

University Plan



# Learning and Teaching Plan

Revised  
26 October 2006  
Progress Report 26 July 2007

## INTRODUCTION

This Plan is part of the University's programme of high-level strategic plans which focus on those activities which underpin the eight Key Strategic Areas of the University Profile. The plan also reflects the key themes from the government's Tertiary Education Strategy and reiterated in its Statement of Tertiary Education Priorities (STEP) – 2005-2007, namely:

1. **Quality Teaching and Learning**  
To value, encourage, reward and celebrate excellence in teaching and learning.
2. **Teaching and Learning Capability**  
To support and further enhance key aspects of teaching and learning capabilities.
3. **Relevant Teaching and Learning**  
To ensure that curricula, teaching and modes of assessment are relevant to learners' needs and reflect accepted academic and professional standards.
4. **Access, Retention and Academic Success**  
To encourage the adoption of modes of teaching and academic support which will enhance access by appropriately qualified students and improve their rates of retention and success.

The Plan also recognizes the over-arching objective from the University's Profile, that is *to achieve excellence in curricula and teaching and learning to a standard appropriate to an international research-led university*.

Furthermore, the Academic Audit of 2005 made some specific recommendations which the University needs to address as a priority, in particular (a) implementation of professional development and review for academic staff; (b) enhancement and evaluation of e-learning; (c) identification of and assistance to students at risk of under-achieving. In addition, the self-review identified an urgent need for systematic benchmarking.

Within this environmental context, it is acknowledged that some areas of the University are experiencing significant constraints which could impact on the quality of teaching and learning. First priority, therefore, must be on ensuring quality does not diminish. The Plan emphasizes key activities which should be addressed to ensure quality is at least maintained, and, ideally, will be enhanced.

The Learning and Teaching Plan begins from the position that the University's primary mission is to facilitate effective learning for students. A critical factor in achieving effective learning is provision of excellent teaching. However learning and teaching take place in an institutional context comprising a range of factors which act as facilitators or impediments – ranging from (for example) admission standards of students to professional support for teachers to appropriate teaching and learning spaces for teachers and students.

This Plan reflects those factors which are considered by the Teaching and Learning Committee to be most important for the University, as a whole, at this time, given the context outlined above. Other factors might be more or less important for different parts of the University (Colleges; Schools) and at other times (in the future perhaps). A key challenge for us is how we know that we are meeting the two priorities of effective learning and excellent teaching, and what standards we require or should aim towards for the factors described here as contextual. This challenge introduces the third component of the Plan, namely the development of appropriate institutional benchmarks. These benchmarks might also function as KPIs.

The University Learning and Teaching Plan should be regarded as a framework for the development of institutional operational plans and College strategic plans. It indicates areas which should be considered in relation to the University's overall objective. Actual activities put in place by Colleges, schools and departments will reflect the relevance, utility and feasibility of these areas and objectives for each College, Department or School.

The Learning and Teaching Plan requires Pro-Vice-Chancellors, UCTL and APPU to report annually to Academic Board on progress related to the Plan for their College or Department. The first review will be by 30 June 2007. The plan will then be reviewed in September 2007 and thereafter on an annual basis.

Dr Jan Cameron  
**Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic)**

October 2006

## STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES 2007-2008

Strategic Objective	Strategic Priorities 2007-2008
<b>1. Ensure Effective Learning</b>	1. Develop appropriate benchmark measures for high quality learning and academic standards at both discipline level and at University level.
	2. Evaluate impediments to access and retention for students, in particular for Maori and Pasifika and adult students, and develop and implement a plan to address these.
	3. Evaluate the barriers to high standards of learning achievement, in particular for Maori and Pasifika students, and develop a plan to address these.
	4. Explore and develop, where appropriate, non-conventional modes of delivery which will enhance access, in particular for adult students who are in the workforce and for regional students seeking transition opportunities
	5. Develop, support and evaluate various e-learning technologies, to ensure they are appropriate to the discipline and course objectives, and enhance student learning.
	6. Assess the relevance of qualifications, curricula, assessment practices and graduate profiles to student, community and professional needs and expectations (including international comparability) and plan revisions as appropriate.
<b>2. Encourage, Support and Reward Excellent Teaching</b>	1. Develop appropriate benchmark measures for high quality teaching at both discipline level and at University level.
	2. Evaluate the barriers to high standards of teaching, in particular in disciplines with high student:staff ratios and where there are significant numbers of students for whom English is not a first language, and develop plans to address these.
	3. Identify key capability needs among teaching staff and develop professional development resources to address these.
	4. Develop and implement a University-wide teaching professional development programme, including provision within College budgets for teaching development, ensuring staff access these opportunities and are acknowledged for the progress they make.
	5. Enhance the use of e-teaching and e-learning for campus-based students, including ensuring the provision and use of both pedagogical and technological support and appropriate time allowance for staff to engage in development of courses.
	6. Develop and implement a systematic review of teaching and learning infrastructure, to ensure this meets benchmarked standards appropriate to a university of international quality.

## KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ACTIVITIES

The following table identifies both measurable key performance indicators and also key activities which need to occur at College and institutional level to meet the Strategic Objectives. The KPIs represent existing measures. The benchmarking processes itemized under the two Strategic Objectives will contribute to future KPIs which in some cases will be more appropriate.

The Key Activities listed in the following table are institution-wide activities. Colleges need to assist their Departments and Schools to determining how they might most appropriately work within the framework of these activities at their own level. Constraints on some activities might well mean the development or re-emphasis on others – for example, if one accepts that teacher-student interaction is fundamental to effective teaching (Strategic Objective 1) and a School is unable to offer tutorials as the conventional way of achieving this interaction, then that School would need to develop alternative ways of compensating for this loss. The alternatives might be quite discipline-specific. The key objective, however, is (in this example) to maintain the interaction. College Plans, and Teaching and Learning or Academic committees, are key vehicles for planning these activities.

Key Activities	Forecast 2006	Milestone 2007	Milestone 2008	Responsibility	Status June 07
<b>1.1 and 2.1 Benchmarking</b>	Systematic portfolio of benchmarking measures developed	Benchmarking plan developed and trialled against Learning and Teaching Plan	Benchmarking plan used to assess achievement of Strategic Objectives of Learning and Teaching Plan	APPU with AC and TLC	Benchmarking project established; currently focuses on teaching & learning evaluation
<b>1.2 Identify and address impediments to access and retention for students</b>	Retention analysis part of routine UCTL reporting	New analysis of access; Retention analysis provides basis for development of Retention and Access Plan	On-going analysis; implementation of Retention and Access Plan	UCTL and APPU assisted by Marketing, Student Services(analysis) and PVCs (implementation)	Student Admin survey of withdrawing students latter part of 2007 should identify some retention barriers.
<b>1.3 Identify and address barriers to student achievement</b>	Assessment of GPAs against admission criteria part of on-going UCTL reporting	Assessment of GPAs against admission criteria.  Research includes review of literature and local analysis to assess barriers; evaluation of local strategies (eg; academic progress; mentoring)	Assessment of GPAs against admission criteria.  Development of long term Plan which introduces new strategies or identifies existing strategies which will enhance achievement	UCTL with Academic Skills Centre (analysis) and PVCs (development and implementation)	UCTL research to identify NCEA predictors of student achievement – methodology development in consultation with Principals; work with subject convenors to identify discipline-specific predictors.

Key Activities	Forecast 2006	Milestone 2007	Milestone 2008	Responsibility	Status June 07
1.4 Encourage non-conventional modes of delivery	Web-enabled courses widespread; need identified to focus on increasing sophistication; identify courses appropriate for own-time own-place learning	Identify significant barriers to further development of web-enabled learning and alternative modes of delivery; increase number of own-time own-place courses; develop and implement plan to address these	Implement plan , evaluate effectiveness of learning from courses offered in alternative modes; provide support for further development of such courses	UCTL (analysis and evaluation), with Marketing (identification of courses) and PVCs (identification of courses and support for development)	<p>Courses under development for flexible delivery in Linguistics; Computer Forensics; European Studies.</p> <p><b>Education: Significant number of courses offered in 'non-conventional' modes. Courses for further development of web-enabled learning and alternative modes of delivery will be identified as part of the process of course and programme review over 2007-2009.</b></p> <p><b>Engineering: Block course model is used where appropriate (professional masters in engineering)</b></p> <p>Science: have recently begun discussions on capturing 'different' student markets by using different delivery methods – this came out of a College Think Tank as part of our planning process.</p> <p><b>Arts: being considered as part of the Arts Future Project</b></p> <p>LAW: Trialling video for web broadcasting of Law of Evidence. All core Law courses have presence on WebCT/Blackboard and all staff encouraged to make use of technology. School is collaborating</p>

					in a 3-year project with UCTL “Unlocking Student Learning”. Project employs TLEIs to improve learning outcomes for students in the School’s largest course by student numbers. Modes of delivery may be subject to Council of Legal Education approval.
<b>1.5 Develop, support and evaluate various e-learning technologies</b>	Approval for additional e-learning support; restructure of ITS enhances pedagogical/technical synergy; WebCTv6 support	Additional e-learning support; evaluate existing technologies (including Interact from CCE); develop ongoing e-learning Plan	Implement Plan; ongoing evaluation	UCTL (development, evaluation and support); PVCs (support for academic staff)	<p>Project plan for evaluation of LMSs initiated.</p> <p><b>Arts: No formal monetary support at present</b></p> <p><b>Education: Interact already in use in COED. Contribute to the UC evaluation of Blackboard, Interact and Moodle as platforms. Promote the participation of other UC faculty in e-teaching/e-learning qualifications. Develop ongoing e-learning plan for further development of courses and support of faculty in this development and on-going delivery.</b></p> <p><b>Science: We plan to discuss technologies with UCTL in light of discussions in 1.4 above.</b></p> <p><b>LAW: Students complete evaluation surveys as part of the “Unlocking Student Learning” project referred to in 1.4 above.</b></p>
<b>1.6 Ensure relevance of qualifications,</b>	Pilot Programme review protocol on 2006 reviews; evaluate protocol; review	Reviews to schedule; evaluation of assessment practices	Reviews to schedule; ongoing review of protocol; evaluation of	APPU and Academic Managers	MEFE; BE(Hons) reviews completed; BA review proposals under consultation; BSc; BSpC and

<p><b>curricula, assessment practices and graduate profiles</b></p>	<p>assessment for compressed courses</p>	<p>(phase 1 – selected Schools)</p>	<p>assessment practices (phase 2 – selected Schools)</p>	<p>(programme reviews); UCTL (assessment review); PVCs (support for reviews and development of assessment practices)</p>	<p>education &amp; teaching programme reviews planned.</p> <p><b>Arts: Reviews of other degrees such as the BA Honours will follow. Assessment practices will form an inevitable part of this.</b></p> <p><b>Education: Review will span period 2007-2009 and will include review of assessment procedures.</b></p> <p><b>Science: The graduate profile will be considered as part of the BSc review which is taking place in 2007.</b></p> <p><b>LAW: Currently engaged in review of LLM including structure, content, assessment and degree regulatory framework. Full curriculum review at pre-initiation stage. Law curriculum subject to statutory oversight (and approvals) by Council of Legal Education.</b></p>
<p><b>2.2 Assess and address barriers to high standards of teaching</b></p>	<p>Non-systematic knowledge</p>	<p>Colleges to assess barriers to high standards of teaching and develop Plans to address these</p>	<p>Implement Plans and initiate ongoing evaluation of effectiveness</p>	<p>PVCs, in conjunction with Academic Departments/Schools, assisted by UCTL</p>	<p><b>Arts: Ongoing part of PD&amp;R</b></p> <p><b>Education: COED has identified that workload issues may present a barrier to high standards of teaching given the beginning research profile of most faculty and additional administration that is now expected as part of a workload in UC. COED Executive to</b></p>

		<p><b>strategise for development of equitable workloads.</b></p> <p><b>Science: This will be part of the BSc review.</b></p> <p>LAW: School's Teaching &amp; Learning Committee is active throughout the year and is currently engaged in drafting School of Law <i>Learning and Teaching Plan</i>. Individual staff-level issues are addressed in annual PD &amp; R process. Departmental academic allowance criteria include relevance to teaching development.</p>
--	--	---

Key Activities	Forecast 2006	Milestone 2007	Milestone 2008	Responsibility	Status June 07
<p><b>2.3 Identify capability needs among teaching staff and develop professional development</b></p>	<p>UCTL workshops; self-referral to UCTL; Teaching Score analysis identifies some need</p>	<p>Heads of academic departments/schools to identify capability needs; UCTL to develop programme to address these</p>	<p>UCTL professional development activities to meet capability objectives</p>	<p>Heads of academic Departments/Schools (identification of need); PVCs (support for development and implementation of Professional Development Plans); UCTL provision of professional development</p>	<p><b>Arts: Support is given when possible whenever requests are made.</b></p> <p><b>Education: Discussion of the process to establish needs of staff will take place in the second semester 2007. This will be linked to a career planning process and/or peer support process. This is yet to be discussed by faculty and will be developed in consultation with UCTL.</b></p> <p><b>Engineering: This is one of the expected outcomes of the PD&amp;R process in the College of Engineering.</b></p> <p><b>Science: This is an important facet of the College's PD&amp;R process which began in 2007.</b></p> <p><b>LAW: Support is given when possible whenever requests are made and as issues arise in the course of the annual PD &amp; R meetings. Departmental academic allowance criteria include relevance to teaching development.</b></p>
<p><b>2.4 Implement University-wide teaching professional development programme</b></p>	<p>University Professional Development Plan introduced</p>	<p>Professional Development Plans implemented; % of College budget identified for teaching</p>	<p>On-going implementation of Professional Development Plans; % of College budget</p>	<p>PVCs (implementation and support); UCTL (provision of professional</p>	<p><b>Arts: Formally underway in all 11 schools.</b></p> <p><b>Education: Staff to be advised of purpose of PD&amp;R with</b></p>

		development support	identified for teaching development support	development)	<p><b>implementation to take place during 2008. Monetary amount identified to support professional development, incl. professional teaching development.</b></p> <p>LAW: No %age of School budget is identified for teaching development support in 2007 but will be identified for 2008 once the School's Learning &amp; Teaching Plan is finalised. For 2007 PD &amp; R interviews to be conducted by Acting HoD for staff below level of Associate Professor and by PVC for Assoc Prof and above.</p>
<p><b>2.5 Enhance the use of e-teaching and e-learning</b></p>	<p>Approval for additional e-learning support; development grants for e-learning</p>	<p>Colleges plan for academic staff time devoted to e-learning development of courses; additional e-learning development support from UCTL</p>	<p>e-learning development built into College Plans and individual Professional Development Plans as appropriate</p>	<p>UCTL (professional support); PVCs and Heads of academic Departments/Schools (time and budgetary support)</p>	<p><b>Arts: No financial support available at College level at present.</b></p> <p><b>Education: Staff from COED will work with UCTL to provide UC-wide Professional Development in e-teaching/e-learning. Diplomas for faculty as collaborative investigation of teaching. Time allocated yet to be discussed with UCTL.</b></p> <p>Science: Currently used as back-up for conventional teaching methodologies. Will be considered in discussions relating to 1.4 and 1.5 above.</p> <p>LAW: School is collaborating in a 3-</p>

					<p>year project with UCTL “Unlocking Student Learning”. Project employs TLEIs to improve learning outcomes for students in the School’s largest course by student numbers.</p>
<p><b>2.6 Carry out systematic review of teaching and learning infrastructure</b></p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Plan and carry out systematic review, informed by good practice guidelines</p>	<p>Develop prioritised action plan and assess feasibility; begin implementation of action plan</p>	<p>Facilities Management with UCTL, advised by and advisory to SMT</p>	<p>Discussion with FM and FAC on consultation strategies.</p> <p><b>Education: Infrastructure is currently under review and renewal; 13 new photocopiers and more to come. Workroom computers are being progressively upgraded and printers are in order. Capex requests sought from schools. Lecture theatres to be upgraded during Christmas vacation at the end of 2007. Evaluation of facilities at regional centres is on-going.</b></p> <p>Science: Discussions with FM about refurbishing Science lecture theatres are just beginning.</p> <p>LAW: Other than Law library and access to online research sites, Law does not demand significant discipline specific infrastructure – e.g. no labs. The Law librarian sits on Faculty and spending on library is in the annual capital plan. PD &amp; R process will allow specific staff/course infrastructure needs to be identified.</p>

Key Performance Indicators	Indicator	Actual 2006	Estimate 2007	Estimate 2008	Responsibility	Status June 07
1.2 Access and retention of students	% Maori EFTS;	4.8%	5.6%	5.6%	Marketing, Student Services and PVCs	5.5%
	% Pasifika EFTS	1.9%	2.1%	2.1%		2.0%
	low decile;	7.2% first year	7.2% first year	7.2% first year		6.8%
	% Adult students EFTS	21%	27%	27%		27%
	First Year retention rates					Academic staff; Student Services
	Maori;	70%	72%	72%		70%
	Pasifika;	79%	79%	80%		78%
	low decile;	85%	85%	85%		85%
	adult students	69%	72%	75%		72%
	“all students”	81%	81%	81%		81%
	# of academic progress advice letters	600	680	≥ 720	APPU and Academic Managers	No action until after semester 1
1.3 Student achievement	Mean Ugrad GPA				Academic Staff; Student Services (WASS)	End of year
	Maori	3.1	3.2	3.3		
	Pasifika,	1.7 <sup>1</sup>	2.0	2.5		
	adult students	3.3	3.3	3.3		
	“all students”	3.6	3.6	3.6		
	Mean GPA by admission category				Academic Staff; Student Services (WASS)	End of year
	UE	3.9	3.9	3.9		
	Ad eundem	2.8	2.9	2.9		
	Adult	3.3	3.3	3.3		
	Discretionary/Special	3.7	3.7	3.7		
# graduating <sup>2</sup>				Academic Staff; Student Services (WASS)	End of Year	
Maori	119	113				
Pasifika	46	59				
# of NZVCC and Bright Futures Top Achiever Doctoral Scholarships				Academic Staff; SMT	End of Year	
		31	35	≥ 35		

Key Performance Indicators	Indicator	Actual 2006	Estimate 2007	Estimate 2008	Responsibility	Status June 07
<b>1.4 Non-conventional modes of delivery</b>	% of web-enabled courses	75% (790)	≥75%	>75%	Academic Staff; UCTL	52% <sup>3</sup>
	% of courses offered in non-conventional mode (eg; own time/own place; block; evening)	<1.0%	1.7%		PVCs; Academic Staff; UCTL	19% <sup>4</sup>
<b>1.5 Support of various e-learning technologies</b>	# of FTE staff dedicated to development and support of e-learning pedagogy and technology	1.5	3.0	3.5	UCTL	7 <sup>5</sup>
<b>1.6 Qualifications, curricula, assessment practices and graduate profiles</b>	# of programme reviews	4	32 <i>(incl former CCE quals)</i>	≥ 36 <i>(incl former CCE quals)</i>	APPU; Academic Managers; PVCs	4 <i>(includes 8 qualifications)</i>
	# of new programmes/majors	3 <i>(2 subject to CUAP approval – excludes CCE)</i>	5	≥ 5	Deans; PVCs	5 <i>(subject to CUAP approval)</i>
	# of programmes/majors deleted	0	1 <sup>6</sup>	? <i>(est 10 former CCE)</i>	Deans; PVCs	0
	# of programmes gaining professional accreditation	4	9 <sup>7</sup>	6 <sup>8</sup>	PVCs	2
	# of appeals related to assessment	3	5	5	Academic Staff; Deans	3
<b>2.2 Standards of teaching</b>	% of courses evaluated scoring >4.0	48% <i>(n=648)</i>	48%	50%	Academic Staff; Heads of Dept/School	End of year
	% of courses evaluated scoring <3.0	3% <i>(n=648)</i>	3.5%	<3.5%	Academic Staff; Heads of Dept/School	End of year
	% of students surveyed who thought their course was of “good quality”	72% <i>(n=648 courses)</i>	73%	≥ 73%	Academic Staff; Heads of Dept/School	End of year

Key Performance Indicators	Indicator	Actual 2006	Estimate 2007	Estimate 2008	Responsibility	Status June 07
<b>2.3 Building capability of teaching staff</b>	# of staff enrolled in tertiary teaching qualifications (FTEs)	16	18	≥ 18	PVCs	16
	# of new staff enrolled in teaching induction courses (FTEs)	23	25	≥ 25	PVCs	22
	Number and value of Teaching Development Grants	12 \$100,000	15 \$100,000	≥ 17 ≥ \$100,000	Chair, TLC	10 \$93,674.48
<b>2.4 University-wide teaching professional development programme</b>	% of College budget identified for teaching development support	TBA			PVCs	Arts: ~ 1%
<b>2.5 Enhance the use of e-teaching and e-learning</b>	% of web-enabled courses	75% (790)	75%	≥ 75%	Academic Staff	52% <sup>9</sup>
	% of teaching staff engaged in e-learning development	50%	60%	65%	Academic staff; PVCs	68% <sup>10</sup>
<b>2.6 Teaching and learning infrastructure</b>	<i>Indicator not yet developed</i>				Chair, FAC	<i>Indicator not yet developed</i>

<sup>1</sup> Low average GPA for Pasifika students is largely a consequence of a large proportion (71/237) with a 0 GPA – these students presumably did not complete but did not formally withdraw. Improved academic advice should therefore lift this GPA considerably (Average GPA for those who completed in 2006 was 2.4).

<sup>2</sup> 2006 actual; 2007 estimate is the number identifying as “final year” at enrolment, out of total enrolled 905 Maori students and 347 Pasifika.

<sup>3</sup> This was calculated by Bob Hall who notes the following: The drop in the proportion of web-enabled courses is a reflection of two main factors: (1) the impact of the merger with the Christchurch College of Education; and (2) the introduction of a new University web-based teaching system. At the time of merger Christchurch College of Education already had its own web-based teaching system (StudentNet). The merger therefore not only added to the University’s list of courses but also added new web-enabled courses. This increase was more than offset, however, by the fact that the University’s transition from one web-enabled teaching system (WebCT) to the other (Blackboard) provided opportunities for house cleaning and rationalisation which resulted in quite a number of inactive “web-enabled” courses being identified and dropped. Overall then, the increase in web-enabled courses didn’t match the much larger increase in all courses – hence the proportional drop. Workings: Number of web-enabled courses = 1,700 (Blackboard 1,300; StudentNet 400); Total number of courses = 4,543; Number of courses with enrolments as at June 30, 2007 = 3,290; 1,700 as a proportion of 3,290 = 52%.

---

<sup>4</sup> The number of “non-conventional mode courses” is a total of course *occurrences* (628) that have a Site of Distance, Extramural, Nelson, Rotorua, Tauranga, or New Plymouth. Virtually all come from the College of Education. Course **occurrences** are used because some courses are offered in dual mode. Some of the non-conventional courses counted have more than one instance – for example EDUC151 is offered both by “Distance” and at “Rotorua”. Only course occurrences with non-zero enrolments in the current year are counted because there are many courses set up for special topics etc which are unused at any given time. However this may wrongly exclude some courses for which enrolments for the second or summer semesters have not completed. No attempt has been made to distinguish foundation, postgraduate and thesis courses from undergraduate degrees.

<sup>5</sup> This is the number in the Flexible Learning Group at UCTL, not including the Video Production Coordinator, which includes 3 staff transferred from CCE and 2 new staff members. With the Video Production Coordinator the number would be 8; discounting some of the Deputy Director’s time, which is spread across the whole of UCTL, it would be about 6.5.

<sup>6</sup> Grad Cert Social Work – to CUAP R2

<sup>7</sup> 8 Engineering programmes, plus MBA

<sup>8</sup> All teacher education programmes

<sup>9</sup> See note 3.

<sup>10</sup> The number of designers/controllers of Blackboard (404) and StudentNet (180) courses as a percentage of academic staff numbers (853 - headcount). If all “teaching staff” are counted a further 734 staff members should be added to the denominator, making the proportion 37%. The designers/controllers of Blackboard and StudentNet courses will not necessarily all be academics; and there may well be academics who are active in e-learning development not counted in that number, but this is the best proxy we have.