

Dear Grace

Yes, Sue has given me your letter and I am looking forward to working on this degree application. I hope that the degree documents will arrive as soon as possible so that we can try to meet your dates. It is very useful to know those and both suggestions suit me well.

The most difficult process in degree work is getting the panel together as proposed members always have diaries booked up weeks ahead and we can only fix a date once all the panel can be available on an agreed date. I will try to have the panel meeting during the week beginning 7 August. I am going away for a few weeks from 10 September and the later date could be a little tight although possible. It is a fall-back position. Are there any dates which would be absolutely impossible for you?

However in order to have a meeting in that week in August I really need to know your panel nominations as soon as possible. I would suggest that even if you don't have the delayed critique that you send the documentation in by the end of this month if possible. Don't wait for the final critique as you can send that in later as it is not really needed in the setting up process but will be needed by the panel members.

The most important thing is to get your panel nominations in to me as soon as possible as I can't do anything until I receive those. The composition of the panel is on page 46 of the NZQA publication Approval and Accreditation of Courses Leading to Degrees and Related Qualifications 2003. and the guidelines for nominating panel members are in paragraph 5, page 41.

And, unfortunately for you, paragraph 6 is no longer accurate. As you say, we no longer work through NZVCC for their representatives, so you need to approach appropriate university people yourselves and put them forward as part of your list of nominees.

I hope this helps. Please contact me if you have any queries.

Kind regards

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 18/05/2006 3:03:31 p.m. >>>
Dear Lesley

Sue Walbran has possibly give you a copy of my letter giving early notification of a degree approval and accreditation process for the proposed Bachelor of Naturopathy and Herbal Medicine. We will be getting the document to NZQA as close as possible to the end of this month. However, while we have had the critiques from professional assn representatives in Medical Herbalism and Naturopathy, the critique from the University of Western Sydney has been delayed by a couple of weeks through illness.

I would like to set the dates for the panel visit to fit in with the commitments of the Head of Faculty responsible for this degree. Our preference would be for the week beginning 7 August. If this is not possible, then the week beginning 21 August. I would like to block out the days asap and begin working with you on the make up of the panel.

Let me know how your diary stacks up against these dates and what

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

process you wish to follow in relation to setting up the panel. My understanding from Sue is that we no longer work through the Vice Chancellor's Committee for university representatives. Whatever, we will be guided by you.

Best Regards

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:24/05/2006 9:57:07a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Degree approval

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Good morning Grace

Your suggested nominee sounds just fine. Please make sure that you get working CVs from your nominees to send to us as well.

Cheers

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xx.xx> 23/05/2006 4:03:02 p.m. >>>
Dear Lesley

Thanks for the response. I have just noticed that nominations cannot have 'an association with the applying provider which may constitute a potential conflict of interest.'

I have emailed Assoc Professor Jo Barnes from the School of Pharmacy and Auckland University and asked her if she was able to put her name forward for nomination. She has recently arrived in NZ to take up a position relating to her specialist field relating to quality controls of herbal medicine. Our association has been one visit to the College to see around and meet a few people. We are of course in the process of getting research off the ground and she gave us some ideas and offered to look over proposed research projects. She has had nothing at all to do with the degree programme, she is a fine academic and I believe the best we could get in New Zealand. I don't believe there is a conflict of interest at all. Is this okay?

Regards

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 9:34 AM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Degree approval

23 May 2006

Dear Grace

Thank you for your email. It's good to get these things sorted out

early. Panel members need to be free for one evening (from about 6pm for the briefing meeting) and then two full days. It is really important that they can be there for that time.

Panel members are paid the princely sum of \$400.00 per day for four days (to pay for reading before hand and reporting matters afterwards etc).

I can quite understand that finding appropriate panel members will be difficult for you, so you will have to be a trifle creative. As you have discovered panel members must have experience at or be able to work at degree level, so you may have to look at other natural therapy areas.

As long as someone with content knowledge is there, others with degree level expertise should be fine. Someone from Unitec's osteopathy degree would be most acceptable.

And unfortunately, you won't be able to use the Medical Herbalist who critiqued your proposal as they would now have a conflict of interest.

Sorry about that but good luck.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or information in it. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately. NZQA does not accept any liability for changes made to this email or attachments after sending by NZQA.

All emails have been scanned for viruses and content by MailMarshal. NZQA reserves the right to monitor all email communications through its network.



Create Date:29/05/2006 3:40:16p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Degree approval

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Hello Grace

Approaching candidates for a panel is incredibly time consuming, I know. The person from UWS sounds fine if she hasn't started the critique. We need someone teaching a similar degree so try to get her.

And the AUT possibilities also sound fine - academics from a similar field add the academic approach not just subject expertise.

We ask for two nominations for each of the positions for which you have to nominate people, because so often the preferred nominee cannot make the date and we end up needing alternative nominees. Setting the date is the task I find most difficult in setting up degree panels as you can get 6 out of 7 agreeing on a date and the 8th person can't make it. If there are no alternatives and you have to set a new date, other people then won't be able to make that.

However if you are having difficulties send me your list of nominees (with their work CVs) and I can at least get started on trying to fix a date. You never know, we may not need to fall back on alternatives if a can fix a date early enough on.

The other reason for having 2 nominees for each position is to make sure that we have the content of the degree reasonably covered by someone and the other areas of scrutiny also covered. That is why we like to see the CVs.

Hope that helps.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 29/05/2006 10:07:02 a.m. >>>
Hi Lesley

I am still working through the task of getting panel members - the AU professor doesn't have the time unfortunately. I have written to the person at the University of Western Sydney suggesting that if she has not yet started the critique, would she have the time to participate in the panel. We do not know her but she leads a degree that appears to be similar so I don't believe there is a conflict of interest. Your view?

As the students will be taking two AUT courses I have been speaking with the Health and Environmental Sciences Dean. We hope this relationship may grow in the future, so I am seeking nominations from that source as well even though they don't cover this area.

Is it essential to have two nominations for each position?

I hope to sort the panel out today or tomorrow.

Regards

Grace Sylvester

Wellpark College

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 9:34 AM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Degree approval

23 May 2006

Dear Grace

Thank you for your email. It's good to get these things sorted out early. Panel members need to be free for one evening (from about 6pm for the briefing meeting) and then two full days. It is really important that they can be there for that time.

Panel members are paid the princely sum of \$400.00 per day for four days (to pay for reading before hand and reporting matters afterwards etc).

I can quite understand that finding appropriate panel members will be difficult for you, so you will have to be a trifle creative. As you have discovered panel members must have experience at or be able to work at degree level, so you may have to look at other natural therapy areas. As long as someone with content knowledge is there, others with degree level expertise should be fine. Someone from Unitec's osteopathy degree would be most acceptable.

And unfortunately, you won't be able to use the Medical Herbalist who critiqued your proposal as they would now have a conflict of interest.

Sorry about that but good luck.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or information in it. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately. NZQA does not accept any liability for



Create Date:31/05/2006 10:40:07a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Degree approval

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Good morning Grace

Great that you managed to contact the UWS person before she got too involved.

In regard to the Maori endorsement, it does not necessarily have to be a Maori person but whoever it is has to be endorsed by the relevant Maori community. So, yes, we're back to the protocols issue.

Is your Maori adviser (Teahou) actually part of the staff at Wellpark? If so, I was wondering if he could be both the Wellpark representative (that is for transparency) and the Maori representative. He is not actively teaching on an existing course, is he? I don't think his being a graduate of 6 years back would necessarily be a conflict of interest because of the time gap and as a student he would not have been involved in the development of either his programme or this one (was he?). If Teahou is not considered to be part of the staff, he could be nominated to take the cultural perspective but there could still be the issue of endorsement.

I'm not sure if I'm helping. I talked to Sue and she agreed with what I've suggested.

In regard to the list of nominations, I would rather receive your nominations altogether (and with CVs). However, as you have been telling the candidates to keep that week aside, send your list when you have at least one for each position (that is two for the universities and industry of course), because the chances are that they might be able to make the date. I would prefer two nominations however and you may still need to provide a second nomination if I consider the first not appropriate or if they can't for some reason make the date. So, please keep working on it, but send as much as you can but with each position "covered". as soon as possible. Time is of the essence of course, if we wish to make that date.

I know it is difficult but having the right panel is both key and essential.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 30/05/2006 2:54:27 p.m. >>>
Hello Lesley

It really is a job getting panel nominees but we will get there. I managed to contact the University of Western Sydney programme leader who had not had time to do the critique for us. Vicki Mortimer had not looked at the material, has destroyed it and is keen to be on the panel. She is doing one in Australia in June. She will get her summarized CV to me by the end of this week. We may be able to get someone from Southern Cross University in NSW where a similar programme is offered.

Now the Maori endorsement. Our programme document details where the College is with iwi 'partnership' per se and our consultation around the programme has been with the assns that cover Maori Traditional Healing - Pumau Trust and Nga Ringa Whakahaere o te Iwi Maori. However, I am still waiting for their letters of support and hopefully they will come in time. I believe programme consultation/support needs to be based on the discipline.

A Maori adviser, graduate of 6 years back, has been appointed to

establish sound relationships with the relevant iwi using appropriate protocols - also in programme document. I have talked with him (Teaohou) about the endorsement and the most appropriate way to go about this. He believes it would set the College back if he went to iwi seeking a nomination (or declining to nominate) before proper protocols had been followed. We are concerned to establish proper working relationships between iwi and the College. He feels the approach is a European model which tries to integrate Maori participation. He believes such participation requires equal opportunity but without depth of knowledge and practice in naturopathy or herbal medicine, equal opportunity is not possible.

Please advise me what to do in this case. Teaohou could be nominated to take the cultural perspective but you may feel this is a conflict of interest.

Did you mean that I could send the nominees and CVs directly to you as soon as I have at least one for each position? I am telling them all it is the week beginning 5 August so they should have marked the full week out.

Look forward to your response.

Best Regards

Grace Sylvester

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2006 3:40 PM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: RE: Degree approval

Hello Grace

Approaching candidates for a panel is incredibly time consuming, I know. The person from UWS sounds fine if she hasn't started the critique. We need someone teaching a similar degree so try to get her.

And the AUT possibilities also sound fine - academics from a similar field add the academic approach not just subject expertise.

We ask for two nominations for each of the positions for which you have to nominate people, because so often the preferred nominee cannot make the date and we end up needing alternative nominees. Setting the date is the task I find most difficult in setting up degree panels as you can get 6 out of 7 agreeing on a date and the 8th person can't make it. If there are no alternatives and you have to set a new date, other people then won't be able to make that.

However if you are having difficulties send me your list of nominees (with their work CVs) and I can at least get started on trying to fix a date. You never know, we may not need to fall back on alternatives if a can fix a date early enough on.

The other reason for having 2 nominees for each position is to make sure that we have the content of the degree reasonably covered by someone and the other areas of scrutiny also covered. That is why we like to see the CVs.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Hope that helps.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xx.xx> 29/05/2006
10:27:02 a.m. >>>
Hi Lesley

I am still working through the task of getting panel members - the AU professor doesn't have the time unfortunately. I have written to the person at the University of Western Sydney suggesting that if she has not yet started the critique, would she have the time to participate in the panel. We do not know her but she leads a degree that appears to be similar so I don't believe there is a conflict of interest. Your view?

As the students will be taking two AUT courses I have been speaking with the Health and Environmental Sciences Dean. We hope this relationship may grow in the future, so I am seeking nominations from that source as well even though they don't cover this area.

Is it essential to have two nominations for each position?

I hope to sort the panel out today or tomorrow.

Regards

Grace Sylvester

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 9:34 AM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Degree approval

23 May 2006

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Dear Grace

Thank you for your email. It's good to get these things sorted out early. Panel members need to be free for one evening (from about 6pm for the briefing meeting) and then two full days. It is really important that they can be there for that time.

Panel members are paid the princely sum of \$400.00 per day for four days (to pay for reading before hand and reporting matters afterwards etc).

I can quite understand that finding appropriate panel members will be difficult for you, so you will have to be a trifle creative. As you have discovered panel members must have experience at or be able to work at degree level, so you may have to look at other natural therapy areas.

As long as someone with content knowledge is there, others with degree level expertise should be fine. Someone from Unitec's osteopathy degree would be most acceptable.

And unfortunately, you won't be able to use the Medical Herbalist who critiqued your proposal as they would now have a conflict of interest.

Sorry about that but good luck.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or information in it. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately. NZQA does not accept any liability for changes made to this email or attachments after sending by NZQA.

All emails have been scanned for viruses and content by MailMarshal. NZQA reserves the right to monitor all email communications through its network.



Create Date:7/06/2006 11:18:24a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Re: Degree Approval

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Dear Grace

Thank you for your email. It is a pity that we have to delay the process but I do respect the integrity with which you are approaching the task. And congratulations for getting those 4 good nominees. I hope that you can hold on to them.

What kind of delay are we talking about - days, weeks or months? I guess that it is hard to tell and I know that these things take time. My only concern is that I will be away from 11 September to 24 October 2006. If we have the meeting before I go away I would just need time to write up the report and circulate it before I go. I could possibly get a colleague to take it from there.

If absolutely necessary we could get a QSE, but I would like to be involved.

Keep me posted.

Kind regards

Lesley

>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 6/06/2006 12:12:16 p.m. >>>

Dear Lesley

I have now managed to get four very good nominees for the university section of the panel - all keen to be involved - as well as all the other slots filled. However, I need to put the approval and accreditation process on hold as we are unable to go ahead for the week beginning 5 August. As I looked further into the iwi endorsed representative and had discussions with the recently engaged Maori Adviser, I discovered that advice from Maori re iwi consultation over a Diploma programme had certainly been sought and acted on but it was the wrong advice. We acted on that advice for the degree programme plus key iwi involved in traditional healing.

A formal relationship now needs to be set up with Ngati Whataua before we go any further. I have advised the panel members accordingly. As soon as the correct protocol has been followed, I will get in touch with you re possible dates. I am assuming you will be able to stay with this degree programme and hopefully I won't need to go back to the drawing board on the nominees. It is a time consuming process without the VCC taking this responsibility.

Best Regards

Grace Sylvester

most appreciated. However, you didn't receive a response because we were working through details around whether we could proceed with the process on the given week in August. As it happens I have had to put the panel on hold until the College works through correct consultation processes with local iwi (Maori tribe). The incorrect process took place and, in this case, native herbs are part of the curriculum and there is an issue around sustainability.

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

Lesley Edgeley-Page

Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Create Date:8/06/2006 3:56:09p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Panel membership

8 June 2006

Hello Grace

I'm starting a new email as the last rolling copy was getting so long.

In answer to your queries:

Industry reps only need to be endorsed by the relevant association, so you are fine there. The reference to registration is really for bodies like the NZ Nurses Council and the NZ Teachers Council who register nurses and teachers respectively.

In regard to the plan for flexible delivery, it may be as well to have the range of possible modes considered with this application as the introduction of a new mode of delivery constitutes a Category D change. Category D changes require evaluation by a (small) panel and possibly a visit. It could be like a mini repeat of what you are going through now.

You are right about Section 2.1 but remember that given the identified mode of delivery, panel members will then check that other things, for example, assessment methodology, admin support, number and qualifications of teaching staff etc., are appropriate, given the mode(s) of delivery.

I look forward to hearing from you once you have resolved the current situation.

Kind regards

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:20/06/2006 1:57:43p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Re: FW: Ngati Whatua representation on Degree Programme

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Hello Grace

Thank you for your email and congratulations for resolving this issue. Teahou Luke sounds absolutely fine and good that he has the appropriate backing and support.

And yes, the week beginning 21 August is fine for me. Do you know if that is ok for panel members? In any case, the sooner I can get in touch with them to confirm things and send guidelines etc, the better, but at the moment we are fine for time - if that date is ok with panel members.

And in regard to your next email, no, you are quite right, you do not have to send an Independent Subject Expert report. That is for undergraduate local course approvals only, because NZQA doesn't send out little panels for those courses as we used to. You will have letters of support and a whole panel of experts looking at your degree, so no, no subject expert report.

Kind regards

Lesley Edgeley-Page

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx> 20/06/2006 12:14:28 p.m. >>>

Dear Lesley

I have received the message (below) from Ngati Whatua in relation to the degree panel and the recommendation/endorsement of Teahou Luke as the iwi's representative. Teahou has recently been appointed as the College's Maori Adviser and is successfully working on the ongoing iwi/college partnership which is very important to the College. In his previous position at Tamaki Healthcare he wrote a letter of support for the programme in relation to things that are important to iwi but he has not seen or been involved in any critique of the programme document. He has agreed to be a member on the newly established advisory committee for Naturopathy and Herbal Medicine but will not be available to join the committee until the November 2006 meeting. I am assuming that you will be happy with the Ngati Whatua nomination.

If I can get the document to you within a week, could we convene the panel for the week beginning 21 August hopefully beginning on the evening of Tuesday 22 August? The Head of the Naturopathy and Herbal Medicine Faculty is key to the process and he is in the USA returning Monday 21 August. Does this give you sufficient time for your 10 September departure? I still need to check this out with the Principal and before I go back to the panel with a revised date.

Best Regards

Grace Sylvester

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Naida Glavish [mailto:xxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 12:10 PM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Ngati Whatua representation on Degree Programme

To whom it may concern

I am R. Naida Glavish JP and I am the chairperson of Ngati Whatua Nga

Rima o Kaipara.

At this time it is with regret that I must decline the invitation to participate in the review of the degree programme. However we would like to nominate Teaohou Luke to represent us for this particular review of the degree programme.

We expect that Teaohou Luke would cover the reading material and understand the reading from the charter draft report with ease as he has the experience and knowledge in this field.

Teaohou Luke is contactable on 027 4450120 or at xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xx.xx

<mailto:xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xx.xx>

Thank you for the invitation and we anticipate working very closely with you in the very near future

Heoi ano mo tenei wa.

Naku na

Naida Glavish JP

Chairperson

Ngati Whatua Nga Rima o Kaipara.

R. Naida Glavish JP
Chief Advisor-Tikanga
Auckland District Health Board
Mobile 021 722086

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:12/07/2006 9:36:11a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Re: Degree Development

12 July 2006

Good morning Grace

Thank you for your email. I have been away for most of the past two weeks with both a family bereavement and the 'flu so I am a little behind. I'm working frantically to catch up and hope to get the letters out to panel members this week (tomorrow?). I'll keep you posted.

I think that a copy of the Prospectus would be very useful for all panel members, so include that.

I have received your file from operations, so you should have received an acknowledgement from them (they log in the applications before they are passed on to us to work on). I'll check it out.

I'll be in touch.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 11/07/2006 10:23:54 a.m. >>>
Dear Lesley

I have all the material ready to go out to the panel members. Can you give me an indication of the time frame to which you work for sending the material out and whether you feel I should put in a copy of the 2006 Prospectus to give them an understanding of the College and its philosophy. I have not received an acknowledge from NZQA that they have received the documentation which is unusual. However, I guess NZQA may be under some pressure with the new CEO and, as I understand it, a new structure with the new deputy positions.

Look forward to your response.

Regards

Grace Sylvester

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:24/07/2006 10:07:39a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Panel members

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Good morning Grace

Pity I missed your phone call as I 've only been away from my desk for about two minutes, but in any case, through this email correspondence, you can see the issue. And I do appreciate that you have a very small field to choose from. I'll wait until I hear back from you.

Kind regards

Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 24/07/2006 10:02:19 a.m. >>>

Dear Lesley

You will have a voice mail from me and since then I have cleared my emails so I assume this is the issue.

I will try and get hold of Dawne Sanson today to see if the NZAMH will be happy to endorse Jeff Flat even though he is not a member. I agree that Dawne would have been a good panel member. However, she came to one of the external groups relating to the programme and then critiqued it for us. The field out there of suitable people is small for us to get the best feedback possible from the experts. Unfortunately, my understanding is that Dawne would not be acceptable to NZQA even though my personal interactions tell me that she would be by far the best professional member on the panel. One of the problems of being in an emerging area.

Will be in touch asap.

Regards

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]

Sent: Friday, July 21, 2006 4:45 PM

To: Academicdirector

Subject: Panel members

21 July 2006

Dear Grace

I have virtually selected the panel, with thanks to you for your careful work on it.

I am having a little difficulty though with the professional reps as I have no endorsement for either Isla Burgess or Jeff Flat.

I would be quite interested in an endorsement for Jeff and was told that the NZ Association of Medical Herbalists might be prepared to do that as Jeff is well known. Dawn Sanson was (and still may be) the president, so it may be worth contacting her. I have also heard that she would be a good panel member herself.

Could you try to get an endorsement for Jeff through Dawn or whoever is appropriate. I will try to contact her too so whoever gets there first.

I have tried to contact you all day today but to no avail so hope to hear from you on Monday morning.

Have a good weekend.

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or information in it. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately. NZQA does not accept any liability for changes made to this email or attachments after sending by NZQA.

All emails have been scanned for viruses and content by MailMarshal. NZQA reserves the right to monitor all email communications through its network.



Create Date:24/07/2006 12:09:09p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject: Introductions

24 July 2006

Dear colleagues,

Tena koutou katoa

Most of you will have been contacted by Wellpark College of Natural Therapies about being on the peer review panel to evaluate their application for approval and accreditation of their proposed Bachelor of Naturopathy and Herbal Medicine

This email is to confirm your membership of the panel, to make contact and to introduce myself. You will receive an official letter from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority providing details of the arrangements along with a package including guidelines, contracts, claim forms and more information. We hope to get that package out to you on Friday 28 July 2006 although I am still awaiting the endorsement for one more panel member. The degree documents will be sent to you directly by the College.

In any case, please fix the dates in your diaries. We will begin at 6pm on 23 August with the briefing meeting and then meet for two full days on 24 and 25 August. I understand that you are all available then.

The panel chairperson is Candis Craven.

Vicki and Teahou, could you send me a postal address (ie street address) for your packages please.

If you have any queries, please contact me, although initially I suggest that you wait for your packages. They should clarify things for you.

Thank you for agreeing to be on this panel. I look forward to working with all of you.

Yours sincerely

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: lesley.edgeley-page@nzqa.govt.nz

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Create Date:31/07/2006 11:22:51a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Panel arrangements

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Hello Grace

That's fine. Candis' street address is 63 Esplanade Road, Mt Eden, Auckland.

Cheers

Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 31/07/2006 11:21:10 a.m. >>>
Dear Lesley

I will get back on the points below asap. What I need right now is a street address for Candis Craven so that the documents can be couriered to her today.

Thanks

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxx-xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2006 10:49 AM
To: Academicdirector
Cc: xxxxxx.xxxxxx@xxxx.xx.xx
Subject: Panel arrangements

31 July 2006

Good morning Grace

Our packages with guidelines, claim forms, criteria etc are ready to go out this morning, so feel free to send your documents out. Just to remind you, the final panel is Candis, Vicki, Hans, Simeon, Isla, Peggy, Teaohou, Vijay and me - but I have the documents. If you need any further details please contact me.

Our letter told the panelists that we would confirm the agenda, accommodation and venues later, so you and I need to have a chat about these.

NZQA can do the travel arrangements if that suits you, but can you arrange the accommodation, please. That will be for all of those from out of Auckland for the nights of 23 and 24 August 2006.

Could you also advise us of the venue for the main meeting on the Thursday and Friday and for the briefing meeting on the Wednesday night.

The latter is often held at the same place as the accommodation if there is a suitable room. The panel then has dinner together afterwards ("getting to know you" etc), so that has to be arranged. That too can be at the accommodation place if they have a dining room. The panel will also need to be fed on the Thursday night so could you think about that too. Lunch and morning and afternoon teas during the two days is also the provider's responsibility. Another thing to think about.

In regard to the agenda, basically you need to arrange it because of the situation you outlined in your email, that is staff availability. I will outline who we need to see if you wouldn't mind arranging it with

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



the appropriate people.

On the Thursday morning the panel should have an hour together, say from 8.30am to 9.30am. After that, we would like to see (in the order that you can arrange):

- senior management including the CEO and finance manager for an hour
- the programme developer/manager(s) for an hour
- teaching staff (all those you suggested in your email and it may include the programme developer given that you are a small organisation) for an hour.
- any potential students (or students from another course if need be) - for half an hour
- the advisory committee - for half an hour. It is common to invite the advisory committee for lunch which they have together with the panel before sitting down for a discussion.

At some stage the panel would like to see the premises, including teaching facilities, library, student areas (caf, common room?).

The Friday afternoon should be left free for final panel discussions. A group of you may wish to be available for the informal feedback at the end of the meeting, later that afternoon.

Would you mind drafting an agenda based on the requirements above and the availability of the staff and then sending it to me for confirmation?

Many thanks

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or information in it. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately. NZQA does not accept any liability for changes made to this email or attachments after sending by NZQA.

All emails have been scanned for viruses and content by MailMarshal. NZQA reserves the right to monitor all email communications through its network.



Create Date:1/08/2006 3:13:39p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Re: Panel material

Hello Grace

Oh dear. Poor Vijay. The NZQA material was sent out yesterday so he should receive it by tomorrow at least. I don't know why he didn't receive my initial introductory email. I didn't receive any "failed to deliver" message, but who knows with technology. I'll send him a copy of that now so that he is in the loop.

Hope to get back to you on the agenda shortly.

Kind regards

Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 1/08/2006 12:41:23 p.m. >>>

Dear Lesley

Vijay tells me he has not received an email from you as yet. I haven't been able to talk with him face to face as he has been tied up teaching. Can you confirm whether he has been sent the panel material as identified in your email to me.

Thanks

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date: 1/08/2006 3:23:14p.m.

withheld under section 9 (2)(a)

Sender: "Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To [REDACTED]

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject: Introductions

1 August 2006

Dear colleagues

I understand Vijay that you didn't receive my initial introductory email and I think from my "message failed" notice that you didn't either, Candis. My apologies to you both. I have copied it down below.

The NZQA official documents were sent yesterday, so you should receive those at least tomorrow.

Kind regards

Lesley

Here is the previous message:

24 July 2006

Dear colleagues,

Tena koutou katoa

Most of you will have been contacted by Welpark College of Natural Therapies about being on the peer review panel to evaluate their application for approval and accreditation of their proposed Bachelor of Naturopathy and Herbal Medicine

This email is to confirm your membership of the panel, to make contact and to introduce myself. You will receive an official letter from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority providing details of the arrangements along with a package including guidelines, contracts, claim forms and more information. We hope to get that package out to you on Friday 28 July 2006 although I am still awaiting the endorsement for one more panel member. The degree documents will be sent to you directly by the College.

In any case, please fix the dates in your diaries. We will begin at 6pm on 23 August with the briefing meeting and then meet for two full days on 24 and 25 August. I understand that you are all available then.

The panel chairperson is Candis Craven.

Vicki and Teahou, could you send me a postal address (ie street address) for your packages please.

If you have any queries, please contact me, although initially I suggest that you wait for your packages. They should clarify things for you.

Thank you for agreeing to be on this panel. I look forward to working with all of you.

Yours sincerely

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: lesley.edgeley-page@nzqa.govt.nz

Create Date:2/08/2006 4:20:53p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Agenda plus

Hello Grace

Please find attached an amended draft agenda. I hope that you can follow my notes and that the red tracking changes device works and is legible. Get back to me if you can't read it or if you have other issues/concerns.

One other issue. Would it be alright with Wellpark if I were bring an observer with me? It would be David Duthie, one of my colleagues here in Course Approvals. NZQA is trying to build up the degree expertise inside the organisation now, so I need to train people. As with all observers, David would not be able to comment, express an opinion, contribute to the discussion, nor vote. He would be there to learn about the process. His attendance would not cost Wellpark anything. NZQA would pay David's airfare and accommodation. Please let me know if that's ok. If so, could you please book David into the quality Inn, but put it onto a separate account.

By the way, the Quality Inn sounds fine, the restaurant will be fine, I'm sure, and you mentioned a meeting room, so that's fine too. Five minutes drive from the College sounds good.

I have asked the panel members to contact NZQA for flight arrangements but so far have only heard from Hans, who will be at a conference in Wellington beforehand. He would like an extra night at the Quality Inn on the Friday night (ie 25 August). Could you arrange that please?

Could you please send an amended draft agenda back to me as soon as you have dealt with it, and I'll shoot it to the chair in case she has any thoughts on it.

Many thanks.

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



**DRAFT TIMETABLE : DEGREE APPROVAL AND ACCREDITATION
WELLPARK COLLEGE**

Wednesday, 23 August 2006

Venue: Quality Inn West End, 465 Great North Road, Grey Lynn
Telephone: 64-9-378 9059
Fax: 64-9-378 1464

6pm Briefing meeting

7.30pm Dinner

[Please fill in the time you intend to begin the meeting and likely time for dinner to follow.]

Thursday 24 August 2006

8.30 – 9.30 am Panel Time
Meet the Phillip Cottingham (Principal) and QinQin Zhan (Panel Support)
Room – Kawa Kawa
Panel Time

9.30 – 10.30 am Meeting with Management:
Phillip Cottingham, Principal
Grant Litchfield, Chair, Board of Directors not available
Vinay Shah, Accountant

10.30-11.00 am Morning Tea *I have left 30 minutes in case you run over the time and/or
to discuss points raised within the meeting fine*

11.00-~~12.30~~ 12.00 pm Meeting with teaching staff *I have allowed 1.5 hours as I will be inviting
representatives who specialize in the major subject areas although some
teach across more than one area. Subject to being available, I will be
inviting. The above is fine. One hours is enough. We can call them back if
need be.*

<i>Herbal Medicine</i>	<i>Medical Sciences</i>
<i>Naturopathy</i>	<i>Aromatherapy</i>
<i>Nutrition</i>	<i>Clinical Practice Supervisor</i>
<i>Homeopathy</i>	<i>Teaching Head of Faculty</i>

*Plus two others who are young, excellent teachers and practitioners who
would benefit from participating in the session. Fine*

~~12.3000~~ – 12.30 pm Panel time

12.30 – 1.30 Lunch

1.30-2.30 pm Meeting with Programme Development team
(Phil Dowling, Phil Cottingham, Grace Sylvester)

2.30 – ~~4.~~ 3.00 Meeting with students *I would like some guidance here on how many you wish to meet. May be 10 (4 from year 3, 2 from year 2, 2 from year 1 and a couple of recent graduates). We would try and get a balance of male, female, older and younger, an international student You may not need the full 1.5 hours. We will have to select them and to some extent it will be those who are available on the day. Do you have any rules on how they are selected? 10 and with a number from each year would be great if you can do it – and with the various balances. We do not have rules but volunteers are preferable to a provider selection and those available on the day are also fine. If you can influence it slightly so that different years are covered and with those balances, that would be great.*

We can leave a little gap here. Time to walk back from where-ever.

3.30 – 4.00pm Meeting with student and admin support staff

Could we have this meeting here rather than 11.00am on Friday?

Formatted

4.00pm Followed by ~~P~~panel time, as required.

Time? ~~Meet for dinner~~ *I assume you mean the full panel will have dinner together on Thursday evening. Although I haven't checked it out, Dr Vijay could host the group at an Indian Restaurant if you think that would be acceptable for panel taste! This is a strongly vegetarian College. I have not yet approached Vijay. This dinner does not have to be on the agenda. Local people may wish to go home, but the people from out of Auckland will probably need to be fed. Some may even visit friends so it can be a bit of a moving feast (excuse the pun!) A possibility in someone's mind for those from out town would be good. Indian would be fine but it could be difficult to book in terms of not really knowing numbers. We can perhaps discuss it at the briefing meeting.*

Panel time if necessary

Friday 25 August

8.30-9.30 Panel time

9.30-11.00 am 10.30? ~~Tour of facilities which will include~~ *ing visiting the Prema Clinic. ~~Students should be working in the Clinic at that time which should be of interest to the panel. The Clinic Supervisor will also be available for further discussion. Do we need one and a half hours here or is the Prema Clinic some way away? Normally one hour is sufficient.~~*

11.00-12.00 noon Meeting with student and admin support staff. See Thursday.

10.30 – 12.00pm Panel time (we can recall people then if need be)

Grant Litchfield could come anytime between 10.30 and 12.00 that suits him. While it would be good for him to meet the Advisory committee (perhaps he could stay for lunch – talk to you for half an hour while waiting) I'm not so sure that we should see them together as we would need to ask the Ad Comm and Board chair different questions.

~~12.00-1.00-12.30pm Lunch and Meeting with Advisory Committee or it could be the other way around. They are very busy people and if lunch goes on a bit, they may well have to slip out. This session could be to 1.30 pm. While the Advisory Committee is new and I have set it up as an outcome of the external consultation process, these people are very important to the College. We are only meeting formally twice a year and we have only had one meeting. However, they know the field well and have a good understanding of required educational standards.~~

~~12.30 – 1.30pm Lunch~~

~~1.30 – 3.30pm Panel meeting~~

~~3.30pm Informal feedback to college~~

~~is Friday afternoon and getting to the airport could take a little time. Good point!~~

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Create Date:7/08/2006 10:56:42a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: FW: Booking Confirmation

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Hi Grace

How very sad about Geoff Page. I only met him once and he seemed a fine person. How awful to die in office so to speak and have no retirement time.

Re the agenda, I haven't heard back from Candis so I'll check with her. Like you, I want to get it out to the panel, with all that accommodation info etc.

I'll be in touch soon.

Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 7/08/2006 11:01:47 a.m. >>>
No, I don't wish to do them. NZQA will have staff who do travel arrangements all the time and it would be more efficient for them to do these.

Can you give me any idea when I may receive a confirmed agenda once Candis has okayed it? I will not be here Wednesday or Thursday this week and I really need to let both the staff and advisory committee members who are in practice know asap so that they can adjust their times.

The current CEO of MIT died last week (only a little more than two years into his contract) and I must go to his funeral on Wednesday. I had enormous respect for Geoff Page and it is very sad.

Regards

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xx.xx]
Sent: Monday, August 07, 2006 10:20 AM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Re: FW: Booking Confirmation

Good morning Grace

That's right although if you wish to do them, that's also fine, as long as we both know. In the letter to panel members, we did tell them to contact NZQA if they had travel requirements and gave them a contact address, so your advice was right.

Cheers

Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 7/08/2006 9:57:35 a.m. >>>
Dear Lesley

My understanding was that NZQA would be doing the travel bookings for the panel. I have this morning advised Isla Burgess that this is my understanding but am checking in case I have made an incorrect assumption.

Regards

Grace

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 06, 2006 11:11 AM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: RE: Booking Confirmation

withheld under section 9 (2)(a)

Good Morning Grace,
Thank you for the E-mail.
I will book tickets this week and send you the details.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Academicdirector [mailto:academicdirector@Wellpark.co.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 3 August 2006 3:14 p.m.
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Booking Confirmation

For information, [REDACTED] Please ignore reference to payment of course.
Can you advise your arrival and departure details when your tickets
are
received so that transport can be available.

Thanks

Grace Sylvester

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: The Reservations Department
[mailto:RESERVATIONS@QUALITYINNWESTEND.CO.NZ]
Sent: Friday, August 04, 2006 2:33 AM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Booking Confirmation

DEAR [REDACTED]

THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESERVATION FOR ACCOMMODATION AT THE QUALITY INN
WEST
END
PLEASE FIND BELOW CONFIRMATION OF YOUR BOOKING.

NAME [REDACTED]

ARRIVAL DATE : 23rd August 2006

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



DEPARTURE DATE : 25th August 2006

ROOM TYPE BOOKED : SUPERIOR ROOM

ROOM RATE : 111.38

CONFIRMATION # : 48219

METHOD OF PAYMENT : PLEASE NOTE ALL RESERVATIONS NOT SECURED IN FULL BY

COMPANY CHARGE BACK OR TRAVEL AGENT GUARANTEE MUST ADHERE TO THE CASH/EFTPOS

BOND POLICY BELOW OR PRODUCE A CREDIT CARD AS GUARANTEE FOR ANY INCIDENTALS.

CASH & EFTPOS PAYMENTS :

PLEASE NOTE FOR ALL CASH/EFTPOS PAYMENTS WE REQUIRE THE TOTAL ACCOMMODATION

PLUS A BOND OF \$150.00 TO BE PAID ON ARRIVAL. THE BOND IS REFUNDABLE ON

CHECK OUT. GUESTS ARE REQUIRED TO PRODUCE ID ON ARRIVAL.

CANCELLATION POLICY

GUARANTEED RESERVATIONS MUST BE CANCELLED NO LATER THAN 6PM ON THE DAY OF

ARRIVAL. ALL RESERVATIONS CANCELLED AFTER THIS TIME WILL INCUR A CHARGE

OF 1 NIGHT'S ACCOMMODATION TO THE GUARANTEED METHOD OF PAYMENT.

NON-GUARANTEED RESERVATIONS DURING HIGH OCCUPANCY PERIODS WILL BE RELEASED

FOR RESALE FROM 6PM ON THE DAY OF ARRIVAL.

BOOKING STATUS : Confirmed

ONCE AGAIN THANK YOU AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO WELCOMING THE ABOVE GUEST UPON

ARRIVAL.

KIND REGARDS

DELYSE STEWART

RESERVATIONS

QUALITY INN WEST END

465 GREAT NORTH ROAD

GREY LYNN, AUCKLAND

TEL 09 378 9059

FAX 09 378 1464

www.QUALITYINNWESTEND.CO.NZ

_____ NOD32 1.1684 (20060729) Information _____

This message was checked by NOD32 antivirus system.



This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or information in it. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately. NZQA does not accept any liability for changes made to this email or attachments after sending by NZQA.

All emails have been scanned for viruses and content by MailMarshal. NZQA reserves the right to monitor all email communications through its network.

Create Date:10/08/2006 12:02:50 p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Agenda plus

10 August 2006

Good morning Grace

I realise that you are not at Wellpark today but this email nevertheless.

Candis is happy with the agenda, but not quite so happy with the accommodation. Apparently other providers don't use it any more but she realises that it is close to Wellpark and that there are few other choices. In particular she said to check if the Dorset Room is really a room and not part of the lobby, which is not private.

We do need a private room for that briefing meeting.

Because we are starting earlyTeaohou Luke thinks that he may need to stay at the hotel but I'll get back to you to confirm that.

Cheers

Lesley

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:10/08/2006 2:45:16p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

"D"

Sent

Sent_BC:

Subject:Agenda plus

10 August 2006

Dear colleagues

Attached for your information is the agenda for our meeting on 24 and 25 August. (The briefing meeting the previous night has its own agenda). The agenda also names the venues for you.

The NZQA operations person who is looking after travel is away at the moment so if any of you still have travel arrangements to be made please let me know as soon as possible.

I have had some queries about the panel response form. The form is made up of the criteria against which we evaluate an application. Eventually we will be deciding if all the criteria have been met. This initial analysis is really just to give us an idea as to whether there are any obvious issues or concerns to be discussed. I summarise your responses just to give us (the panel) a guide for our discussions. If, for example most of you highlight the same issue, we would know to spend some time on it. Some other issues raised may be easily dealt with. Some of you may feel that you cannot write a comment under each of the criteria. That is fine. You all have different sorts of expertise so respond accordingly. This initial analysis does not preclude any further questioning.

I am aware that some panel members are not able to get their responses in to me by Friday. I am perfectly happy if you can get them to me by the end of Tuesday 15 August.

Should there be any other queries, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: lesley.edgeley-page@nzqa.govt.nz

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:14/08/2006 4:32:24p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Agenda plus

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Thanks, Grace. Cheers Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 11/08/2006 10:51:30 a.m. >>>
Hi Lesley

I have been in touch with the Quality Inn and changed the room to the Sussex Room which is upstairs off the restaurant and I am assured it is quiet. They will send me through a confirmation of the change but I don't anticipate any problems.

I have attached the agenda with one change for the Friday. I have put the Library first in the tour of facilities as the Library consultant was free to come at this time. I brought Lynley Stone in to review the library as part of the degree development process and she has since been back to check on progress. At the same time Lynley has given one-on-one focused training to Hu. This approach to training has proved excellent and will continue each term. I anticipate that Lynley will be involved in the extension when it comes on track at the end of the year. The library is such an important part of the College's development, I feel it needs its own slot in situ even if it means the tour section may result in a shorter morning tea slot.

I will have the names of staff and students available when you arrive.

Regards

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2006 12:03 PM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Agenda plus

10 August 2006

Good morning Grace

I realise that you are not at Wellpark today but this email nevertheless.

Candis is happy with the agenda, but not quite so happy with the accommodation. Apparently other providers don't use it any more but she realises that it is close to Wellpark and that there are few other choices. In particular she said to check if the Dorset Room is really a room and not part of the lobby, which is not private.

We do need a private room for that briefing meeting.

Because we are starting earlyTeaohou Luke thinks that he may need to stay at the hotel but I'll get back to you to confirm that.

Cheers

Lesley

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:14/08/2006 4:33:35p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Agenda plus

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



And again. Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 11/08/2006 11:07:13 a.m. >>>
Lesley

I realize I have not changed 'ground floor' to 'First Floor' at the beginning of the agenda - hence a correct agenda attached.

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2006 12:03 PM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Agenda plus

10 August 2006

Good morning Grace

I realise that you are not at Wellpark today but this email nevertheless.

Candis is happy with the agenda, but not quite so happy with the accommodation. Apparently other providers don't use it any more but she realises that it is close to Wellpark and that there are few other choices. In particular she said to check if the Dorset Room is really a room and not part of the lobby, which is not private.

We do need a private room for that briefing meeting.

Because we are starting early Teaohou Luke thinks that he may need to stay at the hotel but I'll get back to you to confirm that.

Cheers

Lesley

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or information in it. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately. NZQA does not accept any liability for changes made to this email or attachments after sending by NZQA.

All emails have been scanned for viruses and content by MailMarshal. NZQA reserves the right to monitor all email communications through its network.



Create Date:15/08/2006 9:09:40a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Re: Panel

Good morning Grace

A whitebaord and pens would be useful, but we would survive without them if it was too difficult Thanks. Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 14/08/2006 5:05:36 p.m. >>>

Lesley

The Quality Inn has asked whether you require any equipment. I am assuming just a conference table and seating for nine but thought I had best check - OHP? Whiteboard and pens etc? Powerpoint facilities? Let me know.

Thanks

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:15/08/2006 3:18:00p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Agenda

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Hi Grace

Sorry about these changes. The change I have asked for really just means 2 and a half hours of panel time. We still wish to meet briefly with Phil and QinQin Zhan at 8.30 am. With that and a tea break at 10.30 or quarter to 11 taken out of that time, it is more like 1 and a half to 2 hours together.

It is important that the panel sorts out its issues and works out the questions it wishes to ask before it begins interviewing people. Little of that is achieved at the briefing meeting which is really describing procedure and ice-breaking. That is the approach that I and my chairs, have taken over the past 15 years of working on degrees. Often we would not meet anyone until after lunch. If the panel is not well prepared the questioning can go haywire.

I am not changing the brief welcome at 8.30am, nor any other meeting, I am just asking that the meeting meeting with you, Phillip and Vinay is moved to 4.00pm.

I'm not sure what you mean in your email by "very little time for panel discussion in relation to meetings with key staff and students". The time slots for those have not changed.

I hope that that is clarified and that this request does not cause too much inconvenience.

I also notice that the student and admin support staff group is down to talk to the panel twice - once on Thursday from 3.30 to 4.00pm and again on Friday from 11 to 12.00noon. We only need to see them once. What about Friday and that will give us some space on Thursday pm but I'm easy.

More for you to sort out, I'm sorry

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Kind regards

Lesley

Good morning Grace

Thank you for your message about Teahou's accommodation. There is another panel member who is concerned about getting to the meeting on time through the Auckland rush hour. Could Peggy Lowndes also have accommodation.

I realise now that I usually start degree panels a little later to allow for the local people to travel. I think that it is possibly a little late to change the starting time now, but I wonder if we could change something else.

I realise that we have not really allowed enough time for initial panel discussion at the beginning. One hour between 8.30am and 9.30 am is not enough. In order to gain a little more time without changing the times for too many people too much, I wonder if it would be possible to change the meeting with the management.

If we could put that meeting at 4.00 - 5.00pm, we could gain an extra hour to an hour and half for panel discussion in the morning when we most need it. The panel meeting would not finish before 5 or 5.30pm anyway. If 4pm is not suitable for the management team, we could see them between 12 midday and 1.00pm and then have lunch from 1.00pm to 1.30pm. 4pm would be my preference though.

Would that change be possible? I look forward to hearing back from you.

Thanks

Lesley

inay can move form its 9.30 slot

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 15/08/2006 11:52:02 a.m. >>>

Hi Lesley

I have requested accommodation for Peggy Lowndes and awaiting confirmation of that.

Phil is not in at the moment so I am unable to make a decision on which of the two possibilities for a change of slot. Can I just confirm that you do not wish to meet anyone before 11.00 am - 4 hours in a row panel time (including the evening before) and very little time for panel discussion in relation to meetings with key staff and students. Have I read it right as I have been on many panels and this seems quite a different approach?

Thanks

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2006 11:16 AM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Agenda

15 August 2006

Good morning Grace

Thank you for your message about Teahou's accommodation. There is another panel member who is concerned about getting to the meeting on time through the Auckland rush hour. Could Peggy Lowndes also have accommodation, please.

I realise now that I usually start degree panels a little later to allow for the local people to travel. I think that it is possibly a little late to change the starting time now, but I wonder if we could change something else.

I realise that we have not really allowed enough time for initial panel discussion at the beginning. One hour between 8.30am and 9.30 am is not enough. In order to gain a little more time without changing the times for too many people too much, I wonder if it would be possible to change the meeting with the management.

If we could put that meeting at 4.00 - 5.00pm, we could gain an extra hour to an hour and half for panel discussion in the morning when we most need it. The panel meeting would not finish before 5 or 5.30pm anyway. If 4pm is not suitable for the management team, we could see them between 12 midday and 1.00pm and then have lunch from 1.00pm to 1.30pm. 4pm would be my preference though.

Would that change be possible? I look forward to hearing back from you.

Thanks

Lesley

This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:16/08/2006 11:04:31a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Agenda

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Good morning Grace and thank you for all your efforts. As usual, you have done wonders.

I'm glad that senior management can change thier time slot and thank you for updating the agenda and leaving copies at the hotel for me.

I didn't notice the double booking either until yesterday. We only need to see this group once for half an hour maximum I'll leave it up to you to fit them into the slot that suits those people best.

Thank you also for arranging the "pick up" each morning from the hotel. There will now be 6 people staying in so I think (unfortunately) that we will need two cars. Is that possible? We could use a taxi - or two?

It is important that Phil and QinQin formally welcome us. I have always been happy with that. And good to know that QinQin is available as the contact person.

Grace, I think that we are virtually there. Thank you very much for your hard work. I'm sure I'll talk to you (email you) before the day though.

Kind regards

Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx> 15/08/2006 5:40:56 p.m. >>>

Thanks, Lesley. Phil has cleared himself of engagements so is happy about the 4.00-5.00 pm time slot. I will update the timetable and see that revised timetables are available for all panel members. Will leave these and name tags at the Quality Inn addressed to you.

I didn't notice the double booking for the student and admin support staff. My apologies. What would you like me to do about this. One is 30 minutes and the other is one hour? If you have a preference to moving the group to Friday, I will see if that is possible. It may be more convenient for one person and less for two but I can check on this.

The College had planned to pick up the Quality Inn group each morning at say 8.15 am. Now that two locals are also staying over, I am assuming that one car may be sufficient. What do you think - one or two cars.

I would think the time with Phil and QinQin would be brief. It is important that Phil formally welcomes the panel and I have asked QinQin to be your point of contact for anything you need. She will also look after refreshments and so on. QinQin is the assistant to the College Accountant.

Let me know if there is anything else you need.

Best Regards

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx]
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2006 3:18 PM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: RE: Agenda

Hi Grace

Sorry about these changes. The change I have asked for really just means 2 and a half hours of panel time. We still wish to meet briefly with Phil and QinQin Zhan at 8.30 am. With that and a tea break at 10.30 or quarter to 11 taken out of that time, it is more like 1 and a half to 2 hours together.

It is important that the panel sorts out its issues and works out the questions it wishes to ask before it begins interviewing people. Little of that is achieved at the briefing meeting which is really describing procedure and ice-breaking. That is the approach that I and my chairs, have taken over the past 15 years of working on degrees. Often we would not meet anyone until after lunch. If the panel is not well prepared the questioning can go haywire.

I am not changing the brief welcome at 8.30am, nor any other meeting, I am just asking that the meeting meeting with you, Phillip and Vinay is moved to 4.00pm.

I'm not sure what you mean in your email by "very little time for Panel discussion in relation to meetings with key staff and students". The time slots for those have not changed.

I hope that that is clarified and that this request does not cause too much inconvenience.

I also notice that the student and admin support staff group is down to talk to the panel twice - once on Thursday from 3.30 to 4.00pm and again on Friday from 11 to 12.00noon. We only need to see them once. What about Friday and that will give us some space on Thursday pm but I'm easy.

More for you to sort out, I'm sorry.
I look forward to hearing back from you.
Kind regards
Lesley

Good morning Grace
Thank you for your message about Teahou's accommodation. There is another panel member who is concerned about getting to the meeting on time through the Auckland rush hour. Could Peggy Lowndes also have accommodation.

I realise now that I usually start degree panels a little later to allow for the local people to travel. I think that it is possibly a little late to change the starting time now, but I wonder if we could change something else.

I realise that we have not really allowed enough time for initial panel discussion at the beginning. One hour between 8.30am and 9.30 am is not enough. In order to gain a little more time without changing the times for too many people too much, I wonder if it would be possible to change the meeting with the management.

If we could put that meeting at 4.00 - 5.00pm, we could gain an extra hour to an hour and a half for panel discussion in the morning when we most need it. The panel meeting would not finish before 5 or 5.30pm anyway. If 4pm is not suitable for the management team, we could see them between 12 midday and 1.00pm and then have lunch from 1.00pm to 1.30pm. 4pm would be my preference though.

Would that change be possible? I look forward to hearing back from you.
Thanks
Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <academicdirector@Wellpark.co.nz> 15/08/2006 11:52:02 a.m. >>>

Hi Lesley

I have requested accommodation for Peggy Lowndes and awaiting confirmation of that. Phil is not in at the moment so I am unable to make a decision on which of the two possibilities for a change of slot. Can I just confirm that you do not wish to meet anyone before 11.00 am - 4 hours in a row panel time (including the evening before) and very little time for panel discussion in relation to meetings with key staff and students. Have I read it right as I have been on many panels and this seems quite a different approach?

Thanks

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:Lesley.Edgeley-Page@nzqa.govt.nz]

Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2006 11:16 AM

To: Academicdirector

Subject: Agenda

15 August 2006

Good morning Grace

Thank you for your message about Teahou's accommodation. There is another panel member who is concerned about getting to the meeting on time through the Auckland rush hour. Could Peggy Lowndes also have accommodation, please.

I realise now that I usually start degree panels a little later to allow for the local people to travel. I think that it is possibly a little late to change the starting time now, but I wonder if we could change something else.

I realise that we have not really allowed enough time for initial Panel discussion at the beginning. One hour between 8.30am and 9.30 am is Not enough. In order to gain a little more time without changing the Times for too many people too much, I wonder if it would be possible to Change the meeting with the management.

If we could put that meeting at 4.00 - 5.00pm, we could gain an extra hour to an hour and half for panel discussion in the morning when we most need it. The panel meeting would not finish before 5 or 5.30pm anyway. If 4pm is not suitable for the management team, we could see them between 12 midday and 1.00pm and then have lunch from 1.00pm to 1.30pm. 4pm would be my preference though.

Would that change be possible? I look forward to hearing back from you.
Thanks
Lesley

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Create Date:21/08/2006 4:42:18p.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To:academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:RE: Details

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Hello Grace

Thanks for sending that. I am happy with the agenda. I appreciate your colleagues' concerns about getting through the agenda, but I am sure that we will cope. It will certainly concentrate the mind! And as you say there are little gaps on Friday if need be. I'll advise the chair of people's other commitments.

Kind regards

Lesley

>>> "Academicdirector" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 21/08/2006 1:06:59 p.m. >>>

Hello Lesley

I have attached what I see as the timetable and it would be good if you could confirm it asap. The names of staff/students are attached to the timetable. I still need to see that Thursday's lunch is organized and then will have a final timetable to leave for you at the Quality Inn. Please confirm that you are happy with it or give me any final changes. At this point I have changed lunch to 12.00 noon and panel time 1.00-1.30 pm as I believe the café will be able to serve the group quicker at this time.

There has been some concern that the panel may not keep to schedule on the Thursday in particular and I have assured staff that the schedule will be followed. Some of the students are coming out of class for 2.30 pm and Phil Dowling needs to be back in class close to 2.30 after his 1.30-2.30 slot.

I don't anticipate there will be a problem but am passing the concern on to you. There is time on the Friday if you need to get any of the management/support staff back for any reason.

Regards

Grace

Wellpark College
6 Francis Street
Grey Lynn
(09) 360 0560/728

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Edgeley-Page [mailto:xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxx.xx]
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2006 11:01 AM
To: Academicdirector
Subject: Details

21 August 2006

Good morning Grace

Thank you for your email on Friday. I presume that when you leave the support staff on the agenda for Thursday that you have removed them from the Friday slot. Would you mind sending me a final agenda please. I feel a trifle confused without one.

That all sounds fine in terms of staff and student numbers - and the Advisory Committee too as they are always hard to get hold of.

And lunch across the road on Thursday will be fine - reservations would be a good idea.

Many thanks.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Lesley

This email may contain legally privileged information and is intended only for the addressee. It is not necessarily the official view or communication of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy or distribute this email or information in it. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately. NZQA does not accept any liability for changes made to this email or attachments after sending by NZQA.

All emails have been scanned for viruses and content by MailMarshal. NZQA reserves the right to monitor all email communications through its network.

Create Date:28/08/2006 3:02:18p.m.
Sender:"Lesley Edgeley Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>
Sent_To:academicdirector@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>
Sent_CC:
Sent_BC:
Subject:Lost documents

28 August 2006

Hello Grace

Sorry that we missed you at the end of proceedings on Friday, but I am sure that the two Philips will have reported the outcome. I'll send my report to you as soon as I have (a) finished it and (b) got agreement from the rest of the panel.

This email is really to let you know that Teahou's car was broken into on Friday night and all his documents and wallet, cards etc stolen. I'm just letting you know that the theft included the Wellpark course documents and everything else relating to the meeting that Teahou may have had. I'm not sure what we can do about it except hope that they don't fall into the wrong hands.

Thank you for looking after us so well.

Kind regards

Lesley

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Create Date:5/09/2006 10:51:41a.m.

Sender:"Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To

[Redacted recipient information]

Sent

[Redacted date and time]

Sent_BC:

Subject:Wellpark Panel report

Good morning panel colleagues

Thank you for being on the approval and accreditation panel for Wellpark's Bachelor of Naturopathy (and Herbal Medicine). Your efforts were greatly appreciated and I thoroughly enjoyed working with all of you.

Attached for your information is the report of our meeting. Please send an email confirming your agreement with the report. If you have any issues please let me know as soon as possible.

As I am leaving for Italy and India (!!) for 6 weeks on Sunday, I would be grateful if you could get your response to me by the end of this Thursday (7 September) at the latest. It is a little less than the usual week, so my apologies, but it shouldn't take long to read the report.

Once I have your agreement, I send the report to Wellpark to check for factual accuracy and then they can start working on the requirements. The timeframes then theirs.

Once Wellpark has completed their resubmission, I shall notify you all and arrange for Wellpark to send it to you. My notification will talk about timeframes and process etc. but all this will most likely be several months down the track.

I need a response to the report from everyone of you, so look forward to hearing from you.

Teahou, a claim form is on its way.

Kind regards

Lesley

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



DEGREE APPROVAL AND ACCREDITATION REPORT

APPLICANT: Wellpark College of Natural Therapies
QUALIFICATION: Bachelor of Naturopathy and Herbal Medicine
DATE OF VISIT: 23, 24 and 25 August 2006

PANEL:

Independent Chairperson

Candis Craven

University Representatives

Vicki Mortimer
Head of Programme, Naturopathy
School of Biomedical & Health Sciences
University of Western Sydney

Hans Wohlmuth
School of Natural & Complementary Medicine
Southern Cross University
Lismore NSW

Senior Academic from Alternative Institution

Simeon London
Programme Director, Bachelor of Applied Science
Unitec Institute of Technology

Professional Representatives

Peggy Lowndes
Auckland
(Naturopathy)

Isla Burgess
Gisborne
(Herbal Medicine)

Senior Academic from Applicant Institution

Dr Vijay Srinivasamurthy

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

HOF Ayurvedic Medicine
Wellpark College of Natural Therapies

Maori Stakeholders Representative

Teaohou Luke
Ngati Whatua representative

NZQA Analyst

Lesley Edgeley-Page
NZQA

INTRODUCTION

Wellpark College Natural Therapies (Wellpark) was first registered as a private training establishment in 1997. It currently offers ten diploma and several certificate courses in a range of natural therapies. It receives EFTS funding for its NZQA approved qualifications and eligible student can apply for Student Loans and Allowances. Wellpark is signatory to the Code of Practice as twenty-six of the current students are international students. Between 2004 and 2005, 315 students graduated from the College's certificate and diploma programmes. This is Wellpark's first degree application.

The rationale behind the development of a degree programme is based on international and national trends, which indicate a growth in the use of traditional medicine inclusive of complementary and alternative medicines. Jobs for naturopaths are increasing and companies involved in natural products are increasingly employing naturopaths. In New Zealand, the Health Practitioners Competency Assurance Bill signals a move towards registration for practice in the field of health care. The profession and the College believe that the introduction of a degree programme is timely.

CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL AND ACCREDITATION OF COURSES LEADING TO DEGREES AND RELATED QUALIFICATIONS

1 Title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence: The adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole course.

1.1a *The title of the course provides an accurate indication of its general subject areas.*

The panel agreed that the title did not meet the criterion. While herbal medicine is a necessary component of a naturopathy degree, there was insufficient herbal medicine content to warrant the inclusion of "herbal medicine" in the title. Wellpark should reconsider the title as part of the review of the programme.

1.1b *The title of any qualification(s) awarded on the basis of successful completion of the course, or part of the course, is consistent with the title of the course and the requirements on nomenclature in the general registration criteria for the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications (the Register) (www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications/register/index.html) and relevant conventions (See Special Issues section).*

The title does not currently meet the Register criteria, as it does not accurately describe the content.

1.2a The stated aims are clearly defined and appropriate to the nature and level of the qualification to which the course leads.

The aims were totally pragmatic in that the degree is intended to help raise the status of the profession and to integrate traditional wisdom and knowledge related to well-being with modern medical science. The aims were however less than satisfactory in terms of providing a philosophical base for the programme.

Wellpark was advised to include a review of the aims and philosophical base in the required review of the programme.

1.2b The aim includes identification of any specifically targeted student body and the relationship between the course and any industrial, professional or community need.

Wellpark had specifically targeted its naturopathy diplomates as the intended student body. The College, the students and the profession all agreed on the need for a degree programme.

The criterion was met.

1.3a The course outcomes statement, or graduate profile, is consistent with the aims of the course and the requirements of the Register.

The graduate profile is consistent with the current aim of the course and as such would meet the Register requirements.

1.3b Clear learning outcomes are specified for each component part of the course.

There were serious concerns about the lack of depth, the unacceptable breadth of the content, the lack of evidence of higher order learning and thinking skills as demonstrated by the learning outcomes.

1.4a Learning outcomes are consistent with the aims and level of the course.

The learning outcomes are not consistent with a degree level programme. They are more appropriate for a diploma programme than a degree.

1.4b Appropriate levels and credits are allocated to each component of the course.

There were concerns here, as the learning outcomes and the levels ascribed do not reflect the content which appears to be largely vocational and less indicative of higher learning. The learning outcomes and the levels ascribed are not at degree level.

1.4c The level and credit value of any qualification to which the course leads are appropriate, clearly identified and meet the minimum requirements of the Register.

The levels of the components do not meet the prescribed level of the course. Therefore the course/qualification level is not accurate and would not meet Register requirements.

The panel agreed that Wellpark needed to review and rewrite the programme and that the review should include, but not be limited to, the title, philosophy, aims, rationale, course outcome, learning outcomes, levels and credits and assessments.

The panel requires a total review and re-write of the programme.

1.4d An appropriate New Zealand Standard For Classification of Education (NZSCED) classification is identified.

The NZSCED is 06 10 01.

The criterion is met.

2 Delivery and learning methods: The adequacy and appropriateness of delivery and learning methods, for all modes of delivery, given the stated learning outcomes.

2.1 Proposed modes of delivery and delivery sites are clearly identified.

The modes of delivery and the delivery site are clear, apart from queries about the Auckland University of Technology (AUT) modules, which will be delivered at AUT's North Shore campus. The issue of the AUT modules is dealt with under Criterion 2.3. The suggestion of flexible delivery has been put on hold.

2.2 Delivery and facilitated learning methods are appropriate to the nature of the course, the proposed modes of delivery and the likely student body.

The delivery and facilitated learning methods appear to be appropriate apart from some concern about the lack of laboratories.

2.3 Any practical, field-based or work-based components, including research, which are based away from the delivery site are integrated into the course.

Clinical work is carried out at Wellpark's own clinic and it is well integrated into the course. There was some concern however about the AUT modules. If they are modules belonging to AUT and delivered entirely by them, it is doubtful that they can be considered to be a part of the degree. There appeared to be no formal arrangement to confirm the modules as part of the degree award, nor to confirm the delivery of them. The panel was concerned about the students and the programme if AUT decided for whatever reason, to no longer deliver these modules to the Wellpark students.

It is recommended that Wellpark review the arrangements by which the AUT papers are incorporated into the programme.

2.4 *Delivery methods do not place students or the public at risk (emotional or physical).*

There were some concerns about the fact that the students only had to do 25 clinical cases which might not give them sufficient experience and skills to be fully competent to practice on completion of the course. However getting enough face-to-face cases was seemingly difficult and clinical practice and the requisite number of clinical cases, varied at different institutions. A buddy system in which newer students are “buddied” with more experienced students, would provide new students with exposure to higher number of patients and also introduce a kind of mentoring system which would help with the supervision problem.

It was recommended that new students be given a “buddy” to work alongside in the clinic.

Of more concern was that there was only one clinical supervisor, who could not possibly supervise students adequately alone. This situation could potentially place the students/and or clients at risk. This issue is dealt with further under Criterion 6.

The panel was further concerned that the students took clinical files home to write up their reports. This could breach legal requirements for privacy and potentially put students at risk. The files should be kept securely at the clinic and Wellpark must ensure that the students have appropriate time and space to write their reports.

It is recommended that the clinical files be kept securely at the clinic.

2.5 *In the case of courses with research components, appropriate systems and facilities appropriate to the level and scale of the research are provided to enable students to undertake relevant research, including:*

Guidance on the development and approval of research projects; N/A

Criteria and procedures for the appointment of appropriately qualified and experienced supervisors; N/A

A code of conduct for researchers and research supervisors; and mechanisms for ethical approval of research projects.

N/A

3 ***Assessment: The adequacy of the means of ensuring that assessment procedures are fair, valid, consistent and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes.***

3.1 *Assessment methodology and planning are appropriate.*

Assessments have been planned to match the documented learning outcomes and weightings have been given in relation to those. The methodology is not always appropriate however.

3.2 *The required standards for assessment are clearly specified in relation to each component part of the course.*

The panel considered the assessments to be inconsistent, lightweight, and not sufficiently robust for the units of work. The panel was concerned about the required 70% pass mark and the lack of an acceptable rationale for its ongoing use.

As assessment relates to learning outcomes, levels and credits, the proposed sample assessments need to be included in the review requested in Requirement 1.

It is recommended that in redeveloping the assessments, that the 70% pass mark is reviewed.

3.3 *Learners are provided with fair and regular feedback on progress and fair reporting on final achievements.*

There are systems in place relating to both formative and summative assessments. It seemed that part-time students would have individual short courses to catch up, but it was unclear as to how this would work in terms of assessments.

3.4 *Where appropriate, assessment policies and practices allow students to request assessment in te reo Māori.*

Provision exists for assessment in te reo Māori.

The criterion is met.

3.5 *Pre-assessment moderation of summative assessment tasks ensures that they are fair, valid and consistent.*

Internal moderation procedures for existing courses are documented in the Quality Management System (QMS). It appears that it is intended for the degree programme, especially the pre-assessment moderation. Staff commented on the improved internal moderation system.

3.6 *External post-assessment moderation of examples of student work and marking/grading ensures that assessment outcomes are fair and consistent.*

The external moderation is included in the documentation, but the description of the process is limited and no arrangements have been made to date with another tertiary institution.

3.7 *In the case of courses with research components at postgraduate levels (levels 8 – 10), assessment includes external examination of all research components amounting to more than 60 credits.*

N/A

4 *Acceptability of the course: The acceptability of the proposed course to the relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities, in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure.*

4.1 Stakeholders, including relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities, are identified.

Stakeholders have been identified, and an Advisory Committee established. The group has met at least once and includes two people from the profession and 6 with commercial interests, but there is no academic from another institution on the advisory group.

It is recommended that an external academic be included on the Advisory Committee.

There are plans to establish three consultancy groups to cover the subject areas. Some of the stakeholders listed for the consultancy groups did not believe that they had in fact been consulted. The relationship of these with the Advisory Committees is not clear and at present one committee may be better.

4.2 The actual or likely interests of these stakeholders in respect of the proposed course are clearly identified.

The interests of those on the panel are closely identified with the College's aims, in that they want a degree programme for their profession. However the panel has no educational input.

4.3 The interests of stakeholders have been appropriately addressed.

The advisory committee members interviewed by the panel were all professional stakeholders, were passionate about their subject area and the desire to have an integrated healthcare system. Most had been to one meeting of the advisory committee.

4.4 The course is likely to be acceptable to the relevant wider communities: academic, professional, industrial, Māori and other communities.

Ngati Whatua has given their support. The professional and industrial communities support a degree programme.

The criterion has been met.

4.5 Where appropriate, the course is cognisant of Māori tribal tikanga, reo and traditions and is acceptable to Māori as a reflection of their aspirations for quality learning and standards in accordance with te reo me ona tikanga.

A Maori adviser has been appointed to guide the programme.

5 Regulations: The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations that specify requirements for admission, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning, course length and structure, integration of practical/work-based components, assessment procedures, and normal progression within a course.

5.1 *General and course-specific regulations are clear, comprehensive and fair and cover, where appropriate:*

General and course regulations are for the main part adequate for the course as it currently stands. The course regulations may need to be reviewed after the re-write of the course.

Requirements for admission to the organisation and to the course;

Entry requirements need to be revised, as it is desirable that students some have background in chemistry or science, at least to Level 3. Mature students may not have it and should be made aware of the need. The IELTS score was too low compared to similar areas. The IELTS score should be 6.5 with a minimum band of 6.

It is recommended that the entry requirements be reviewed to include a science background and to set the IELTS requirement at 6.5 with a minimum band of 6.

Provisions for the awarding of credit towards a qualification or exemptions from specific course requirements as a result of cross crediting (from another course within the organisation), credit transfer (from a course awarded by another organisation) or recognition of prior learning (credit awarded for informal or uncertificated learning);

The bridging and transition arrangements from the diploma into the degree programme were over generous with only 60 more credits required for diplomates to complete the degree programme. This issue needs to be re-investigated. It would appear that Wellpark does not wish to cross-credit from other institutions. This policy needs to be clarified.

It is recommended that Wellpark review the bridging, transition and cross-crediting arrangements for the degree.

Course structure, including specified pre- and co-requisites, mandatory and optional/elective components, practical/work-based components and alternative entry and exit points;

The contact hours appear to be high for a degree programme and the progression towards self-directed learning is not clear. The arrangement for the inclusion of the AUT papers into the programme needs to be clarified and strengthened. There do not appear to be any pre-requisites for clinical practice.

The issues raised in regard to this criterion should be dealt with under Requirement 1.

Normal progress through the course and minimum and maximum periods for completion of the course;

Six years for the completion of the programme was acceptable although panel members tended to think that it was too short so students could be disadvantaged.

Assessment, including provisions for assessment in te reo Māori, reassessment and appeals;

The provision for assessment in te reo Māori, re-sits and the appeals process are clearly documented.

Provisions for dealing with instances of impaired performance (eg aegrotat passes);

This was not clear, although there are opportunities for re-sits.

Requirements for the award of the qualification;

This was clearly stated as being the completion of all courses.

Rules and criteria governing any awarding of merit, distinction, honours or other grades.

The margins between merit and distinction made it quite easy to pass with distinction. This needs to be reviewed under Requirement 1.

5.2 *In the case of programmes with research components, regulations must also cover:*

Definition of the type of research activities acceptable;

Research project approval;

Supervision and reporting;

Requirements for submission of theses (length, format, authenticity, presentation of evidence in other than written form);

Provision for the resubmission of theses; and

The respective roles of internal (if applicable) and external examiners with clear statements on reporting and the resolution of differences of opinion.

N/A

6 ***Resources: The capacity of the organisation to support sustained delivery of the course, in all delivery modes, with regard to appropriate academic staffing, teaching facilities, physical resources and support services.***

6.1 *The Education Act 1989 defines a degree as an award that recognises the completion of a course of advanced learning that is taught mainly by people engaged in research. Collectively, the academic staff involved in the course:*

a *are adequate in number and appropriately qualified for the outcomes of the course to be met;*

There would appear to be an adequate number of staff for the diploma, but the number will not convert exactly for the degree programme as preparation for the new courses and a time allowance for research will need to be incorporated into staff workloads. This will mean that some staff will have to have less contact time, so more staff will be needed. A workload formula needs to be developed and consequently the staff contracts will need to be revised.

Currently the face-to-face teaching load is high. Many of the staff are contracted to deliver their subject only and many of these people run their own clinics. While it is valuable for the college to have current practitioners, it also needs a bigger core of permanent staff who can take responsibility for the degree programme.

Not all staff are adequately qualified although one or two are working towards a higher qualification.

b are engaged in research;

No staff are currently engaged in research, although at least two are research capable and several others are keen. Wellpark might consider finding an academic mentor from a degree providing institution with a similar qualification. This should be considered under Requirements 2 and 3.

c have experience and expertise in teaching, with regard to the proposed delivery modes; and

Most are experienced teachers but more in vocational training than higher education. The staff interviewed did not consider that there would be major changes to their teaching style with a degree programme, apart from an emphasis on critical thinking and apparently more assessments.

The College needs to address staffing resources, contractual arrangements for staff, and a workload formula to ensure that time is allowed for research, qualification upgrades and professional development. These should be incorporated into the plan requested in Requirement 2.

d in the case of courses with research components, have experience and expertise in the supervision of research at the appropriate level.

N/A

Standards b-d will not necessarily be equally met by each member of academic staff. The expectation is that a collective view of the staff will acknowledge complementary contributions to meeting the standard.

In the case of courses with practical, field or work based components, the roles and responsibilities of the supervisory staff and the institution are formalised.

There was only one clinical supervisor. The roles and responsibilities are clear but it is impossible for one person to adequately supervise a group of students with clients and to manage the clinic as well. Having only one supervisor means a limited perspective for students and a high workload for the supervisor.

Wellpark needs to review the staffing for clinical supervision with consideration being given to the appointment of at least one additional staff member. This should be considered under Requirement 2.

In some situations experience in Māori language and culture, and appropriate knowledge, skills and tikanga will also be necessary.

The College has appointed a Māori advisor who has a Diploma in Naturopathy. There is an inherent respect for other cultures.

Additional staffing needs are identified where necessary and detailed recruitment and or staff development plans appropriate to the course implementation timetable are in place.

Limited funds are available for additional staffing, but there was no obvious recruitment policy.

Wellpark is required to develop a comprehensive plan for the staffing of the degree.

6.2 *The organisation has clearly identified the range of teaching facilities and physical resources, including library facilities, necessary for the implementation and sustained delivery of the course, in all proposed modes of delivery, and*

- a put in place the necessary teaching facilities and physical resources, or*
- b established detailed development and acquisition schedules appropriate to the course implementation timetable.*

There are resourcing issues. While current facilities are very pleasant, only full-time academics have their own offices and tutors are cramped into a very small space. Access to databases is difficult and computer access for both staff and students is limited.

Laboratory facilities are also lacking, but Wellpark is undergoing negotiations with AUT for the use of one of their laboratories.

Wellpark has a very good dispensary on site, but panel members were concerned to hear that it might be removed. They considered it an important teaching resource, which would also be valuable at the clinic.

The library is the main concern as it is very small and barely useable, it does not have a trained librarian and the students are not permitted to take out books. They can use them for limited time at one of the two desks available for students. There are plans to extend the library, but it will still be too small. Wellpark has a small but good collection of very specific texts, but the collection needs to be bigger and broader. A major review has been carried out by a library consultant, and this should help with electronic access and access to journals, but overall the plan is inadequate for degree programme.

Wellpark is required to enhance and sustain the library and to provide access to library resources so that the degree programme is adequately supported.

6.3 *There is a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and/or experienced support staff for the outcomes of the course to be met.*

The current three full-time support staff were applauded for their work by students and others, but they did not think that their workload would increase if they were to be supporting a degree programme. The panel however considered that the group would be very vulnerable if one of them were to leave and that their workload would indeed increase with a degree programme.

This issue needs to be considered under Requirement 2 or 4.

6.4 *Adequate and appropriate course information and guidance and support systems are accessible to students.*

The Prospectus and Student handbook are informative, but students found the library and its no-lending policy inadequate and the lack of computers for student use, a definite disadvantage. Students felt well supported by the College, by each other and the academic and support staff.

The issues above need to be addressed under Requirements 4 and 5.

6.5 *The organisation's financial infrastructure, administrative systems and resource management practices are adequate to support implementation and sustained delivery of the course.*

The panel were given a copy of the College's financial statements. It would appear that on paper, the College is sufficiently financially robust to support the degree programme. However, the library upgrade, creating more office space, making arrangements for the use of laboratories and funding for research will all be expensive exercises, which will require ongoing financial input.

The panel requires a comprehensive long-term business plan, including capital and operational requirements, for the further development and delivery of the degree.

6.6 *The organisation's quality management system incorporates structured processes associated with an Academic Board or equivalent (with delegations to faculty or programme committees as appropriate).*

The structure is acceptable although there was some concern about objectivity with the close relationship between the Prema Trust and the Board of Directors, who are for the main part, the same people. They are also members of the Academic Board although that includes the faculty heads as well.

The criterion is met.

7 ***Evaluation and review: The adequacy and effectiveness of the provision for evaluation and review of courses: for monitoring the on-going relevance of learning outcomes, course delivery and course standards; for reviewing course regulations and content; for monitoring improvement following evaluation and review; and for determining whether the course shall continue to be offered.***

7.1 There is an effective system for the regular monitoring, evaluation and review of courses such that the course approval and accreditation criteria and requirements continue to be met. The system includes structured processes, associated with the academic board (or equivalent), for ensuring that the views of learners and representatives of relevant industries, professions, academic and research communities, Māori and other stakeholders are taken into account.

The policies and procedures for the evaluation and review of courses are included in the QMS. As a degree programme, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority will appoint a monitor. The review process needs to include more than one external stakeholder.

7.2 Changes to approved courses are managed consistently with external requirements.

The policies and procedures in the QMS are indicative only in regard to the degree. It is understood that the QMS will be re-written to incorporate degree requirements.

8 Research: The adequacy of provision of research facilities and support of staff involved in research, the levels of research activity of staff involved in the course and of ways by which the research-teaching links are made in the curriculum.

8.1 Staff conduct research within their area of experience which advances knowledge and understanding and supports their function as teachers.

Research, by the staff to be involved in the degree programme, is not under way as yet.

8.2 The quantity and quality of staff research outputs are monitored and the collective output is consistent with the development and maintenance of an on-going research culture in support of the course.

An audit, instigated by the College, showed that research experience is very limited and involves very few staff members. The college is looking to collaborative approaches and has approached selected companies with this in mind.

8.3 Organisational systems and facilities provide appropriate support to staff involved in research, including access to an appropriate ethics committee.

The College has developed a research plan, established a Research and Ethics Committee with an external chairperson and appointed a Research Leader. This is a positive start to developing a research culture, but research support, such as a workload formula, improved library and study facilities, needs to be put in place for research to begin and a research culture to develop.

Wellpark is required to develop a comprehensive long-term plan for the development of a research culture to support the degree programme.

MONITOR

The panel recommended that Hans Wohlmuth of Southern Cross University, be appointed as the NZQA monitor.

REQUIREMENTS

The panel requires

- 1 a total review and re-write of the programme.
- 2 Wellpark to develop a comprehensive plan for the staffing of the degree.
- 3 Wellpark to enhance and sustain the library and to provide access to library resources so that the degree programme is adequately supported.
- 4 a comprehensive long-term business plan, including capital and operational requirements, for the further development and delivery of the degree.
- 5 Wellpark to develop a comprehensive long-term plan for the development of a research culture to support the degree programme.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The panel recommends that

Wellpark review the arrangements by which the AUT papers are incorporated into the programme and consider some formal agreement with AUT.

new students are given a "buddy" to work alongside in the clinic.

the clinical files are kept securely at the clinic.

in redeveloping the assessments, that the 70% pass mark is reviewed.

an external academic is included on the Advisory Committee.

the entry requirements are reviewed to include a science background and to set the IELTS requirement at 6.5 with a minimum band of 6.

Wellpark review the bridging, transition and cross-crediting arrangements for the degree.

NB The panel cannot recommend approval and accreditation until all requirements have been met to the satisfaction of the panel.

OUTCOME

The panel recommends that xxxx (*degree*) is approved and xxxx(*institution*) is accredited and authorized by the New Zealand Qualification Authority to offer the degree entitled xxxx as an award that satisfies the requirements of s254(3) and s246(3) of the Education Act 1989 and its amendments, and the approval and accreditation criteria established by the Authority under s253(1)(d) and (e) of the Act.

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Course Approvals Adviser
NZQA

Date: 4 September 2006

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Create Date: 7/09/2006 5:14:25p.m.

Sender: "Lesley Edgeley-Page" <LesleyE.NZQAWPO.NZQADOM>

Sent_To: academicdirector <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject: Panel report

7 September 2006

Dear Grace

Attached for your information is a copy of the panel report from the approval and accreditation meeting for Wellpark's proposed Bachelor of Naturopathy and Herbal Medicine. It has been agreed to by all panel members.

You are asked to comment on the factual accuracy only, that is, on any facts about the College. It would be good if you could comment by the end of tomorrow as I leave for Italy and India for 6 weeks on Sunday, but if I remember rightly you don't work on Fridays. In that case, send any comments to David Duthie at xxxxx.xxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Apart from that, you may now use the report to help you to work on the 5 requirements written at the end. When the College has completed that task please send me one copy and then we shall liaise about the mechanics of the process from there.

Thank you for looking after us so well while we were at Wellpark.

Kind regards

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

125 The Terrace
PO Box 160, Wellington, 6015, New Zealand

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



DEGREE APPROVAL AND ACCREDITATION REPORT

APPLICANT: Wellpark College of Natural Therapies
QUALIFICATION: Bachelor of Naturopathy and Herbal Medicine
DATE OF VISIT: 23, 24 and 25 August 2006

PANEL:

Independent Chairperson

Candis Craven

University Representatives

Vicki Mortimer
Head of Programme, Naturopathy
School of Biomedical & Health Sciences
University of Western Sydney

Hans Wohlmuth
Head, Department of Natural & Complementary Medicine
Southern Cross University
Lismore NSW

Senior Academic from Alternative Institution

Simeon London
Programme Director, Bachelor of Applied Science (Human Biology)
Unitec New Zealand

Professional Representatives

Peggy Lowndes
Auckland
(Naturopathy)

Isla Burgess
Gisborne
(Herbal Medicine)

Senior Academic from Applicant Institution

Dr Vijay Srinivasamurthy
HOF Ayurvedic Medicine
Wellpark College of Natural Therapies

Maori Stakeholders Representative

Teahou Luke
Ngati Whatua representative

NZQA Analyst

Lesley Edgeley-Page
NZQA

INTRODUCTION

Wellpark College Natural Therapies (Wellpark) was first registered as a private training establishment in 1997. It currently offers ten diploma and several certificate courses in a range of natural therapies. It receives EFTS funding for its NZQA approved qualifications and eligible student can apply for Student Loans and Allowances. Wellpark is signatory to the Code of Practice as twenty-six of the current students are international students. Between 2004 and 2005, 31 students graduated from the College's certificate and diploma programmes. This is Wellpark's first degree application.

The rationale behind the development of a degree programme is based on international and national trends, which indicate a growth in the use of traditional medicine inclusive of complementary and alternative medicines. Jobs for naturopaths are increasing and companies involved in natural products are increasingly employing naturopaths. In New Zealand, the Health Practitioners Competency Assurance Bill signals a move towards registration for practice in the field of health care. The profession and the College believe that the introduction of a New Zealand based degree programme is timely.

CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL AND ACCREDITATION OF COURSES LEADING TO DEGREES AND RELATED QUALIFICATIONS

1 Title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence: The adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole course.

1.1a *The title of the course provides an accurate indication of its general subject areas.*

The panel agreed that the title did not meet the criterion. While herbal medicine is a necessary component of a naturopathy degree, there was insufficient herbal medicine content to warrant the inclusion of "herbal medicine" in the title. Wellpark should reconsider the title as part of the review of the programme.

1.1b *The title of any qualification(s) awarded on the basis of successful completion of the course, or part of the course, is consistent with the title of the course and the requirements on nomenclature in the general registration criteria for the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications (the Register) (www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications/register/index.html) and relevant conventions (See Special Issues section).*

The title does not currently meet the Register criteria, as it does not accurately describe the content.

1.2a *The stated aims are clearly defined and appropriate to the nature and level of the qualification to which the course leads.*

The aims were totally pragmatic in that the degree is intended to help raise the status of the profession and to integrate traditional wisdom and knowledge related to well-being with modern medical science. The aims were however less than satisfactory in terms of providing a philosophical base for the programme.

Wellpark was advised to include a review of the aims and philosophical base in the required review of the programme.

1.2b The aim includes identification of any specifically targeted student body and the relationship between the course and any industrial, professional or community need.

Wellpark had specifically targeted its naturopathy diplomates as the intended student body. The College, the students and the profession all agreed on the need for a New Zealand based degree programme.

The criterion was met.

1.3a The course outcomes statement, or graduate profile, is consistent with the aims of the course and the requirements of the Register.

The graduate profile is consistent with the current aim of the course and as such would meet the Register requirements.

1.3b Clear learning outcomes are specified for each component part of the course.

There were serious concerns about the lack of depth, the unacceptable breadth of the content, the lack of evidence of higher order learning and thinking skills as demonstrated by the learning outcomes.

1.4a Learning outcomes are consistent with the aims and level of the course.

The learning outcomes are not consistent with a degree level programme. They are more appropriate for a diploma programme than a degree.

1.4b Appropriate levels and credits are allocated to each component of the course.

There were concerns here, as the learning outcomes and the levels ascribed do not reflect the content which appears to be largely vocational and less indicative of higher learning. The learning outcomes and the levels ascribed are not at degree level.

1.4c The level and credit value of any qualification to which the course leads are appropriate, clearly identified and meet the minimum requirements of the Register.

The levels of the components do not meet the prescribed level of the course. Therefore the course/qualification level is not accurate and would not meet Register requirements.

The panel agreed that Wellpark needed to review and rewrite the programme and that the review should include, but not be limited to, the title, philosophy, aims, rationale, course outcome, learning outcomes, levels and credits and assessments.

The panel requires a total review and re-write of the programme.

1.4d An appropriate New Zealand Standard For Classification of Education (NZSCED) classification is identified.

The NZSCED is 06 19 01.

The criterion is met.

2 Delivery and learning methods: The adequacy and appropriateness of delivery and learning methods, for all modes of delivery, given the stated learning outcomes.

2.1 Proposed modes of delivery and delivery sites are clearly identified.

The modes of delivery and the delivery site are clear, apart from queries about the Auckland University of Technology (AUT) modules, which will be delivered at AUT's North Shore campus. The issue of the AUT modules is dealt with under Criterion 2.3. The suggestion of flexible delivery has been put on hold.

2.2 Delivery and facilitated learning methods are appropriate to the nature of the course, the proposed modes of delivery and the likely student body.

The delivery and facilitated learning methods appear to be appropriate apart from some concern about the lack of laboratories.

2.3 Any practical, field-based or work-based components, including research, which are based away from the delivery site are integrated into the course.

Clinical work is carried out at Wellpark's own clinic and it is well integrated into the course. There was some concern however about the AUT modules. If they are modules belonging to AUT and delivered entirely by them, it is doubtful that they can be considered to be a part of the degree. There appeared to be no formal arrangement to confirm the modules as part of the degree award, nor to confirm the delivery of them. The panel was concerned about the students and the programme if AUT decided for whatever reason, to no longer deliver these modules to the Wellpark students.

It is recommended that Wellpark review the arrangements by which the AUT papers are incorporated into the programme.

2.4 Delivery methods do not place students or the public at risk (emotional or physical).

There were some concerns about the fact that the students only had to complete 25 clinical cases which might not give them sufficient experience and skills to be fully competent to practice on completion of the course. However getting enough face-to-face cases was seemingly difficult and clinical practice and the requisite number of clinical cases, varied at different institutions. A buddy system in which newer students are "buddied" with more experienced students, would provide new students with exposure to higher number of patients and also introduce a kind of mentoring system which would help with the supervision problem.

It was recommended that new students be given a "buddy" to work alongside in the clinic and that the number of cases required be reviewed.

Of more concern was that there was only one clinical supervisor, who could not possibly supervise students adequately alone. This situation could potentially place the students/and or clients at risk. This issue is dealt with further under Criterion 6.

The panel was further concerned that the students took clinical files home to write up their reports. This could breach legal requirements for privacy and potentially put students at risk. The files should be kept securely at the clinic and Wellpark must ensure that the students have appropriate time and space to write their reports.

It is recommended that the clinical files be kept securely at the clinic.

2.5 In the case of courses with research components, appropriate systems and facilities appropriate to the level and scale of the research are provided to enable students to undertake relevant research, including:

Guidance on the development and approval of research projects; N/A

Criteria and procedures for the appointment of appropriately qualified and experienced supervisors; N/A

A code of conduct for researchers and research supervisors; and mechanisms for ethical approval of research projects.

N/A

3 Assessment: The adequacy of the means of ensuring that assessment procedures are fair, valid, consistent and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes.

3.1 Assessment methodology and planning are appropriate.

Assessments have been planned to match the documented learning outcomes and weightings have been given in relation to those. The methodology is not always appropriate however.

3.2 The required standards for assessment are clearly specified in relation to each component part of the course.

The panel considered the assessments to be inconsistent, lightweight, and not sufficiently robust for the units of work. The panel was concerned about the required 70% pass mark and the lack of an acceptable rationale for its ongoing use.

As assessment relates to learning outcomes, levels and credits, the proposed sample assessments need to be included in the review requested in Requirement 1.

It is recommended that in redeveloping the assessments, that the 70% pass mark is reviewed.

3.3 Learners are provided with fair and regular feedback on progress and fair reporting on final achievements.

There are systems in place relating to both formative and summative assessments. It seemed that part-time students would have individual short courses to catch up, but it was unclear as to how this would work in terms of assessments.