nzist | new zealand institute of skills and technology

Poari Akoranga - Academic Board	Minutes
Wednesday 8 July 2020	**10:00am-2:00pm** **Via Zoom**

Welcome and Attendance

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Kieran Hewitson opened the meeting with a Karakia.

Introductions and welcome to Stephen Town.

Present
Chris Collins (Chair), Luana TeHira, Oonagh McGirr, Deborah Young, Glynnis Brook, Jeanette Grace, Kieran Hewitson, Lorna Gillespie, Natalie Waran, Neil Carroll, Nita Hutchison, Sue Smart

In Attendance
Stephen Town (NZIST CE) (ex-officio)
Michael Gilchrist (TEU)
Gordon Reid (EIT)
Vikki Roadley (NZIST interim GM)
Carole Unkovich (minute taker)

Apologies/Absent
Greg Durkin

Stephen Town new NZIST CE provided an introduction and background about himself and his career. Stephen noted:
- Pleased to be in the sector to support IST to achieve the requirements of the charter and vocational education reforms.
- NZIST itself has a very small team with the CE as one of only a few full-time employees for NZIST
- Chris Collins has agreed to Chair the Academic Board until tier two positions are in place
- Thanked everyone for taking the time to be part of the academic board and looked forward to working with the group.

In response to questions from the Board, the following points were noted:
- Office space in Hamilton is currently being assessed.
- Interviews for all 6 x Deputy Chief Executive roles will occur between 23 July and 5 August. A wide range of good applications has been received with over 400 applications in total. There was some very healthy interest from within the ITP and ITO parts of the system and network.
- It is likely to be late September before these positions start.
- All roles do not have to be based in Hamilton and it is expected that experience from the Covid-19 period will drive NZIST to create a virtual contribution from as many people as possible. The way forward for NZIST will about finding better ways to release people/leaders and contributors from within the sector to help do the work of NZIST.
- Concern was expressed that if there is a significant hiatus between recruitment and appointment of tier 2 positions the workloads of those in the subsidiaries will become increasingly pressured.
- NZIST is in discussion with TEC in order to access and have governance over a pool of funding that is not purely about more learners but about the wrap around work of NZIST and all the moving parts of the system for the next few years.
- The Board thanked Stephen for his leadership and wished him well as he takes on some of the challenges of the role.

1.   Minutes of the Previous Meeting

1.1   Scheduled Meeting
The minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 10 June 2020 were approved electronically on the 29 June (as per the discussion at the last meeting to ensure minutes are provided to the NZIST Council in a timely manner).

Carried

1.2   Matters Arising
1.2.1   Action Items

	Detail	Owner	Due Date
0620-1	It was agreed that the suggested name of Poari Akoranga be used for Academic Board and a recommendation for the name will be taken to NZIST Council. *This was discussed at the Council meeting and approved.*	CC/ST	Completed – July 2020
0620-2	It was agreed at the last meeting for the National Sub-Committees to have a common name. This is still to be actioned. *Kieran updated on this. Need to bring work across NZIST together.*	VR/KF	Completed – July 2020
0620-3	The National Sub-Committee TORs will be tidied up based on today's comments and then sent out for e-vote. *Not voted on yet and further discussion on this is required.*	VR/DY/KH	To be discussed at the workshop following the next meeting
0620-4	Contact details are to be sent to Vikki Roadley so they can be involved. *(Item 3/5: ITO concern regarding Komiti Ōritetanga)*	GD	Completed July 2020
0620-5	A working group is now required to take this further. An advisory committee meeting is being held next week; the first action of the working group is to tidy the document ready to take to the advisory committee. *(Item 7: Delegations)*	DY(C)/NH/ KH/LT/LG	August 2020
0620-6	A working group is to be formed to get a framework defined for how each of the subsidiaries can plan for new programme development.	SS(C)/GB/ NC/OM	Completed July 2020
0620-7	A draft statement to the subsidiaries around what to consider will be created and circulated for input. *(Item 12: Consideration of impaired performance due to Covid-19)*	CC/VR/NW	Completed July 2020
0620-8	An audit/stocktake is to be undertaken to see what already exists within the subsidiaries and ITOs and to assess the effectiveness of the existing processes. This will provide a starting point for a network. *(Item 13: Discipline Networks).*	All	To be discussed in further detail at the workshop following the next meeting

1.2.2   Other Matters Arising
- Clarification was sought on the academic architecture of NZIST and subsidiaries. Further information is required on the how the delegations will work across the system. NZIST will provide further clarification.
- A request to share information more widely with the subsidiaries was made. Minutes will be posted to the NZIST website and information provided regularly to subsidiaries.

- Could subsidiary websites link to the minutes? NZIST will ensure minutes are made more readily available to the subsidiaries in the future.
- It was noted that from the point of view of company law and the way company is structured that Academic Board doesn't have a direct line to the Academic Committees of the subsidiaries. In terms of company structures the Academic Board would need to provide a recommendation or resolution to the NZIST council who would then provide a direction to the board of subsidiary who would then provide a direction to the Subsidiary Academic Committee.
- However, NZIST as a parent entity can identify policies and procedures to operate under with regards to the academic architecture by establishing a clear statement and set of policy and procedures how the academic architecture and infrastructure works across the group. This will help with some clear delegations in place and making those relationships much cleaner and direct. Work will be undertaken on establishing a clear set of policies and procedures with regard to delegations and academic architecture across NZIST group.
- A suggestion was made to ensure that clear statements go to the subsidiaries to clarify the roles of the subsidiary academic committees so that staff are more certain of the requirements.

2.   Academic Reports to Council May and June

Chris Collins spoke to this item and noted much of the discussion had already occurred in the previous section.

3.   Update from Academic Harmonization Project

The following points were noted:
- There was a desire by council to replace the word "harmonisation" with excellence
- This was to avoid interpretations that harmonisation was an averaging exercise of all activity and Council wanted to ensure an aspirational approach.
- It was decided that Poari Akoranga would work on a name at a workshop following the next meeting and would ask Project Lead Phil Kerr to give the matter some thought.
- The overall purpose of this project is to establish a fit-for-purpose and best practice NZIST regulatory framework that is learner centric with consistency across the network and ensure from a learner's perspective it is easier to move around the network of provision by having one set of academic regulations and policies, instead of 16.
- There was agreement to work from a set of principles and not to over complicate.
- It was raised that Poari Akoranga should consider how the harmonizing of a learner's journey who might not want to stay within the vocational sector could work. Could pathways be developed to one of the degrees offered throughout the University network within NZ or globally? Consideration needs to be wider than just NZIST.
- It was noted that this would sit within the nature of the accreditation that our degrees currently hold. For example, are they internationally recognised for credit transfer purposes? Portability should be looked at both nationally and regionally.
- It was noted that NZQA does currently use benchmarking with Australia from level 1 to 10 and there are 47 countries that have referencing with New Zealand for international recognition.
- It was noted that in the subsidiaries positive feedback has been received on the use of the word Harmonization and it provides a useful message when discussing collaboration.
- The project is likely to be more complicated than originally thought due to the need to ensure good engagement with ITOs and this may extend the time frame.
- Phil Ker is to liaise with the CE to establish new time frames.   **ACTION: Chris Collins / Stephen Town / Phil Ker.**

4.   Update on the Ōritetanga TOR

Kieran Hewitson reported:

- Need to establish how this work fits with other work at NZIST.
- Foundations need to be set so that this committee can then be tasked with measuring how well the NZIST network is doing against those parameters.

- Council has reinforced that an equity lens must be applied in all activity at NZIST.

5. Update on Work on Type 2 Changes and NZIST framework

Deborah Young spoke to this report. The following points were noted:
- Early meetings held to continue the new academic architecture work
- Reviewed with NZQA advisory group and ITP Academic Managers group. Further changes to be made before presenting to Poari Akoranga.
- Type 2 changes require only internal consultation and internal quality assurance approval. Recommendations to come from the Subsidiary Academic Committees.
- Poari Akoranga needs to develop ways to capture the information about changes within the network.
- Need to ensure that TEC and NZQA have clear consistency on this.

6. Update on New Programme Development Planning Framework

Sue Smart spoke to this and the following points were noted:
- The meeting was conducted by zoom and thanks were noted to all who had taken part.
- Need to understand what business as usual looks like.
- Now that clarification has come from Council about the role of Poari Akoranga it is important to meet again and think outside the square and consider what a qualification might look like post 2022.
- The possibility was raised of a pilot so that an opportunity was created where everyone can then work together and come together as a network.
- Developing and using some type of principles to work under for the next 2 years may be helpful.
- Also need to consider work around consistency. For example - What are we developing? What type 2's are we doing? Is there someone else that has got these at the moment? Do we really need to develop them or has someone else already got them?
- NMIT is looking at collaboration from a totally different mindset as are other ITPs and ITOs The message about harmonization and collaboration is coming through as well as the need to work together without competition.
- The ITP Academic Managers group discussed at their meeting about how sharing now works. Some clarification and direction is required so that we can move forward and understand if this means we no longer need MOUs or to charge for the use of resources.
- It was suggested that decisions are made about the type of arrangements. Should it be creative commons which is highly democratic and a positive thing to consider as an organisation and a board? This would send a great message about our intentions.
- Programme sharing principles or an interim list of principles to honour what we are beginning to do would support the work heading into 2022.
- The group will discuss and bring back further ideas. **ACTION: Sue Smart / Oonagh McGirr / Kieran Hewitson/ Neil Carroll**
- The message is to share it and ensure we are moving to a space where there are sensible decisions around delivery and what a single the network looks like and how it operates.
- Need to ensure high quality material is being disseminated across the wider network.
- It is important to consider that care needs to be taken to respect rohe across New Zealand when taking teaching and learning into new regions. This is very important for Māori and something that needs to be discussed as it can challenge a way of being and this needs to be considered and resolved.

7. Establishing Policy & Procedures for Academic Architecture Operations

Vikki Roadley spoke to this item and the following points were noted:
- Had a very clear and helpful signal from Council around their thinking about what they want the focus of Academic Board to be and how to work.
- To discuss and explore more fully in face-face meeting.

8.   National Academic Committee Terms of Reference and Membership

Chris Collins spoke to this item and the following points were noted:
- These will be reconsidered at the next meeting.
- Group to go away and look at the TORs and those structure of those committees in light of feedback from Council.
- To consider - Is it still fit for purpose? Does it still have a valuable and important role to play in terms of the network and provision across NZIST? Does the language of the TOR reflect what is intended?
- Move that this is a major agenda item for the next meeting.
- A summary of other work streams will be useful to see the overall work and activity at NZIST.   Several pieces may be sitting in other work streams and need to manage the efforts and work across the network and work smart. Summary documents to be brought to next meeting   **ACTION: Vikki Roadley**
- Workstream activity that is academic or impacts on academic work such as the RPL working group should come to Poari Akoranga for discussion and/or approval. Overviews of other activity to come to meetings.   **ACTION: Vikki Roadley**

9.   EER Update

The following points were noted:
- There is consideration at present about what the purpose and scope of EERs should be. This group should be involved in this.
- The CEs have been involved in this and how EER might look across the subsidiaries. It is important that EER is fit for purpose in this context.
- Engagement is going on between the CEs and NZQA and also the NZQA advisory group.
- Some noted that not all subsidiaries are currently invited to all meetings about EER and it was considered important that all subsidiaries are invited.

10.   Defining and Building a NZIST Programme Portfolio

Vikki Roadley spoke to this and the following point was noted:
- With the direction and clarification from Council work needs to be started to develop what the new world will look like.
- To begin this discussion at the next face to face meeting
- Need to ensure that a wide range of staff are involved.

11.   Update from Council

Stephen Town updated the meeting from the Council
- The strong message from the Council is business as usual at the institutional/subsidiary level and for work to as uninterrupted and as successful as it can be and taking a high trust environment.
- This message is to be passed back to all the networks.
- Academic Committees are already operating and have operated well in the past.
- There is not a desire to create a deep hierarchical chain.
- The academic board should not try to rush to the final terms of reference and seek perfection as they are likely to be evolving.
- Council did not approve the TOR not because they were unhappy with them but more because they think there is some more refinement to take place through conversation both at the AB level and with subsidiaries.
- Council are keen for the TORs to focus on post-2022 and what does that new world look like and what should the academic board be getting ready to be doing in 18 months' time.
- Academic Board should try to avoid having things on the agenda that should remain with the academic committees within the network.

- Some confusion over the national committees and that they were creating too many layers. Council urged Academic Board to look at those TOR to make sure that we are not creating a very structured and deep bureaucratic process that doesn't do what we think that new world should look like in the future.
- Council is looking for Academic Board to have the space to focus on the new world rather than focusing on the nitty gritty day to day which people have been doing very well at most places across the network.
- An important discipline to the preparation of the academic board agenda may be that that one or two people are able to say, "why is this on our agenda?" and be prepared to pass it on to another agenda where is it more appropriate.
- There is a need to socialise this principle centrally, at the subsidiaries and with TEC and NZQA so that everyone understands the role of each part of the academic architecture. Need to define "What is the new business as usual now and up to 2022?"
- Need to consider how information is going to flow and whether National Subcommittees need to be in place now. The new tier 2 roles will also be important to have in place to work out functions.
- From an ITO perspective keeping the TORs open and encouraging them to evolve is very wise. There are a lot of people who do not understand what academic regulations are and what needs to be in place to support the transitions.
- Information needs to be shared. These meetings are open to staff and students of NZIST and it is important that this is an evolving piece of work that is going to keep progressing and developing.
- It was raised whether some of the working group activity that is currently happening may be more useful than sub-committees at this stage. For example, the research directors are gathering currently and information from them to this group would be helpful to shape that harmonization in 2022.
- The face to face meeting will be a useful time to work together to understand the need for National Committees.

12. Correspondence TEU

- Sue Smart was asked to take the Chair for this item.
- It was noted that this issue has not yet been to the EIT Subsidiary Academic Committee and it was questioned whether it was appropriate for this group to discuss without this. Given the direction from Council the EIT Committee should work through this.
- It was suggested that a submission be presented to the academic committee at EIT and brought back to Academic Board if need be.
- Michael Gilchrist noted that this was tabled at the Academic Committee but was postponed and this was noted in the letter. He noted concern if the view that was being promoted was that NZIST has no interest in changes that may occur at subsidiaries that could affect the future of harmonization or the future unification of the network.
- Michael asked that AB consider that the subsidiary, EIT, wait until decisions about harmonisation across the network are made before making the suggested changes. He noted that all other programmes in this area in the Bachelor of computing science in the country are run on a 2-semester per year basis not on a 4-term per year basis. These are 3-year degrees and that affects consistency across the network if that move is made. It was stated that in the end that the view may be taken that a 4-term year is the right one but the request to the board is to ask EIT to postpone or to delay that process while some determination can be made.
- Michael noted the discussions with Council and that the role of AB is still being formed. This was accepted however he pointed out that overtime there has to be a process and there cannot be a big bang on 1 January 2023. There has to be a process by which preparations are made for that changeover where there is a national network of provision is relatively smooth.
- The EIT Academic Committee have not looked at this yet and this is a necessary first step.
- It was suggested to go back to the Academic Committee at EIT and Academic Board asked that EIT take into consideration what is happening in other subsidiaries and make sure that it is consistent.
- Michael asked that and that the EIT Academic Committee take this on board, re-consider what they are doing, look at consistency across and also at viability of what students and staff are looking for. All

of these things need to be taken into consideration when the academic committee is making their decision.

- It was noted that they reserved the right to come back to NZIST board if that consideration has been made.
- Gordon Reid raised that one of the issues is that staff are not clear about what the Academic Committee is able to do. "I have been told that the Academic Committee might make a decision that says this should not go ahead but it does not have the power to enforce it". Gordon noted that it was unfortunate that the item was withdrawn off the EIT agenda and has not been discussed at the Academic Committee. The next Academic Committee meeting is on this coming Monday and it is the first agenda item.
- Sue Smart concluded that she hoped that the meeting went well and stated that if required the item could come back to Academic Board. She noted however that the group has been given the mandate from the Council that it is business as usual with Academic Committee and have a high trust in the subsidiaries from the Council to the subsidiaries.
- It was noted that EIT Academic Committee has very robust discussions and any learnings should be brought back to Academic Board.
- This reiterates the need to be clear about the role of Academic Board and Subsidiary Academic Committees. Issues such as international teaching and priorities and how delivery is structured ready for 2022 are being raised at the committees and some guidance would be useful.
- It was also noted that it would useful for Academic Committees to bring information to the Academic Board for consideration and to be informed on how this can happen.

13. Other Business

The following points were noted:
- It was raised at the Academic Managers meeting that interpretation is required on the use of common seals with contradictory information existing.
- Vikki to follow up.

ACTION: DY / VR / CC

14. Closure and Next Meeting

The next meeting is going to be a face to face meeting.

Vikki Roadley closed the meeting with a Karakia.

Next meeting date: 12 August 2020.

Future Meeting Dates

12 August 2020	Wellington
9 September 2020	Location tba
14 October 2020	Location tba
11 November 2020	Location tba
9 December 2020	Location tba

Summary of Action Items

	Detail	Owner	Due Date
0620-5	A working group is now required to take this further. An advisory committee meeting is being held next week; the first action of the working group is to tidy the document ready to take to the advisory committee. *(Item 7: Delegations)*	DY(C)/NH/KH/LT/LG	August
0620-6	A working group is to be formed to get a framework defined for how each of the subsidiaries can plan for new programme development.	SS(C)/GB/NC/OM	August
0720-1	Determine new timeline for excellence project for academic regulations	CC/PK/ST	August
0720-2	Provide workstream overview document for Academic Board information	VR	August
0720-3	Determine principles and framework for an audit/stocktake of current subsidiary and ITO networks	All	August
0720-4	Update RPL activity and other academic workstream activity	VR	August
0720-5	Follow up and clarify common seal subsidiary question	VR	August