

Submission on Tāraia Te Anamata

From Te Pūkenga: Unitec and MIT

Contents

List of Recommendations	3
List of Suggestions.....	8
List of Acronyms.....	9
Introduction	10
1 Ako Delivery	10
1.1 Ways of working – Ako Delivery and Academic Centre & Learning Systems	10
1.2 Ako Delivery Teams.....	11
1.3 National Operations Directorate	11
1.4 Recognition of Prior Learning	12
1.5 Trades Academy	12
1.6 Kaiako Capability.....	13
1.7 Pasifika Cultural Responsiveness	14
1.8 Examinations Administration.....	14
1.9 Complaints and Appeals	14
1.10 Local Presence.....	15
1.11 Ako Delivery Team Transition Risks	15
2 Academic Centre and Learning Systems (ACLS).....	16
2.1 Ako Solutions – Nomenclature	16
2.2 Ako Network roles in ACLS and Ako Delivery	16
3 Office of Te Tiriti Outcomes (OTTE)	17
3.1 Partnership Responsibilities.....	17
3.2 Te Pūkenga Values	17
3.3 Relationship Management Clarity and Connectedness.....	17
3.4 Mātauranga Māori for Kaimahi.....	18
4 Learner and Employer Experience and Attraction (LEEA).....	18
4.1 The Learner Journey	18
4.2 Customer Insights	18
4.3 Marketing.....	19
4.4 Branding.....	19
4.5 Pastoral Support for International Learners	19
4.6 Structural Commitment to Equity Groups	20
4.7 Accountability and Responsibility for Ākonga Success	20
4.8 Events.....	20
4.9 Responsiveness to Niche Provision.....	21
5 Office of the Chief Executive (OCE).....	22

5.1	Communication.....	22
5.2	Risk and Assurance.....	22
5.3	Council Secretariat	23
5.4	Government Relations	23
5.5	Strategy & Performance	24
5.6	Māori Engagement.....	24
6	Other Matters	24
6.1	Bilingual Nomenclature.....	24
6.2	Minor Impact	25
6.3	Relationship with Digital	25
6.4	Research, Scholarship and Enterprise.....	26
6.5	Regional/Local Uniqueness	27
6.6	Branding	27
7	Feedback on Process.....	27
7.1	Changes to the Proposal	27
7.2	Recruitment Process	27
7.3	Comparable Roles	29
7.4	Recruitment Perspectives	30
7.5	Phase Two	30
7.6	Handover Arrangements.....	30
7.7	Legacy Systems, Products and Processes	30
7.8	Business Continuity During Transition.....	31

List of Recommendations

Recommendations are our proposed changes to the Proposal/

Recommendation 1.	That formal mechanisms are set up to ensure that kaiako across all modes and domains of delivery have the opportunity to engage and work together with ACLS and LEEA. Such mechanisms could include working groups, advisory boards, committee structures, a range of communication channels, and cross-functional group.....	10
Recommendation 2.	That Team Leaders have authority to establish Team structures, including staffing hierarchies of no more than two layers, within parameters determined in accordance with the Delegations Framework, Ako Delivery regional senior leadership and approved budgets.	11
Recommendation 3.	That Team Leaders be called Ako Delivery Managers.....	11
Recommendation 4.	That further consideration be given to clarifying the level of impact on people leaders below current Heads of School, with a view to ensuring fairness of opportunity to the new leadership roles.	11
Recommendation 5.	That the National Operations Directorate should be renamed (perhaps National Ako Delivery Director) to avoid confusion with other roles and better reflect its core purpose.....	12
Recommendation 6.	That the Proposal clarify where responsibility for assessment of non-formal, informal and precedent-setting formal prior learning sits.	12
Recommendation 7.	That the position of Recognition of Prior Learning Domain Lead be clarified.	12
Recommendation 8.	That pathways and transition kaimahi for Trades Academy are located within the Regional Domain Head Foundation and Pathways	12
Recommendation 9.	That there be a Kaiako Capability team within the National Operations Directorate, and that the team include four Regional Kaiako Capability Leads, each of which has responsibility for ensuring there is local capability support.....	13
Recommendation 10.	That the Kaiako Capability team have responsibility for fostering the scholarship of learning & teaching and using that to ensure that it supports kaiako teaching activity of the highest quality.	14
Recommendation 11.	That dedicated Pacific Centres are retained in Rohe 1 with a regional Pacific Director and team.....	14
Recommendation 12.	That within each of the Site Operations Manager roles adequate provision be made for exam administration, including at least an Examinations Administrator and an adequate budget for casuals.	14
Recommendation 13.	That specific roles be established for Student Advocates, Complaints Officers and Appeals Officers at each Site, and that these be managed within the Regional Operational Directorate, managed by each site's Learner Services Manager.	15

Recommendation 14.	That further clarification be provided as to the structure and roles of localised support positions under the Ako Delivery directorate.	15
Recommendation 15.	That, should Heads of School and other academic leadership positions and positions involved in grade resulting be disestablished, the disestablishment not take effect before the end of the 2023 year in order to ensure business continuity for, at least, final marking and resulting processes.	15
Recommendation 16.	That Team Leaders be appointed, even if they overlap in time with the continuity of Heads of School as indicated in Recommendation 16. above	16
Recommendation 17.	That, to avoid confusion, the Learning and Development Manager and the Learning and Development Product Manager titles are replaced with titles that highlight the differences between the roles and functions.	16
Recommendation 18.	That the relationships between Ako Network roles in ACLS and Ako Delivery are explicitly acknowledged in job descriptions.	16
Recommendation 19.	That, to avoid confusion, Ako Network and Domain roles be prefaced with National or Regional (as appropriate) in every instance in which they are used.	16
Recommendation 20.	That Te Tiriti Outcomes include roles to ensure a partnership approach to addressing equity outcomes for ākongā.	17
Recommendation 21.	That a framework be established which shows the interoperability of kaimahi and kaiako with Pou Ārahi, regional co-leaders, Tiriti Partnership Director & Māori Engagement Director to have greater visibility of relationship management and where individual kaimahi can see where they fit and how they contribute to this mahi.	17
Recommendation 22.	That the structure (perhaps within PCW) includes specific and sufficient provision for Māori capability development for kaimahi and kaiako.	18
Recommendation 23.	That the proposed Customer Insights FTE be reviewed in order to ensure sufficient capacity for providing a proactive insights function.	19
Recommendation 24.	That local and regional knowledge of, and responsiveness to, markets and partnerships with stakeholders be maintained in the transition to network and regional provision of marketing.	19
Recommendation 25.	That responsibility for, and provision of pastoral support for International Learners remains local to those learners.	20
Recommendation 26.	That Te Pūkenga include a specific structural commitment for the network capability and support needed to ensure equitable outcomes for Pacific and Disabled ākongā and kaimahi.	20
Recommendation 27.	That within each of the Site Operations Manager roles adequate provision be made for events management and an adequate budget for casuals.	21
Recommendation 28.	That, given that many events will require national consistency, responsibility for setting standards for national academic events (albeit	

	likely delivered locally or regionally) sits within the National Operations Directorate.	21
Recommendation 29.	That the Communications Directorate be revisited to include an appropriate balance of Communications Advisor roles.	22
Recommendation 30.	That a Communications Advisor with the portfolio of Māori communication be specifically included within the Communications Directorate.	22
Recommendation 31.	That the proposal clarifies the framework whereby risk and assurance functions will operate nationally and regionally/locally and clarify the commensurate roles required in the structure to enable this framework. 22	
Recommendation 32.	That Te Pūkenga provides a framework to clarify the respective responsibilities of Risk & Assurance, People Capability & Wellbeing and Regional site operations when it comes to practice development, planning & leadership of an incident to deliver our duty of care to ākonga & kaimahi.	23
Recommendation 33.	That Te Pūkenga explicitly provision for governance secretarial support throughout the network as appropriate.....	23
Recommendation 34.	That the shared responsibility for providing information in response to external requests be reflected within all leadership job descriptions.	23
Recommendation 35.	That a Government Business Development Director role be created within the Government Relations team.	23
Recommendation 36.	That the roles and teams required to provide the data input, extrapolation and co-ordination during the extensive transition period until Te Pūkenga is on common platforms is clearly defined and arrangements are in place to maintain these roles during the transitional period.....	24
Recommendation 37.	That the relevant responsibilities of all senior leadership roles associated with Māori engagement be clarified in the pending Job Descriptions to avoid unhelpful overlap or confusion.	24
Recommendation 38.	That all titles of roles and entities be expressed in te reo Māori and English.	25
Recommendation 39.	That Te Pūkenga adopt a “Business Owner & System Owner” co-equal model of digital governance.	25
Recommendation 40.	That the “Business Owners” of significant systems, such as the Digital Learning Ecosystem (including LMS and other functions and features central to the learning activity), Library, ePortfolios etc, be clearly specified in roles outside of the Digital Portfolio.....	25
Recommendation 41.	That the National Domain Leads be tasked with facilitating (but not directing) national communities of praxis, whereby kaiako who are active in domain-related research and scholarship engage with relevant industry and professional body members (and potentially the relevant WDC) to collaborate in their research and scholarship with a view to helping inform curriculum design, development, review and improvement, and associated teaching strategies and practices.	26

Recommendation 42.	That kaiako who are successful in securing external funding for research projects (e.g. via MBIE grants) are provided with time allocation (bought out via the grant revenue) to fulfil those projects and are supported by a national or regional management support office.....	26
Recommendation 43.	That mechanisms for understanding community needs and preserving regional/local uniqueness are expressly identified and safeguarded in the new structure.....	27
Recommendation 44.	That work on a unified Te Pūkenga brand and brand architecture with regional variations is expedited.....	27
Recommendation 45.	That work is undertaken to ensure that ākonga expectations are managed in relation to differing learning experiences available to them across the motu.....	27
Recommendation 46.	That, upon releasing the Outcome, Te Pūkenga clarify what changes have been made to the proposal during the consultation process	27
Recommendation 47.	That Te Pūkenga provide transparency to kaimahi around the number of roles proposed for disestablishment and people ‘mapped’ to each area to enable them to make informed career decisions.....	28
Recommendation 48.	That Te Pūkenga provides improved clarity around which roles are open or closed for recruitment, how this links to information provided in kaimahi consultation letters and how the recruitment process will work for people in these positions.....	28
Recommendation 49.	That Te Pūkenga provides clarity on how the recruitment process will work, including selection criteria, who will be making decisions etc. and how expressions of interest/ applications for multiple opportunities will treated, e.g. will the different panels discuss that an individual has applied for a number of vacancies, what does that process look like?	28
Recommendation 50.	That selection criteria are position specific to job descriptions and weighted for importance to ensure that appointments are fair.	29
Recommendation 51.	That Te Pūkenga provides clarity on which roles will be available in which recruitment phases and address concerns that there will be missed opportunities if kaimahi wish to apply for multiple roles (in different phases of recruitment).....	29
Recommendation 52.	That more fulsome role descriptors with salary bands are provided as part of the recruitment process so that staff can assess whether roles are comparable.	29
Recommendation 53.	That formal opportunities for voluntary redundancy are made available where appropriate.....	29
Recommendation 54.	That all leadership positions within ACLS be open for contestation by all Te Pūkenga kaimahi and kaiako in the same way that all leadership positions within Ako Delivery are proposed to be open for contestation.....	29

Recommendation 55.	That a pragmatic approach is adopted by Te Pūkenga to enable kaimahi who are mapped to one area or group to apply for roles in other areas or groups where the required skill sets are comparable.	29
Recommendation 56.	That Te Pūkenga provides the definition of ‘comparable’ role which is being applied in the process.	29
Recommendation 57.	That a diversity of perspectives are represented in the recruitment process.	30
Recommendation 58.	The Te Pūkenga provides information and clarity on phase two of the transformation as part of the Outcome for this current Proposal.	30
Recommendation 59.	That handover templates and processes be prepared to help ensure a smooth transition to the new structure.	30
Recommendation 60.	That a stocktake is undertaken of key systems, products and work processes currently in place across the motu with consideration given to how each will be addressed following implementation and disestablishment of roles.	30
Recommendation 61.	That specialist system support roles be identified and, where appropriate, quarantined from the change proposal until such time as the business requirement for that expertise ceases.	31
Recommendation 62.	That notice periods, transition plans and support are clarified for kaimahi as soon as possible and that an incentive scheme be considered for kaimahi in disestablished kaimahi to remain in place while the transition takes place.	31

List of Suggestions

Suggestions are matters raised during consultation that do not impact the proposal specifically but that nonetheless propose opportunities for improvement related to the Proposal and/or within Te Pūkenga as a whole.

Suggestion 1.	That further effort be expended on ensuring that the values of Te Pūkenga are understood as being based in Te Tiriti and equally applicable to all kaimahi.....	17
Suggestion 2.	That the design and provision of flexibility across modes of delivery (location, duration, WBL/Campus/Online) into Te Pūkenga systems should be based on evidence of ākonga demand.	18
Suggestion 3.	That the development of a single unified Te Pūkenga brand be phased to ensure that the benefits of scale, reach and consistency of brand are achieved, while managing customer expectations that are currently based on locally-known business division products and reputations.....	19
Suggestion 4.	That accountability and responsibility for ākonga success be clarified in the final decision.	20
Suggestion 5.	That Te Pūkenga consider how to cater for small-scale products in the design of its learner and employer journey, including industry engagement, marketing and ākonga enrolment processes.	21
Suggestion 6.	That detail be provided regarding the delineation of responsibilities and interoperability between the Strategy & Performance team and the Performance and Analysis team in LEEA.	24
Suggestion 7.	That the Performance and Capability team takes the model of an internal consultancy team – i.e. maintains their separate reporting line, however has accountability and responsibility under each applicable DCE accountability, e.g. Ako, LEEA.	24
Suggestion 8.	That Te Pūkenga develops an explicit strategy for supporting staff in managing the change to their experience of their work and workplace. ...	25

List of Acronyms

The following is a list of the acronyms used in this Submission.

ACLS	Academic Centre and Learning Systems (a Te Pūkenga executive portfolio)
APM.....	Academic Programme Manager (at Unitec, a people manager reporting to a Head of School)
CRM.....	Customer Relationship Management
DCE.....	Deputy Chief Executive
FTE.....	Full Time Equivalent (staff quantity indicator)
LEEA.....	Learner and Employer Experience and Attraction (a Te Pūkenga executive portfolio)
LGBTQI+	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex and other (community)
MBIE.....	Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
MIT	Manukau Institute of technology (a division of Te Pūkenga)
NZQA	New Zealand Qualifications Authority
OCE.....	Office of the Chief Executive (a Te Pūkenga executive portfolio)
OIA	Official Information Act
OTTO	Office of Te Tiriti Outcomes (a Te Pūkenga executive portfolio)
PCW.....	People, Culture and Wellbeing (a Te Pūkenga executive portfolio)
RoVE.....	Review of Vocational Education
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SMS	Student Management System
TEC	Tertiary Education Commission
WBL.....	Work-based Learning
WDC	Workforce Development Council

Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission in respect of Tāraia te Anamata. This submission is from Te Pūkenga: Unitec and MIT. It was compiled through five workshops (one each at Mt Albert, Manukau, Otara, Waitakere and City campuses), attended by over 75 kaimahi. Contributing to a reform of this scale and significance is a once-in-a-generation opportunity. As such we have entered into this with a serious, constructive and willing spirit.

The process has not only produced some recommendations and suggestions that we trust will be found helpful, but has also assisted all those who participated in better understanding the proposal and Te Pūkenga's direction of travel generally.

Unitec and MIT understand that an organisational structure does not, in itself, provide all the information about how work will take place. It must be interpreted against governance documents (policies, procedures etc.), the budget, and also way of working across team structures (e.g. via communities of practice). Determining whether a structure is fit for purpose in the absence of this more complete picture cannot be done precisely, and we recognise that Te Pūkenga will benefit from continuously reviewing the suitability and sufficiency of the structure during at least the first two years.

This final document was shared with our Regional Co-Leaders and signed off by our Senior Leadership Team. We have removed elements on which there was not a clear consensus, and have encouraged individuals and teams to submit independently.

1 Ako Delivery

1.1 Ways of working – Ako Delivery and Academic Centre & Learning Systems

Connection and collaboration across directorates will be key to the successful implementation of Tāraia te Anamata. For Ako Delivery and Academic Centre and Learning Systems (ACLS), this collaboration is important both for unified and new product development and as part of ongoing continuous improvement.

Input from provider and work-based kaimahi in Ako Delivery will be important in maintaining quality, consistency, and relevance of our products. Holding close connections with stakeholders, Ako Delivery kaimahi are able to help provide the community, employer, industry, professional body, and ākonga voice to ensure that products are both nationally consistent and locally responsive. This academic and kaiako voice is also important to ensuring that our products are research-informed.

Recommendation 1. That formal mechanisms are set up to ensure that kaiako across all modes and domains of delivery have the opportunity to engage and work together with ACLS and LEEA. Such mechanisms could include working groups, advisory boards, committee structures, a range of communication channels, and cross-functional group.

1.2 Ako Delivery Teams

Vocational education and training spans a considerable range of industries and disciplines. Some require little more than the teaching staff; others require an extensive range of associated roles such as placement coordinators, preceptors, technicians etc. Given this complexity, it does not make much sense to prescribe this nationally (especially at this early stage), and yet if the intention is to allow a Team Leader to have significant agency over the form of their team, that has not yet been signalled.

Under the current structures, members of Teams (currently Schools) may have designated leadership roles for specific matters. These may or may not involve line management responsibilities, but either way make a significant contribution to enduring that a team properly attends to certain matters. Such matters that, it seems, would continue to be relevant for Teams under the new structure and may include *inter alia*: quality assurance in practice; research and scholarship; cultural competencies; embracing learning technologies; sustainable practices.

Recommendation 2. That Team Leaders have authority to establish Team structures, including staffing hierarchies of no more than two layers, within parameters determined in accordance with the Delegations Framework, Ako Delivery regional senior leadership and approved budgets.

It is the unanimous view that Team Leader is not a suitable title for academic leaders responsible for delivery of programmes to learners, and all that entails (including leading kaiako, addressing learner issues etc.).

Recommendation 3. That Team Leaders be called Ako Delivery Managers.

Unitec has roles called Academic Programme Managers. These are people leader roles reporting to a Head of School. At present, they are designated as “minor impact”. We do not agree that this is the case. Either:

- they are mapped to Team leader roles, which are likely to be bigger than their current roles (and which would likely be contested by disestablished Heads of School who may argue their roles are more compatible with Team Leaders than APMs); or
- they are mapped to kaiako roles without people leader responsibilities, which would be a major impact on their current responsibilities.

Recommendation 4. That further consideration be given to clarifying the level of impact on people leaders below current Heads of School, with a view to ensuring fairness of opportunity to the new leadership roles.

Note also comments about Transitional Risks (section 7.4).

1.3 National Operations Directorate

With a focus on providing strategic guidance for kaiako capability, strategy, policy, and improvement for Kāhui Ako | Ako Delivery, as well driving planning and performance, it

appears that the National Operations Directorate could be more aptly named. Moreover, use of the term “Operations” has generated confusion as to whether Regional Operations Directors report to this National role (when in fact the roles are quite different).

Recommendation 5. That the National Operations Directorate should be renamed (perhaps National Ako Delivery Director) to avoid confusion with other roles and better reflect its core purpose.

1.4 Recognition of Prior Learning

The proposal states that Ako Network Directors are responsible for establishing the approach to Recognition of Prior Learning (pp65-66). What is not evident is whether kaiako in the Ako Delivery Network will be tasked with conducting assessment against specified learning outcomes. Where this involves recognition of previous formal learning resulting in credit through some appropriately accredited system, this can increasingly be managed through automated (or, at the least, administrative) systems. However, where the previous learning is informal or non-formal, or formal but precedent-setting, this is a task that requires subject matter expertise because the evidence submitted will typically be bespoke rather than standardised. The assessment task itself belongs with the relevant SME kaiako.

Recommendation 6. That the Proposal clarify where responsibility for assessment of non-formal, informal and precedent-setting formal prior learning sits.

Separately, this function appears to be grouped together under the Ako Network Foundation and Pathways (p31 & p67). We assume that in this context it refers specifically to assessment for the purpose of pathwaying learners into vocational education (as opposed to assessment of prior learning for credit), as set out on p31, which makes good sense.

However, p67 has a “Recognition of Prior Learning Domain Lead”, which suggests a national responsibility for RPL generally, which generates confusion in relation to the points made above. It would be useful to provide clarity in this regard.

Recommendation 7. That the position of Recognition of Prior Learning Domain Lead be clarified.

1.5 Trades Academy

At present, the MIT pathways and transitional coordinators (or equivalent) are mapped to Regional Engagement Director within Ako Delivery. In practice, these kaimahi engage with Secondary Schools, marae and kura kaupapa and, extensively, with Trades Academy Learners themselves in a critical pastoral capacity. They work to a capped number of enrolments each year, and therefore their primary focus is on quality of delivery rather than on growing delivery. A more appropriate fit would be within the Regional Domain Head Foundation and Pathways.

Recommendation 8. That pathways and transition kaimahi for Trades Academy are located within the Regional Domain Head Foundation and Pathways

1.6 Kaiako Capability

Under the proposed structure, Kaiako Capability kaimahi were not shown in the organisational structure. These staff were, we believe erroneously, mapped to learner support. However, they are kaiako-facing.

Kaiako Capability will benefit from overall coordination at a national level, however, leadership at a regional level will be key role to both shaping the strategic direction of teacher capability development and to responding to differing regional needs. Working closely with ACLS, these regional kaiako capability leader under the National Operations Directorate would lead the implementation the kaiako capability framework, aligning to Te Pūkenga national priorities with remaining responsive to regional and local needs. This would include the setting of priorities and KPIs and the sharing of best practice across regions.

Regional Kaiako Capability leads would be supported at the local level to provide personalised and immediate support to kaiako. At both regional and local levels kaiako capability kaimahi with key expertise in capability development to enable teachers to better support Māori (see also section 3.4), Pacific, and Disabled priority group learners.

Local support helps teachers improve by offering personalized, immediate, and context-specific assistance. Kaiako have different development needs and face unique and diverse challenges based on the discipline, context, ākonga population, teaching style, level of experience, and so on. Local support that is responsive and adaptive to these needs, both for work-based and provider-based kaiako, is critical to complement a regional and national kaiako development approach.

We support those kaimahi associated with Kaiako Capability forming a grouping within the National Operations Directorate, Ako Delivery. It is essential that kaiako maintain a strong sense of agency in relation to their profession as teachers, and having kaiako capability within their own portfolio will assist in that regard.

Recommendation 9. That there be a Kaiako Capability team within the National Operations Directorate, and that the team include four Regional Kaiako Capability Leads, each of which has responsibility for ensuring there is local capability support.

If we think about industries and professions, we recognise that Te Pūkenga has a role to help those industries train and support the continuing professional development of their kaimahi. This involves working with industry to identify how it is improving what it does, and adjusting kaimahi training and professional development accordingly.

Teaching is a profession. It requires constant attention and development. A team that supports kaiako capability but is not, itself, taking steps to remain at the forefront of teaching will quickly become worthless. As such, the Kaiako Capability team must also be tasked with maintaining the scholarship of learning & teaching (obviously this would entail close collaboration with ACLS and LEEA and OTTO).

Recommendation 10. That the Kaiako Capability team have responsibility for fostering the scholarship of learning & teaching and using that to ensure that it supports kaiako teaching activity of the highest quality.

1.7 Pasifika Cultural Responsiveness

Rohe 1 has the largest Pacific population in the world. The proposal includes a single position specifically dedicated to Pacific outcomes (the Pacific Outcomes Director, reporting to the DCE Ako Delivery, p23). This is unlikely to be adequate, especially in Rohe 1.

As a TEC priority group who make up approximately eight per cent of all Te Pūkenga learners, and higher in Rohe 1, we would like to see more dedicated Pacific roles to support ākonga. We are concerned that simply integrating a Pacific focus into general roles will dilute its effectiveness.

Moreover, experience has shown that relationships with local Pacific communities are instrumental in providing an inclusive environment and networks for Pacific ākonga. We would like to seek specific Pacific roles dedicated to this (as currently exist at the MIT Pacific Community Centre).

Recommendation 11. That dedicated Pacific Centres are retained in Rohe 1 with a regional Pacific Director and team.

1.8 Examinations Administration

There are many reasons to change the nature of examination-based assessment (not least being the broad availability of Generative AI). Some of this will need to be addressed through assessment design, which would sit largely within ACLS. However, this will take time and for the foreseeable future there will be a need for on the ground scheduling, planning (including managing the production of exam scripts), academic security and invigilation (including recruiting and training invigilators) of exams. It is not clear where this function sits within the new structure. In our experience, it is a specialist and very high-risk area that is best managed through a coordinated, expert approach rather than left to each delivery Team.

Recommendation 12. That within each of the Site Operations Manager roles adequate provision be made for exam administration, including at least an Examinations Administrator and an adequate budget for casuals.

1.9 Complaints and Appeals

Te Pūkenga's *Ākonga Concerns and Complaints Policy* and *Ākonga Appeals Policy* specify a number of positions. These include Student Advocates, and Appeals Officers. There is a risk that in the event of insufficient staffing resource, these two positions could become merged (which would present a conflict of interest) or integrated into other roles (which could compromise the level of expertise required in managing risk issues).

In our view, student concerns and complaints and the first tier of Appeal are delivery matters best addressed within the Ako Delivery portfolio at a Site level.

Note that these are process facilitation roles, not decision-making roles.

While we have heard that these policies are currently being reviewed, it seems probable that the need for such dedicated resources will exist irrespective of the policy detail.

Recommendation 13. That specific roles be established for Student Advocates, Complaints Officers and Appeals Officers at each Site, and that these be managed within the Regional Operational Directorate, managed by each site's Learner Services Manager.

1.10 Local Presence

The need to retain localised support and presence for various functions, both for kamahi and ākonga was clearly articulated. Localized support for kaiako and kaimahi includes:

- programme administration with a deep knowledge of our academic products
- placement and internship coordination
- academic quality support
- enrolment advice and support
- learning advice
- specialised pastoral care support, including counselling

While these localised support kaimahi and support teams may be in the new structure, it is not clearly evident for all of these roles. There is significant benefit to a partnership approach to supporting kaiako, with localised support kaimahi who work alongside our people and our teams. Local support from kaimahi who understand the context provided in this partnered way can promote a sense of belonging and motivation and help to drive ākonga-centred continuous improvement.

Recommendation 14. That further clarification be provided as to the structure and roles of localised support positions under the Ako Delivery directorate.

1.11 Ako Delivery Team Transition Risks

The end of the calendar year is typically a busy period for Ako Delivery, including at least the following functions (by no means an exhaustive list):

- Marking of exams and other final assessments
- Moderation
- Finalisation of grades (typically through programme committees or equivalent)
- Processing of grades (an academic admin function, involving entering into the SMS and notifying learners to inform their 2024 course enrolments)

Recommendation 15. That, should Heads of School and other academic leadership positions and positions involved in grade resulting be disestablished, the disestablishment not take effect before the end of the 2023 year in

order to ensure business continuity for, at least, final marking and resulting processes.

Kaiako have lengthy holiday breaks in December, January and February, often not returning until shortly before the first teaching period of the new year (often called Semester 1) commences. It is essential for them and for learners that the timetable for 2024, and corresponding kaiako course occurrence allocations, are finalised prior to their departure for holidays in order to ensure a smooth start to the 2024 academic year.

Recommendation 16. That Team Leaders be appointed, even if they overlap in time with the continuity of Heads of School as indicated in Recommendation 15. above

2 Academic Centre and Learning Systems (ACLS)

2.1 Ako Solutions – Nomenclature

There is significant overlap between the engagement led by the Learning and Development Manager and the Learning and Development Product Manager. It would be helpful if their titles (and the names of their teams) could be better differentiated to better articulate the focus of their roles and prevent confusion.

Recommendation 17. That, to avoid confusion, the Learning and Development Manager and the Learning and Development Product Manager titles are replaced with titles that highlight the differences between the roles and functions.

2.2 Ako Network roles in ACLS and Ako Delivery

It would appear that role in the Ako Networks are echoed in the structure in Ako Delivery. Could Job Descriptions for roles reinforce the structure by being explicit about the relationships between roles pertaining to the same areas of focus.

Recommendation 18. That the relationships between Ako Network roles in ACLS and Ako Delivery are explicitly acknowledged in job descriptions.

A number of roles have similar names, and this has given rise to confusion. We understand that National Ako Network Directors and National Domain Leads are roles that sit within ACLS and have product responsibility; whereas Regional Ako Network Directors and Regional Domain Heads are roles that sit within Ako Delivery and have delivery responsibility. It will help avoid confusion if the words National and Regional are applied where appropriate every time (i.e. in every chart, on every job description, email signatures etc.).

Recommendation 19. That, to avoid confusion, Ako Network and Domain roles be prefaced with National or Regional (as appropriate) in every instance in which they are used.

3 Office of Te Tiriti Outcomes (OTTE)

3.1 Partnership Responsibilities

We are strongly supportive of an increase in Māori expertise to help design, guide and hold Te Pūkenga to account for being relevant to the aspirations of Māori.

We regard Te Tiriti as being a partnership. We consider that many of the impediments to Māori ākonga success are due to insufficient cultural capability of kaimahi, particularly Tangata Tiriti kaimahi (for clarity, non-Māori kaimahi). As such, we believe that much of the heavy lifting required to honour our obligations under Te Tiriti rest properly with Tangata Tiriti, including heavy lifting in the leadership space. We do not see how the proposed structure and Portfolio explanation recognise this.

As with Te Pai Tāwhiti, accountability for Te Tiriti outcomes must sit with all kaimahi.

Recommendation 20. That Te Tiriti Outcomes include roles to ensure a partnership approach to addressing equity outcomes for ākonga.

3.2 Te Pūkenga Values

Feedback from our staff suggests that there is a risk that the values of Te Pūkenga (which we support) can be perceived as inherently Māori rather than steeped in the partnership called for by Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Suggestion 1. That further effort be expended on ensuring that the values of Te Pūkenga are understood as being based in Te Tiriti and equally applicable to all kaimahi.

3.3 Relationship Management Clarity and Connectedness

The proposed model recognises the responsibilities to Te Tiriti. However, there is a question as to whether the proposed approach best positions kaimahi to be able to understand these responsibilities and subsequently enable the related outcomes in their day-to-day work.

The duties and scope of the roles played by the Pou Ārahi, regional co-leader, Tiriti Partnership Director & Māori Engagement Director, particularly in the area of relationship management appear to overlap. Additionally, where industry, iwi & hapū relationships are held for kaimahi ako presents a risk to ensure these are not underserved.

Recommendation 21. That a framework be established which shows the interoperability of kaimahi and kaiako with Pou Ārahi, regional co-leaders, Tiriti Partnership Director & Māori Engagement Director to have greater visibility of relationship management and where individual kaimahi can see where they fit and how they contribute to this mahi.

3.4 Mātauranga Māori for Kaimahi

One of the challenges of responding to this proposal is that while it covers most of Te Pūkenga, it does not cover all of it and therefore the critically of cross-portfolio operations is not always visible.

In terms of support helping kaimahi and kaiako develop mātauranga Māori and cultural competencies, it is our understanding that PCW Portfolio has overall responsibility for planning a professional development approach for kaimahi, and the National Operations Director within Ako Delivery will have carriage of the component that pertains to kaiako capability (including culturally inclusive teaching skills and Māori teaching practices). However, what is still not clear is where in the structure has responsibility for assisting kaimahi generally in the development of cultural competency and mātauranga Māori, and responsibility for assisting kaimahi Māori in the refinement of their self-development as Māori practitioners. As with all capability development, it is our proposal that this resource, while it could have national coordination, be delivered locally.

Recommendation 22. That the structure (perhaps within PCW) includes specific and sufficient provision for Māori capability development for kaimahi and kaiako.

4 Learner and Employer Experience and Attraction (LEEA)

4.1 The Learner Journey

While the RoVE goals associated with supporting a flexible learner journey across modes, durations and locations are important, our internal feedback is that for the majority of ākonga, the mode/location/duration that they begin their learning in, is the one that they are mostly likely to prefer to stay in unless personal circumstances require a shift.

Our view is that there may be limited demand among ākonga for movement across modes (e.g. work-based to campus-based) and locations (e.g. town to city) unless a change to circumstances such as family commitments require it. Given this, the provision of flexibility across modes should be in response to demand. If there is not evidence of demand, it should not be a dominant factor driving the design of systems and delivery across the network.

Suggestion 2. That the design and provision of flexibility across modes of delivery (location, duration, WBL/Campus/Online) into Te Pūkenga systems should be based on evidence of ākonga demand.

4.2 Customer Insights

Feedback from our Marketing teams is that the proposed FTE of the Customer Insights function in LEEA will be insufficient for proactive analytics to be undertaken in-house, and will only be sufficient for a reactive insights function.

We note that there may be similar functions elsewhere in the network that augment this, or that the intention may be to outsource this function, and these variables should be taken into account when considering our recommendation.

Recommendation 23. That the proposed Customer Insights FTE be reviewed in order to ensure sufficient capacity for providing a proactive insights function.

4.3 Marketing

It is likely that a significant proportion of what is important when marketing Te Pūkenga products will continue (at least for a time) to be geographically specific, rather than network-wide.

To this end, it will be important to ensure that local relationships with ākonga, employers and other stakeholders (e.g. schools and kura), and local knowledge and insights about their specific needs and demands, are not lost in the transition to the proposed LEEA.

Responsiveness to local needs and demands will remain important.

Recommendation 24. That local and regional knowledge of, and responsiveness to, markets and partnerships with stakeholders be maintained in the transition to network and regional provision of marketing.

4.4 Branding

Decisions on how to position Te Pūkenga in the market as a unified brand should be made judiciously to ensure that Te Pūkenga does not over-promise and under-deliver on a unified brand, and that customer expectations of network-wide consistency are well managed.

The existing reputations of campus-based providers such as Unitec and MIT rest to a significant measure on local flavour, history and customer loyalty. Similarly, provision across business divisions includes a level of diversity and difference. These are enduring elements.

If Te Pūkenga brand marketing is too heavily focused on a unified and consistent product offering, there is a risk that it will not reflect the reality of local demand and products, and that customer expectations will not be met. Te Pūkenga will then not get the benefits of scale and reach.

Suggestion 3. That the development of a single unified Te Pūkenga brand be phased to ensure that the benefits of scale, reach and consistency of brand are achieved, while managing customer expectations that are currently based on locally-known business division products and reputations.

4.5 Pastoral Support for International Learners

Because International learners are generally new to Aotearoa, they will often struggle with a lack of local connection and support, leading to risks to their retention and success. It will be

important to ensure that responsibility for pastoral support for International Learners sits in Te Pūkenga locations in which those learners live, to ensure it is responsive to their specific needs and to the requirements of the Code of Practice.

Recommendation 25. That responsibility for, and provision of pastoral support for International Learners remains local to those learners.

4.6 Structural Commitment to Equity Groups

We note that there is very little explicit provision in the proposal for dedicated support systems for equity groups such as Pacific and Disabled ākonga and kaimahi, and ākonga with low prior achievement transitioning from school. Ten per cent of Te Pūkenga learners disclose a disability and support for ākonga with learning differences is a rapidly growing area of need at MIT, Unitec and across the motu.

This is particularly notable in comparison to provision and planning for Tiriti outcomes.

It may be that this is a level of detail and planning that Te Pūkenga executive will undertake once decisions on the current proposal are made and implemented. As present, however, this gap is very prominent and represents a considerable inequity in provision for Pacific and Disabled priority groups. It does not reflect the work undertaken in *Te Rito* and it risks leaving responsibility for equitable outcomes with a small number of kaimahi across the network.

Recommendation 26. That Te Pūkenga include a specific structural commitment for the network capability and support needed to ensure equitable outcomes for Pacific and Disabled ākonga and kaimahi.

4.7 Accountability and Responsibility for Ākonga Success

In the LEEA proposal, the Head of Learner Journey Experience is “accountable for ... Ākonga Success Plan and continual improvements in our learner experience and engagement with Te Pūkenga”. We believe the proposal should be explicit that this will be done in full collaboration with kaiako in Ako Delivery, and kaimahi in ACLS, and that responsibility for ensuring successful implementation will be similarly collaborative.

Just as we recommend that National Domain Leads should have responsibility for facilitating national communities of practice pertaining to curriculum, so too should the Head of Learner Journey Experience have responsibility for facilitating one or more (for different modalities) national communities of practice pertaining to ākonga success.

Suggestion 4. That accountability and responsibility for ākonga success be clarified in the final decision.

4.8 Events

The culture of tertiary education is heavily imbued with events. For clarity, an event is one which is extracurricular and typically includes external stakeholders (industry, schools, whanau etc.). These may include, for example (and are by no means limited to):

- Pōwhiri and poroporoaki
- Career events and Open Days
- Conferences, seminars and workshops
- Student exhibitions, performances, showcases
- Wellbeing events and Kaimahi celebrations

Unitec and MIT combined host well over 1,000 events per year. It is likely that this will rise as Te Pūkenga seeks to establish itself within the Aotearoa psyche. Some are high profile and require events expertise. It is not clear where this function sits within the new structure. In our experience, it is a specialist and very high-risk area that is best managed through a coordinated, expert approach rather than left to each delivery Team.

Recommendation 27. That within each of the Site Operations Manager roles adequate provision be made for events management and an adequate budget for casuals.

Recommendation 28. That, given that many events will require national consistency, responsibility for setting standards for national academic events (albeit likely delivered locally or regionally) sits within the National Operations Directorate.

While we have reported this matter within LEEA, on the basis that events are often managed from a Comms or Marketing team. However, we note that Events Management could also sit within Ako Delivery as Events are usually location-specific and therefore could be managed through Site Operations.

4.9 Responsiveness to Niche Provision

There are a number of small-scale, successful product offerings at MIT and Unitec that may be difficult for a regional or network-wide approach to adequately support if LEEA is not designed in a way that allows it to be sufficiently nimble and responsive to their needs. These teams, which will be very small on Te Pūkenga scale, have features such as the following:

- Highly specialised subject matter expertise
- Specific regulatory requirements
- Established, successful trusted professional relationships with industry and employers
- Marketing and recruitment largely by word-of-mouth and existing relationships
- Very specific brands in market
- Enrolment and support processes that require speed and SME knowledge

Suggestion 5. That Te Pūkenga consider how to cater for small-scale products in the design of its learner and employer journey, including industry engagement, marketing and ākonga enrolment processes.

5 Office of the Chief Executive (OCE)

5.1 Communication

The Communications team within OCE is tasked with providing strategic advice and insights, development & implementation of communications strategies and managing the reputation of Te Pūkenga.

The communications roles proposed are Senior Communications Advisors and Principal Communications Advisors; there appears to be no Communications Advisor positions. Many essential communications tasks will not require senior level roles, e.g. updating websites, communications design, interviews with kaimahi.

Recommendation 29. That the Communications Directorate be revisited to include an appropriate balance of Communications Advisor roles.

The ability to converse to kaimahi & ākonga in Te Reo Māori is an expectation they have of us, having the appropriate level of kaimahi qualified to do so is key. It is not understood in the model how this is achieved.

Recommendation 30. That a Communications Advisor with the portfolio of Māori communication be specifically included within the Communications Directorate.

5.2 Risk and Assurance

Having the separation of Risk and Assurance from legal is seen as a positive step forward as they are two discrete disciplines.

We are concerned that the number of FTE allocated to this function may be insufficient given our experience of the scale and scope of risks. While we expect that persons at regional levels will be expected to participate in the identification, assessment and management of risks, this is not evident in the structure.

Recommendation 31. That the proposal clarifies the framework whereby risk and assurance functions will operate nationally and regionally/locally and clarify the commensurate roles required in the structure to enable this framework.

The team is identified to lead and oversee risk management, business continuity planning, and crisis management practice. Crisis management is already designated under Health & Wellbeing and there is a Director in place who oversees this. Additionally, NZ government agencies (and those funded publicly) are required to adhere to the Coordinated Incident Management Systems to ensure interoperability with other agencies. There appears to be a significant cross over between the Risk & Assurance portfolio, Health & Wellbeing and Incident Management requirements.

Recommendation 32. That Te Pūkenga provides a framework to clarify the respective responsibilities of Risk & Assurance, People Capability & Wellbeing and Regional site operations when it comes to practice development, planning & leadership of an incident to deliver our duty of care to ākonga & kaimahi.

5.3 Council Secretariat

The structure under the Council Secretariat is prudent and the design well addresses the various functions at a national level.

In the event that formal committees are required at Regional levels, e.g. Programme Committees, then a secretarial function will be required for that purpose. While we believe that such a service would, of necessity, need to be regionally based it may benefit from a standardised approach to secretarial services (especially agenda, minutes, file security and storage, and compliance with relevant legislation such as Local Government Meetings and Official information Act).

Recommendation 33. That Te Pūkenga explicitly provision for governance secretarial support throughout the network as appropriate.

5.4 Government Relations

The Government Relations Directorate is proposed to liaise with the Minister's office, manage all government servicing, including OIA, briefings and reports to Ministers, and Select Committee briefings and responses. It is noted that the directorate would work across Te Pūkenga to deliver this.

Recommendation 34. That the shared responsibility for providing information in response to external requests be reflected within all leadership job descriptions.

We note that the mahi involved in collecting this information, albeit coordinated centrally, can be onerous and suggest that the Government Relations Director maintain a watching brief on this burden in case it requires additional resources.

As currently proposed, the Government Relations Directorate appears to be focused on compliance matters and not on business opportunities. A number of Government departments purchase various products, projects and services through a variety of means ranging from GETS to MBIE grants to more strategic collaborations. There is an opportunity to include within this Directorate a role dedicated to developing relationships that may give rise to business opportunities (this is distinct from the Key Accounts Managers within LEEA). We note that a similar Wellington-based role exists within UniServices.

Recommendation 35. That a Government Business Development Director role be created within the Government Relations team.

5.5 Strategy & Performance

The Strategy & Performance team will take responsibility for the enterprise strategy and performance of ensuring a clear vision and direction through guidance, systems and tools.

There is also a Performance & insights team within LEEA, how these teams relate and the responsibilities appear to have a degree of cross over. The OCE team, for the remit communicated, seems very small for how broad it is which has led to the questions of how will it relate to a “sister team” in LEEA and deliver the broad remit of strategic & operational reporting.

Suggestion 6. That detail be provided regarding the delineation of responsibilities and interoperability between the Strategy & Performance team and the Performance and Analysis team in LEEA.

Suggestion 7. That the Performance and Capability team takes the model of an internal consultancy team – i.e. maintains their separate reporting line, however has accountability and responsibility under each applicable DCE accountability, e.g. Ako, LEEA.

During the period of time until business divisions are on common platforms, it appears this input will need to come from roles outside of OCE, i.e. how will they elicit the data by function, by site, by Rohe.

Recommendation 36. That the roles and teams required to provide the data input, extrapolation and co-ordination during the extensive transition period until Te Pūkenga is on common platforms is clearly defined and arrangements are in place to maintain these roles during the transitional period.

5.6 Māori Engagement

The Office of the Chief Executive includes a Māori Engagement Directorate. With responsibilities for leading Māori public relations, internal and external engagement, embedding tikanga and te reo across the organisation, and provision of advice, it is unclear how this relates to Te Tiriti Outcomes portfolio, Pou Ārahi, Te Tiriti teams and the engagement responsibilities of the Regional Co-Leaders.

Recommendation 37. That the relevant responsibilities of all senior leadership roles associated with Māori engagement be clarified in the pending Job Descriptions to avoid unhelpful overlap or confusion.

6 Other Matters

6.1 Bilingual Nomenclature

Unitec and MIT are strongly supportive of Te Pūkenga’s emphasis on embedding te reo Māori.

Recommendation 38. That all titles of roles and entities be expressed in te reo Māori and English.

6.2 Minor Impact

We understand that during a major change process specific employment language is necessary. We note also that the majority of kaimahi may not be well versed in this lexicon and will react to how the language makes them feel rather than how it would be interpreted in an employment tribunal.

In particular, use of the language “minor impact” has been interpreted by many staff as dismissive of the major impact of the changes on their world view. For these staff, their institutional membership identity, senior leadership, immediate line manager, team colleagues, the scope of what they do, and potentially their specific location of work, are all likely to change. For many staff this is causing significant anxiety, and in that context the term “Minor Impact” can have the adverse and unintended consequence of contributing to anxiety rather than alleviating it.

The scope of mahi for many Kaiako has also changed who have ongoing concerns around the separation of teaching from curriculum development and ability to be responsive to ākongā and industry needs.

Suggestion 8. That Te Pūkenga develops an explicit strategy for supporting staff in managing the change to their experience of their work and workplace.

6.3 Relationship with Digital

The organisational structure is but one mechanism whereby the operations of the organisation are effected. Another is the protocols whereby organisational entities engage with each other. Yet another is the technology systems that enable (and disable) activities.

We propose that Te Pūkenga adopt a “Business Owner & System Owner” co-equal model of digital governance. This ensures that the voice of the end users and of the system enablers are balanced and required to collaborate, bringing both sets of expertise together.

While it may be tempting to assume that the Business Ownership would typically sit within ACLS or in LEEA (e.g. for a CRM), we note that Ako Delivery includes the vast majority of expert end users.

Also, with dozens of enterprise-wide systems at MIT alone, we propose that Business Ownership not be consolidated into a single role, but be reasonably distributed both as a risk mitigation strategy and as a means for ensuring sufficient business expertise.

Recommendation 39. That Te Pūkenga adopt a “Business Owner & System Owner” co-equal model of digital governance.

Recommendation 40. That the “Business Owners” of significant systems, such as the Digital Learning Ecosystem (including LMS and other functions and features

central to the learning activity), Library, ePortfolios etc, be clearly specified in roles outside of the Digital Portfolio.

6.4 Research, Scholarship and Enterprise

For the purposes of determining an appropriate organisational structure, Te Pūkenga is engaged in two very different groupings of research and rangahau:

- (a) The Teaching-Research Nexus. This includes the scholarship of learning and teaching, and research (basic or applied), as it relates to the curriculum of the Domain. We propose below that, with formally constructed practices that span structures, this can be managed within the proposed portfolios of Ako Delivery, ACLS, LEEA and OTTO.
- (b) Enterprise. This includes specific research projects (basic or applied) that are responsive to external funding and conditions, and which may or may not have a direct relationship with any curriculum. This may also include commercialisation of research output. We propose below that this requires structural solutions that can sit within Ako Delivery, supported by a Research Management function.

NZQA requires that degrees are taught mainly by people engaged in research (see Section 253B of the Education Act 1989).

This supposes that the people that teach degrees are also involved in the design, development, review and improvement of the degree curriculum (it also assumes that, to the extent that the curriculum requires learners to engage in research projects, the kaiako will be qualified to supervise those projects).

It would be difficult to determine the extent to which research time allocation is directly contributing to improvements in curriculum, teaching and assessment.

Recommendation 41. That the National Domain Leads be tasked with facilitating (but not directing) national communities of praxis, whereby kaiako who are active in domain-related research and scholarship engage with relevant industry and professional body members (and potentially the relevant WDC) to collaborate in their research and scholarship with a view to helping inform curriculum design, development, review and improvement, and associated teaching strategies and practices.

Concentrations of research staff, locally or connected nationally via virtual networks, may reach a level of capability and capacity where they are able to lead or partner in externally funded research projects. These are typically governed by funding conditions that are not connected with the learning & teaching activities of Te Pūkenga. As such, to conflate them structurally and procedurally with **Error! Reference source not found.** can hinder rather than help research enterprise.

Recommendation 42. That kaiako who are successful in securing external funding for research projects (e.g. via MBIE grants) are provided with time allocation (bought out via the grant revenue) to fulfil those projects and are supported by a national or regional management support office.

6.5 Regional/Local Uniqueness

We understand the benefits from unifying ākonga learning experiences across the motu, however we are concerned that the proposed structure does not adequately protect existing regional uniqueness, diversity and community specific approaches to supporting ākonga learning and wellbeing. The loss of this uniqueness risks losing what attracted and retained ākonga at our institutions, including the sense of belonging.

Recommendation 43. That mechanisms for understanding community needs and preserving regional/local uniqueness are expressly identified and safeguarded in the new structure.

6.6 Branding

We suggest that urgency is now required around unifying Te Pūkenga branding nationally to create a strong brand identity while also enabling regional variations and community trust to be maintained. The development of a strong brand is an important step towards establishing a strong unified Te Pūkenga culture and a sense of belonging amongst both kaimahi and ākonga. We also note that it will be important to manage ākonga expectations around learning and support provided at different campuses.

Recommendation 44. That work on a unified Te Pūkenga brand and brand architecture with regional variations is expedited.

Recommendation 45. That work is undertaken to ensure that ākonga expectations are managed in relation to differing learning experiences available to them across the motu.

7 Feedback on Process

7.1 Changes to the Proposal

At a number of consultation sessions (particularly for Kāhui Ako Delivery), we are hearing feedback on changes being made to the proposal during the process. While we appreciate and support this responsiveness, unless kaimahi have attended every session they may not be aware of these changes. Staff are keen to engage and want to be able to provide informed feedback.

Recommendation 46. That, upon releasing the Outcome, Te Pūkenga clarify what changes have been made to the proposal during the consultation process

7.2 Recruitment Process

Kaimahi have expressed considerable uncertainty and anxiety around how the recruitment process for new roles will work, in particular around:

- What roles are proposed for disestablishment across the motu and the number of people 're-mapped' to each area. Kaimahi want to make informed career decisions. To do this

they need transparency to understand their chances of success in the recruitment process and whether they should be considering other opportunities outside of Te Pūkenga.

- Which roles are open or closed for recruitment, what is meant by this and how this links to information provided to kaimahi in their consultation letters (a variety of terms have been used and many are unclear around what this will mean in practice).
- How the process will be fair in situations where there are no CVs or interviews for streamlined recruitment.
- How selection criteria for positions will be applied.
- Who will be making decisions regarding appointments.
- What process will be used where kaimahi express an interest/apply for multiple opportunities.
- How the recruitment process will ensure fairness and remove any question of bias.
- This is seen as particularly important in national roles where the manager making appointments may know some but not all applicants. For regional appointments kaimahi want the process to be regionally appropriate and fair.
- How recruitment phases will occur. Kaimahi are concerned that there may be missed opportunities if they wish to apply for multiple roles in different phases of recruitment.
- Role descriptors and salary bands (it difficult to determine whether roles are truly comparable with the limited information available).
- Whether there will opportunities for voluntary redundancy. It is noted that some kaimahi will not be attracted to the more specialised roles proposed in the new structure. Those who want roles should have priority and appointments should be made to kaimahi who are committed to Te Pūkenga and its vision.
- What rights of redress will be available if new roles are not as expected or workloads are overwhelming due to reductions in staffing.

Recommendation 47. That Te Pūkenga provide transparency to kaimahi around the number of roles proposed for disestablishment and people 'mapped' to each area to enable them to make informed career decisions.

Recommendation 48. That Te Pūkenga provides improved clarity around which roles are open or closed for recruitment, how this links to information provided in kaimahi consultation letters and how the recruitment process will work for people in these positions.

Recommendation 49. That Te Pūkenga provides clarity on how the recruitment process will work, including selection criteria, who will be making decisions etc. and how expressions of interest/ applications for multiple opportunities will treated, e.g. will the different panels discuss that an individual has applied for a number of vacancies, what does that process look like?

- Recommendation 50. That selection criteria are position specific to job descriptions and weighted for importance to ensure that appointments are fair.*
- Recommendation 51. That Te Pūkenga provides clarity on which roles will be available in which recruitment phases and address concerns that there will be missed opportunities if kaimahi wish to apply for multiple roles (in different phases of recruitment).*
- Recommendation 52. That more fulsome role descriptors with salary bands are provided as part of the recruitment process so that staff can assess whether roles are comparable.*
- Recommendation 53. That formal opportunities for voluntary redundancy are made available where appropriate.*

Many kaiako (in particular) have noted that the redesign of academic mahi means that some of their current responsibilities (most notably curriculum design and development) may sit within ACLS while others sit within Ako Delivery. However, it is currently proposed that leadership positions within ACLS are only open to recruitment on a “comparable role” basis, meaning that the vast majority of kaiako will not be eligible to compete for these roles. This seems neither fair to those kaiako, nor the best approach to ensure that ACLS leadership roles are filled with the best available talent within the network.

- Recommendation 54. That all leadership positions within ACLS be open for contestation by all Te Pūkenga kaimahi and kaiako in the same way that all leadership positions within Ako Delivery are proposed to be open for contestation*

7.3 Comparable Roles

Many kaimahi whose roles are proposed for disestablishment are currently responsible for multiple functions which are proposed to move to more specialised roles, and as a result more than one of the proposed new roles across one or more groups may be suitable to them. In some cases, mapping appears to preclude kaimahi from expressing interest in equally comparable roles in other groups.

We appreciate the clarifications provided to the scope of comparable roles because this provides more options for kaimahi seeking redeployment, but submit that in some situations this approach should be pragmatically extended across groups.

- Recommendation 55. That a pragmatic approach is adopted by Te Pūkenga to enable kaimahi who are mapped to one area or group to apply for roles in other areas or groups where the required skill sets are comparable.*
- Recommendation 56. That Te Pūkenga provides the definition of ‘comparable’ role which is being applied in the process.*

7.4 Recruitment Perspectives

There is no indication of how a diversity of perspectives, e.g. Māori, Pasifika, LGBTQI+ etc., will be included as part of the recruitment process for new roles.

Recommendation 57. That a diversity of perspectives are represented in the recruitment process.

7.5 Phase Two

Kaimahi not directly impacted by the change proposal have expressed ongoing uncertainty and concern around how they may be impacted by phase two of the change process. There is recognition that future change is inevitable, however pātai is beginning on what these next phases look like, the scope and timeframes. The ongoing uncertainty and constant sense of looming change is continuing to negatively impact wellbeing, engagement and attrition. Feedback from People and Culture representatives from kaimahi is that culture and engagement are being hit hard with little obvious commitment from Te Pūkenga in terms of recognition and engaging kaimahi.

Recommendation 58. The Te Pūkenga provides information and clarity on phase two of the transformation as part of the Outcome for this current Proposal.

7.6 Handover Arrangements

With perhaps 500 people leaving their roles, a significant quantum of operational knowledge will depart. Many contacts, file storage, operating processes etc. will not be well documented and will likely continue to be required while the new arrangement matures.

We suggest that each departing person be provided with a template clearly setting out the information required to be handed over to the incoming person with relevant responsibilities. In most cases, this will benefit from handover conversations as well as documents.

Recommendation 59. That handover templates and processes be prepared to help ensure a smooth transition to the new structure.

7.7 Legacy Systems, Products and Processes

There are hundreds of systems in the network that require specialist business support (e.g. CRM, SMS) that (properly) sits outside of the Digital portfolio. The duration of these systems is not yet clear and we anticipate that over time most will transition to some form of national model. However, until that time there is a risk that system expertise may be lost in this change proposal, causing significant disruption.

Similarly, there will be products and processes that similarly will become legacy products and processes but that will require specialist support until such time as they are ceased.

Recommendation 60. That a stocktake is undertaken of key systems, products and work processes currently in place across the motu with consideration given

to how each will be addressed following implementation and disestablishment of roles.

Recommendation 61. That specialist system support roles be identified and, where appropriate, quarantined from the change proposal until such time as the business requirement for that expertise ceases.

7.8 Business Continuity During Transition

We suggest that clearly defined transition plans and timelines are needed to ensure a seamless transition and to avoid risk to ākonga learning (taking into account that a number of legacy programmes, processes and systems will remain in place for some time to come). We are concerned about the impact of the transition on both ākonga and kaimahi and seek more clarity on how the transition will work, particularly in terms of:

- how the reduction in workload capacity will be managed to ensure critical work is not dropped;
- the time being estimated for transitional periods;
- managing retention of people in disestablished roles during their notice periods, recognising that they may still be required during this time.

Recommendation 62. That notice periods, transition plans and support are clarified for kaimahi as soon as possible and that an incentive scheme be considered for kaimahi in disestablished kaimahi to remain in place while the transition takes place.