvard Medical School, Norway, Boston, Munich, Cardiff, Honolulu, Ontario, Nottingham, Paris, Alice Springs, Chiang Mai, Rigi Kaltbad, San Antonio, and Malmo.

In 1996 a diverse range of disciplines was covered by 28 presentations overseas prepared by 26 staff in the Health Studies Faculty. Some of the papers were presented by one staff member, sometimes at one or more conferences. Several of the papers were prepared by multiple authors.

Staff in other Faculties were also involved in presenting papers at international conferences or workshops in 1996. Eight staff in the Arts Faculty presented nine papers in disciplines including assessment, Media Studies, Refugee Studies, Translation, Interpretation, Communication and Sign Language. Two senior administrative staff presented papers on topics relating to education and learning in Australia, Korea and Germany.

In 1997, the Research Report records that 86 conference presentations were made by AIT staff at international conferences and workshops outside of New Zealand. These staff came from all Faculties across the Institute and covered a wide range of disciplines.
In 1998 the trend is continuing for increasing numbers of AIT’s staff to be engaged in international collaboration and presentation of research.
3.9 There is recognition and acceptance of AIT’s research and teaching by the broader community, and by employer and professional and other relevant bodies.

AIT’s quality management system ensures the representation of industry and community stakeholders in the development, monitoring and review of programmes at AIT. Industry and the professions are represented on Advisory Committees whose function is to monitor the relevance of programmes and advise on the programmes’ outcomes. They link with Boards of Studies and Faculty Boards and report annually to the Council through the President.

Advisory Committees provide AIT with considerable confidence that programme development and review has high levels of employer and professional input and satisfaction. There is consistent and overwhelming support from the widely representative groups for the responsiveness of AIT to the needs of industry and the workplace. Representatives assure that a balance of practical and theoretical components to programmes remains a strong feature of AIT, and support the progression of programmes developed from diplomas to degrees.

Industry and employer support is further evidenced by the co-operative education components and workplace attachments that are incorporated into most degrees. Over 350 companies are partners with AIT in this.

With reference to several AIT qualifications, New Zealand professions recognise AIT graduates equally with university graduates. For example, physiotherapy graduates are registered by the New Zealand Physiotherapy Board with equal status to the graduates from Otago University. BBus graduates in accountancy are deemed by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of New Zealand (ICANZ) to have met the requirements for entry to the professional examinations while in most cases university accounting graduates have to undertake an additional year of study. Graduates with the Bachelor of Medical Laboratory Science have the same recognition as graduates from Otago and Massey Universities. The BBus in advertising is the only advertising degree in New Zealand that is accredited by the International Association of Advertising Agencies. All AIT degrees have the endorsement of the relevant professional bodies.

The AIT Ethics Committee deals with research ethics issues and includes representatives from the University of Auckland, Maori groups, and the general public. It participates in meetings of other ethics committees from the northern region of New Zealand and has recently applied for recognition by the Health Research Council.
3.10 There is international acceptance of AIT programmes through international student and staff transfers.

Acceptance of students is ultimately in the hands of the receiving institution and the rules applied are not always appropriate to graduates of institutions like AIT which are not universities. However many AIT programmes are formally recognised for credit transfer by universities both within New Zealand and internationally. Many of AIT’s graduates have been and continue to be admitted directly to postgraduate studies in New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Australia and elsewhere. For example, Health Studies graduates are eligible for entry to the MA degree at Victoria University, the MPhil at Massey, or the MHSc at Auckland University. Graduates in Business are eligible for entry to the MCom degree at a number of universities, recent international examples including Massey University, the University of Auckland, ESC Rennes and the Texas A&M University.

AIT has developed formal relationships with many educational institutions in Europe and in the Asia-Pacific region which allow for regular exchanges of staff and students.

The Commerce Faculty has a reciprocal arrangement for student exchange with the University of Lincolnshire and Humberside and a Consortium, based in Rennes, of 20 international business schools in Europe. Students studying a degree in International Business at AIT or any of the reciprocal institutions complete a year at an overseas university. In 1997, 20 students came from European universities to AIT for one year or a single semester of the BBus degree while 30 AIT students spent the reciprocal semester in a European university. Co-operative education student exchanges have taken place for the last two years with Nanyang Technological University (Singapore) and the University of Macau in 1998. It is expected to add Nanjing University (China), the Kyung Hee University (Korea), and the University of Thai Chamber of Commerce (Bangkok) to this arrangement in 1998.

Students in Sport and Recreation exchange with the University of Lancaster, Occupational Therapy students exchange with Chiang Mai University and Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia. Engineering students exchange with King Mongkut’s College in Bangkok, and postgraduate students in Applied Science (international practice) are required to undertake their research in an international environment. Physiotherapy students have completed exchanges with the Universities of South Australia, Melbourne, Ulster, and British Columbia.

Active Science and Engineering staff exchange programmes exist with Greenwich University (London) and Leeds Metropolitan University (in which one staff member from each of the respective Engineering schools annually swap for one semester each year). The Arts Faculty has had a number of staff exchanges with Oxford Brookes University.
Staff in the Commerce Faculty have developed regular reciprocal staff exchange programmes with the University of Thai Chamber of Commerce, and the University of Lincolnshire and Humberside. In addition, some staff are engaged in joint projects with staff from the University of Auckland. Two visiting lecturers from McGill University (Canada) and Henderson State University (USA) spent a semester each in the Commerce Faculty in 1996 and 1997 respectively. A professor from Seattle Pacific University, Washington, will be at AIT for a semester in 1998.

Health Studies staff exchanges in 1996 and 1997 have involved the University of Vermont, the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, the University of Otago, the University of Montana, and the University of Auckland.

Senior administrative staff exchanges have occurred with Napier University (Edinburgh).

These exchanges have enabled the staff involved to participate in both research and teaching in a different environment.

In Malaysia the Limkokwing Institute of Creative Technology has Business and Design diploma programmes provided by AIT. Students completing the Diplomas can continue studies to degree level at AIT or at several universities in the UK, Australia and the United States. Students commencing a Diploma in Accounting at INTI College (Malaysia) can complete a Business degree at AIT as well as at Otago University. Student and staff exchanges operate in established twinning programmes with Khon Kaen University, Rangsit University and the University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce. An exchange programme with the National Taiwan University is being developed in the area of Translation and Interpreting and with the Nanyang Technological University (Singapore) in the area of International Business.

The AIT Graduate Diploma in Teacher Education (Tertiary) provides entry to the final year of the Bachelor of Teaching at Charles Sturt University in Australia, and consideration is currently being given to the offering of a Doctor of Education programme in collaboration with this university.

The Faculty of Arts has agreements for mutual exchange of staff and students with the Kent Institute of Art and Design (University of Kent), University of Brighton, RMIT (Melbourne), Rangsit University (Bangkok), Carnegie Mellon University (USA), and Kanda University (Japan). These have resulted recently in the development of exchanges for research students and academic research exchange programmes for staff between the partner universities and AIT.
Characteristic 4

“[Universities] are a repository of knowledge and expertise”

Education Act 1989 section 162(4)(a)(iv)
AIT is a repository of knowledge and expertise.

AIT is a storehouse of knowledge and expertise, and, through its staff, has an active and dynamic influence on its local, national and international communities, and in doing so makes its information and human resources readily available to them.

AIT's programme development and monitoring processes ensure that stakeholder requirements are met and its graduates satisfy employer and community needs. Some programmes have been developed in response to specific employer and community demand. Representatives of the Advisory Committees consistently give high praise to the responsiveness of the Institute in meeting their needs as employers.

AIT has developed a wide range of degree and sub-degree programmes, many of which are unique in New Zealand. Examples are the National Schools of Printing and Ambulance Officer Training; unique programmes in Translation and Interpreting; expertise in Refugee Studies; the only programmes in Textile Technology, the only degrees in Communications, Physiotherapy and Medical Laboratory Science outside existing universities; and programmes to degree level uniquely developed by Maori. It has Business programmes with the only co-operative education component in New Zealand, and the only International Business degree requiring an international exchange and co-operative education placement. It has the largest School of Hotel and Restaurant Studies in New Zealand and the largest Faculty of Health Studies which has recently introduced the only Masters degree in Health Science of its kind in the country.

Co-operative education and workplace experience is a component of many programmes, including degrees. This enables students to learn in the workplace and provides opportunities for those workplaces to be influenced by the students and staff of the Institute.

AIT is also active in providing opportunities for learning in the community. The Prison Education and Refugee Education programmes, and home tutoring for non-English speaking students, are examples. AIT seeks to meet special needs in the community with programmes for the visually impaired and physically handicapped and provides programmes for deaf-language interpreters.

Staff of the Institute perform roles that are expected of members of an academic community. Staff from most faculties have been or are currently involved with the supervision and examination of Masters and Doctoral students from New Zealand and Australian universities. Faculty staff have participated in degree approval panels at other institutions. Staff from the Faculty of Arts currently teach papers to postgraduate students at the University of Auckland where there is cross crediting in the areas of communication, political sciences, and translating and interpreting.
Some staff act as referees for academic journals and members of journal editorial boards.

Staff in the Health Studies Faculty, for example, serve on the editorial boards of the following journals:

- Journal of Occupational Science: Australia
- Occupational Therapy International
- Journal of Occupational Science Australia
- NZ Journal of Occupational Therapy
- The Journal of Manual and Manipulative Therapy
- NZ Journal of Physiotherapy
- Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise
- Kai Tiaki: Nursing New Zealand

In addition, staff from this Faculty have regularly reviewed articles for these and other journals, and are active in a wide range of professional associations including the NZ Society of Physiotherapists, the NZ Manipulative Therapists Association, the NZ College of Physiotherapy, the Nursing Council of NZ (AIT’s Head of Nursing is its current chair), the NZ College of Midwives, the Occupational Therapy Board of NZ (one of which is the delegate to the World Federation of Occupational Therapists), the Recreation Association of NZ, and Fitness Industry NZ. The Dean of the Faculty is Honorary Secretary and Past President of the World Federation for Mental Health. He is also the Regional Chair and Life Member of the International Council of Psychologists.

Some staff also perform advisory roles in areas of their expertise such as expert witnesses, membership of professional associations, invited participants on government and ministerial advisory groups, and scientific advisors to international conference organising committees.

Significant numbers of staff across the Institute are approached to undertake consultancy, often in areas of professional practice.

The Faculty of Te Ara Poutama has become a key source of information in New Zealand with particular reference to tribal knowledge, whakapapa, the analysis of data extracted from the Maori Land Court, and research into contemporary issues related to Maori. Iwi have purchased development plans produced by its students.

AIT has an excellent record in developing strategies for Maori development, and has taken what many consider to be the national lead in Treaty management, the establishment of Te Ara Poutama, and more recently the appointment of Te Ahurei.

Much of the research activity undertaken feeds directly into industry practice or improving the health of New Zealanders. A high profile example of this work is the surface coating research being undertaken by staff in the Science and Engineering Faculty which has resulted in the application of new industrial techniques in this area. Research from the
Biomechanics Unit in the Health Studies Faculty is aiding the performance of sports people.

Joint developments between industry and the Institute are common and provide the opportunity for both partners to benefit from the relationship. Students and staff gain access to leading edge facilities, and industry in turn benefits from the developments that result. The International Multimedia Centre is a prime example of this initiative. A further example of the way in which the Institute is interacting with the community is the opening of a multidisciplinary health clinic involving staff, students and the community. This is a new development in New Zealand where the community can access the professional expertise of staff while, at the same time, providing experience to develop the professional skills of students.

The Institute is proactive in the promotion of the discussion of contemporary issues with which it has expertise. AIT has organised and hosted several major conferences and seminars on issues including employment, the role of ethics in society, the future of education, violence in New Zealand society, and the education of mental health professionals.

AIT has brought prominent speakers and educationalists to New Zealand. Examples of these were given in the 1995 application and included Sir Christopher Ball, Dr Michael Apple, Polly Williams, Dr Richard Chait, and Dr Paul Honan.

In 1997, AIT hosted Professor Don Jones, a prominent ethicist from Drew University, and Sir Ian Axford, an eminent New Zealander and world acclaimed astrophysicist.

AIT staff have a broad and active influence on the local, national, and international communities through their involvement in community development, and professional or community societies.
Characteristic 5

“[Universities] accept a role as critic and conscience of society”

Education Act 1989 section 162(4)(a)(v)
5 AIT accepts a role as critic and conscience of society.

5.1 AIT initiates and readily provides informed and responsible comment on issues facing society, and is sensitive to social and cultural issues in a manner appropriate to an organisation of advanced learning and research, and

5.2 AIT provides an environment in which the views of staff and students can be expressed, and provides the means by which such views can be expressed, and

5.3 AIT has a stated and actual commitment to the concept of free enquiry by its staff, which it also encourages in its students.

AIT has a culture which encourages positive and constructive social criticism by its staff and students as part of its emphasis on critical thinking and the questioning and challenging of conventional assumptions and received wisdom. To a large extent AIT is sensitive to many of the issues in society through its interaction with the broad spectrum of students and community it works with. As stated in the introduction to this submission, AIT has a commitment to being a broad spectrum university offering educational opportunities through programmes from basic literacy for adults through to doctoral and post-doctoral research. It is this commitment which inspires and often gives rise to its taking a role as critic and conscience of society.

AIT’s President has summarised this commitment in the following statement:

*It is absolutely essential in a learning institution to protect the right of colleagues to state their truths without fear or favour. In a sense, progress in our society is only possible if we encourage colleagues to refuse to remain obedient functionaries of the status quo, and engage in the process of constructive critical analysis.*

*At AIT we encourage colleagues who dare to question the values and actions of society, including our own institution. There can be no progress, no action, no transformation without a question and a challenge. We are more likely to go beyond the boundaries of comfort when we are constructively challenged. Thus we welcome what Albert Camus called “creative rebellion” and encourage the clash of the innovative against the routine, the extraordinary against the ordinary, and the paradox against the platitude.*
In his history of civilisations, Toynbee concludes that only those institutions that constructively meet new challenges and respond appropriately will survive. Leadership, and perhaps survival, begins when there is disagreement, when new vision challenges the old, and when there is conscientious and responsible critical analysis.

This means that as an institution we actively encourage critique of any idea, procedure, process, or machine that is not in the best interests of society. This fine art of “conscientious dissidence” is not easy. But as Koestler said; “We are guilty of treason in the eyes of history if we do not denounce what deserves to be denounced.”

There is, however, a caveat on our promotion of the freedom of inquiry. In our criticism, we must respect both people and the dignity of disciplined analysis. We will curtail academic freedom if someone is being hurt. Thus, as with any moral principle, we must contextualise the value of the freedom to be a critic and conscience of society. It is for this reason that we have established an Ethics Committee.

The institution we have a primary responsibility to critique is our own. It is not just the shrill, placard waving extremist who can be doctrinaire. It is sometimes mainstream establishment academia. All too easily academia can be riven by ideological divisions which throw up walls around narrow perspectives. We need in our institution the socratic gadfly who is able to ask pertinent questions, introduce alternative options in ways of perceiving ideas, and enable others to improve their way of doing things.

Accordingly, AIT conducts regular student and staff satisfaction surveys. We receive honest and direct feedback. Sometimes the feedback hurts and does not seem to be fair. However our responsibility is to take it all very seriously. Accepting this responsibility for initiating a comprehensive and open process of self criticism encourages our students and staff to engage in similar self analysis in order to improve their learning, teaching, and management skills.

Teachers who favour academic freedom will encourage their students to be intellectually subversive against their own opinions and skills. Instead of feeling demeaned or diminished by a student who defeats them in argument, a teacher should feel victorious. By feeling empowered and encouraged, the student will experience the exhilaration of learning. So academic freedom for the teacher is not to control, but to relinquish control wherever possible.
It is from this environment that various members of the academic staff write and speak in the media and elsewhere on contemporary issues. In recent times these have included education, child abuse, trauma, gambling, mental health, disarmament, conservation, environmental issues, social violence, Maori development, refugee issues, rehabilitation of prisoners, and advertising ethics.

AIT staff have regularly been involved in preparing submissions of an applied research nature on legislation, and to government and non-government agencies on policy issues. Submissions have been made to the Resource Management Act, to the Health and Disabilities Services Commissioner on the health needs of refugees, to the Law Commission on refugee women and the law, and the status of non-English speaking people in the legal system, to a non-governmental organisation reporting to New Zealand's compliance on the Convention of the Rights of the Child, to Parliament on legislation including the Crime Amendment Act (No. 2) 1995, the Health and Disability Services Bill 1992, the Nurses Act 1992, the Medical Practitioners Bill 1995, the Medicines Act 1995 and the Patients Code of Rights.

The AIT Foundation has been of considerable assistance to AIT in funding many of the visiting speakers and educationalists mentioned in section 4 to New Zealand. These people have further contributed to AIT's role as critic and conscience of society.

Further evidence of AIT's acceptance of a role as critic and conscience of society is to be found in its commitment to social justice in education. A conscience needs to be active. This has been manifest in the institution's response to the needs of disadvantaged groups where statements of belief have been matched by positive initiatives to achieve equity.

The Institute has established Te Purengi Noho Marae to provide experience of Maori culture for all students. It has also supported many educational initiatives including refugee settlement programmes (for up to 1000 people per year), prison education, programmes for the deaf and visually impaired, and the provision of access to university level education for the academically disadvantaged. These are matters that have provided social action which goes beyond the mere researching and speaking out on matters of social concern. AIT believes they are part of its responsibilities as a critic and conscience of society.
University Definition

“A university is characterised by a wide diversity of teaching and research, especially at a higher level, that maintains, advances, disseminates, and assists in the application of knowledge, develops intellectual independence, and promotes community learning”

Education Act 1989 section 162(4)(b)(iii)
AIT is characterised by a wide diversity of teaching and research, especially at a higher level, that maintains, advances, disseminates, and assists in the application of knowledge, develops intellectual independence, and promotes community learning.

This section of the Act is essentially a summary of the five characteristics addressed above, but it also specifically introduces the requirement of diversity at the higher level.

The student enrolment profile of AIT demonstrates a very wide diversity of teaching. The Institute is divided into four Faculty groupings which, in turn, are divided into a range of Departments and Schools responsible for various disciplines as follows:

Faculty of Arts and Te Ara Poutama:

Te Ara Poutama (Faculty of Maori Studies)
School of Art and Design
School of Communication Studies
School of Languages
National School of Printing
School of Fashion Technology
School of Social Sciences
School of Hotel and Restaurant Studies
Centre for Professional Education

Faculty of Commerce:

Integrated Business Studies
Accounting
Computer Information Systems
Economics
Law
Management
Marketing and Advertising
Professional Computing and Computing Business Applications
Tourism and Travel

Faculty of Health Studies

School of Nursing and Midwifery
School of Occupational Therapy
School of Physiotherapy
Department of Psychotherapy and Applied Psychology
Department of Sport and Health Science
Department of Community & Health Services
National Ambulance Officers Training School
Faculty of Science and Engineering

Department of Applied Mathematics
Department of Applied Science
Department of Electrotechnology
Department of Mechanical and Production Engineering

Each of the Faculties offers a wide range of programmes including postgraduate programmes. The higher level programmes (ie at degree or higher) are listed in section 1 of this submission and include 28 degrees and postgraduate qualifications plus 19 diplomas or certificates at degree level which have been specifically designed for graduates wishing to upgrade their qualifications.

AIT’s profile in this respect easily meets the criteria for university classification in the UK which requires 4000 EFTS enrolled in higher level programmes (equivalent to level 6 of the New Zealand NQF or higher) of which 3000 EFTS are enrolled at degree level or higher with at least 300 EFTS in each of five broad subject disciplines.

The five broad subject disciplines in which AIT would have met this latter requirement in 1997 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>EFTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art and Design</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Management</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages &amp; Communications</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Studies</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIT offers a range of undergraduate degrees and postgraduate programmes in each of these broad subject disciplines. The 1996 Research Report demonstrates that AIT’s research is active in each of these diverse areas, and that the research is applied in nature. This is a clear indication that the Institute is maintaining knowledge, advancing and disseminating knowledge, developing intellectual independence, and promoting community learning.

AIT believes that its commitment to applied research is an important factor in its role of promoting community learning, and that a university must be connected to the professions and industries for whom it prepares its graduates, both through its curriculum development and its research.
The Ministry of Education has identified in a memorandum to the Tertiary Consultative Committee (Ross, F; 12 April 1996) that in addition to meeting the Education Act’s criteria, the Minister would consider the wider issues of national interest. The key issues were identified as follows.

**Assessing New Zealand’s tertiary education requirements**

While there is a question over whether there is an “ideal” number of particular types of tertiary institution for New Zealand, the more relevant concern centres on what type and quality of institutions are required to fulfil New Zealand’s tertiary education and training requirements, and the impact that a polytechnic application for university status might have on the provision of lower level and vocational courses.

AIT has not altered its range of courses or its strategic directions in seeking university status, and the decision by the AIT Council to seek university status was made on the basis that it would not diminish its commitment to vocational and lower level courses.

The reality is that AIT is different from any other polytechnic in that most of its trade and other lower level courses were taken from it in the 1970s when the decisions were made to establish the Manukau and Carrington (now UNITEC) Technical Institutes. As a result of this, AIT has for the last 20 years been mostly concerned with technical and professional education that in the 1990s became substantially degree oriented.

AIT has also pointed out elsewhere in this case that the provision of lower level courses in a university is an international trend. Many of the best Australian universities, including one of its most prestigious ones (Melbourne), have merged with TAFE colleges in recent years in order to encourage the development of seamless tertiary education. This is a philosophy that AIT endorses strongly.

More recently, Massey University and the Wellington Polytechnic have agreed to merge. AIT has supported this merger because it will be of significant advantage to the Wellington Polytechnic students, and will broaden and strengthen the curriculum of Massey University. This merger supports AIT’s belief that it is appropriate for many of the courses that were traditionally in polytechnics to be offered in a university. AIT, however, is a larger and more diverse polytechnic than Wellington, and is able to achieve university status without the need to merge with a university in order to do this.

The question has also been raised as to the sustainability of a polytechnic’s university status over time. AIT’s case has shown that over the last few years there has been a gradual but inexorable strengthening of its degree and higher level programmes and its research activity. This has been driven by student demand rather than by any philosophical or strategic decision to develop these rather than to offer more courses at the lower end.
Analyses of the demand for AIT’s courses have all shown that there is poor demand for low level courses and strong demand for its higher level ones. Graduate destination surveys have also shown AIT that employment rates for graduates from its lower level courses are significantly lower than for graduates from its degree and higher level programmes. This indicates that employers are seeking higher qualifications, and it is not surprising that students recognise this and are increasingly seeking entry to programmes of more advanced learning.

In some cases, AIT’s degree programmes attract some hundreds of applications from qualified students whose applications are declined due to lack of space or funding. This is not the case with lower level certificates where the only course for which there is excess demand is English as a Second Language.

All of this is evidence that AIT’s higher level courses are likely to continue to grow while its lower level courses will increasingly be used as stepping stones for those who do not have the entry qualifications for degrees and higher level programmes.

**International competition and reputation**

AIT has pointed out in this case, and has made the point in many forums, that lack of university status is a serious handicap to its ability to market itself internationally and to assist its students to benefit from the opportunities to exchange with many international universities. As stated in the background to this case, this has been one of the driving forces behind AIT’s quest for university status. This handicap is of serious concern to AIT and arguably is an expensive handicap to both Auckland and New Zealand.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade has strongly supported AIT’s application for university status because of the potential development opportunities for New Zealand education in overseas countries that could be responded to.

AIT has active affiliation agreements at various levels with a number of other New Zealand polytechnics enabling them to teach parts of degrees in Business, Applied Science, Nursing, Maori Studies, Sport and Health Science, and Art and Design. Granting university status to AIT will be of significant assistance to them also in enabling them to offer courses that link to AIT’s degrees, thus providing further pathways for international students who choose to study in those polytechnics.

**Fiscal implications for Government**

AIT does not believe that there are any negative fiscal implications for Government. There are no additional costs for Government in granting AIT university status. To the contrary, there are potential gains in external revenue to be obtained as a result of the institution being able to market itself on a level playing field with its Australian and UK competitors. The current benefit to the taxpayer of AIT’s overseas students is estimated at $20 million in export earnings - almost 40% of the value of the EFTS funding the institution receives from
Government. With university status, AIT expects to double this sum within five years.
Regional provision of education and training

New Zealand’s population growth continues to be strongest in Auckland. The population of Greater Auckland is now approximately 1 million. To serve this, it has one university and three large polytechnics, while Massey University has established itself in the Albany basin.

Cities of a comparable size in Australia (Perth, Adelaide, and Brisbane) all have more universities than Auckland, but, more importantly, they all have at least one university with a history and profile similar to that of AIT. The Curtin University of Technology in Perth was created from the West Australia Institute of Technology, the University of South Australia in Adelaide was previously the South Australia Institute of Technology, and Brisbane’s Queensland University of Technology was the Queensland Institute of Technology.

Each of these universities has been extremely successful in the last decade, establishing their particular attributes as an alternative to the traditional universities whose character more closely resembles that of the University of Auckland. There is no evidence that the establishment of these institutions as universities has weakened the overall balance of tertiary provision or weakened the reputation of the older universities in their respective cities.

AIT believes that Auckland, like Perth, Adelaide and Brisbane, would benefit greatly from the establishment of a new university with a focus on vocational degrees developed to serve the needs of the professions, with a strong international focus, and with a history and expertise in the provision of high quality teaching and applied research and consultancy.
### APPENDIX 1: AIT ENROLMENT PROFILES, 1997 - 1999

#### INSTITUTE EFTS PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFTS</td>
<td>EFTS</td>
<td>EFTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postgraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth St</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciEng</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sub total</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth St</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciEng</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sub total</strong></td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>4223</td>
<td>4592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NQF level 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth St</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciEng</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sub total</strong></td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth St</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciEng</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sub total</strong></td>
<td>3501</td>
<td>3252</td>
<td>2972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8713</td>
<td>8990</td>
<td>9256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |      |      |      |
| **Total EFTS at NQF level 6+ or higher %** | 5212 | 5738 | 6284 |
|                      | 59.8 | 63.8 | 67.9 |
| **Total EFTS degree level + or higher %**  | 3904 | 4414 | 4925 |
|                      | 44.8 | 49.1 | 53.2 |
| **% Degree level EFTS at postgraduate level** | 2.5  | 4.3  | 6.8 |

**Note:** EFTS includes all students, domestic and international, enrolled in approved programmes. These figures do not include enrolments in short courses, seminars for industry and the professions, or in other educational contracts either in New Zealand or overseas.
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NOTES TO REFERENCES

1 Newspaper Articles

Where cited, these have been referenced with the date of publication under the following acronyms:

CR  Campus Review
Dom  The Dominion
DST  The Dominion Sunday Times
NZER The New Zealand Education Review
NZH  The New Zealand Herald
Post The Evening Post (Wellington)
Press The Press (Christchurch, New Zealand)

2 Institutional Reports

The following are in the public domain and available from the Institutions concerned:

ACE: Annual reports, 1995, 96
AIT: Annual reports, 1995, 96, 97
AIT: Research reports, 1996, 97
CIT: Annual reports, 1995, 96

3 Records of speeches, meetings, and working parties

Extensive use has been made of the following, many of which are confidential, which are held in the AIT executive offices and the archives of the AIT library:

AIT: Council minutes and Agenda papers, 1995 - 98
AIT: University status working group notes, 1995 - 98
ACE/AIT/CIT: Merger working group minutes and agendas, 1995 - 97
APNZ: Executive and CEO’s minutes and agendas, 1995 - 98
4 AIT Internal Memoranda and Communications Documents

Extensive use has been made of a personal collection of these (including confidential reports) which have been filed in the archives of the AIT library on completion of this dissertation. The policy and procedures documents are all in the public domain and available from the AIT academic secretariat. The confidential reports which include reports from the NZQA on AIT’s university application have been embargoed for public release until January 2005 but may be made available under special circumstances for approved researchers.

5 Field Notes

These are personal records and notes of meetings and discussions with key informants and have been referenced where cited by date.