

Research Report

Regional Collaborative Development of a Degree Preparation Programme

Elizabeth M. Chinlund, Alistair Shaw, James McKay,
Peter Appleby, Karen Davis, Mary Manderson, & Gail Kirkland



This report has been funded by Ako Aotearoa through the National Project Fund and is available online in PDF version at: www.akoatearoa.ac.nz/regional-degree-prep

Authors:

This document has been prepared by Elizabeth M. Chinlund and Alistair Shaw, of Victoria University of Wellington.

Communications regarding this project should be directed to Gail Kirkland at Gail.Kirkland@weltec.ac.nz or Mary Manderson at Mary.Manderson@whitireia.ac.nz

Published by:

Ako Aotearoa – The National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence
PO Box 756
Wellington 6140

Nov 2011

Cover designed by:

Fitzbeck Creative

ISBN: 978-0-473-20460-0 (PDF)



This work is published under the Creative Commons 3.0 New Zealand Attribution Non-commercial Share Alike Licence (BY-NC-SA). Under this licence you are free to copy, distribute, display and perform the work as well as to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, as long as you credit the author/s and license your new creations under the identical terms.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Introduction.....	1
Programme Development Process	2
Existing Regional Degree Preparation Pathways at Levels 3 & 4	3
Tertiary Preparedness and Achievement	5
Transition	6
Preparatory Factors to be Addressed within the Bridging Programme	8
Psychological	8
Social Support & Finances.....	8
Pedagogical Approach	9
Learner Competencies	9
Subjects: General or specific?	10
Embedding Study Skills	11
Regional Level 4 Degree Preparation Programme	12
Degree Preparation Recommendations.....	13
Discussion	14
Acknowledgements	15
References.....	16
APPENDICES.....	21
Appendix A: Regional Degree Preparation Options for Domestic Students	22
Appendix B: Inactive Regional Degree Preparation Options for Domestic Students	23
Appendix C: Drafted Course Outlines	24
Academic Communication.....	24
Business Studies	32
Humanities for Degree Preparation	40
Mathematics.....	44
Science.....	47
Social Science for Degree Preparation	57
Appendix D: Curriculum Subject Expert Discussion & Workshop.....	63
Project Overview:	63
MATRIX: Distribution of skills/competencies:	64
SUMMARY of FEEDBACK: Curriculum Subject Expert Discussion & Workshop	64

Executive Summary

Current tertiary strategic direction has prompted regional bridging providers to streamline preparatory educational offerings in order to exercise New Zealand's commitment to ensuring all students reach their academic potential. This has encouraged a collaborative approach from three Wellington tertiary providers to develop a new degree preparation programme, which aims to address the reduction of Level 4 bridging programmes in Wellington. This initiative encourages a cohesive student-focussed approach that values preparing learners for the most relevant pathway, and promotes the best possible educational outcome.

The project goals have been to:

- develop a shared regional approach to pathways into degree study, including articulation agreements between providers
- develop a new qualification for learners preparing for degree level study that prepares them for study in different contexts at different providers.

It is hoped that this approach will result in a sustainable regional solution based upon shared principles and provider collaboration.

Research has shown that there is a need for pathways for students for whom secondary school may not be a sufficient indicator of their potential for tertiary study, such as those from lower decile schools, or Māori and Pasifika students. In New Zealand, many students have accessed tertiary study through enabling preparatory programmes, such as the Certificate of University Preparation. Their achievement on these programmes is correlated with achievement on degrees. International studies have also revealed that many students, who access education through alternative pathways, if well prepared, do as well as those from traditional routes.

A review of both existing literature and survey feedback from past VUW bridging students identifies a range of factors that will need to be addressed within any degree preparation programme. These factors include a student's engagement, as well as psychological and social readiness, the specifics of course content and the pedagogical approach taken in the programme. The key curriculum development recommendations are that:

- the curriculum needs to be flexible, taking into account institutional distinctiveness, and
- wherever possible, key academic skills should be integrated into the subject-specific elements of the programme.

The specific dimensions of readiness to be included in the various courses are identified as: cognitive strategies, content knowledge, self-management and contextual or institutional awareness.

Accordingly, clear articulation agreements between institutions will be required in order to enable easier progression. Consequently, the new degree preparation programme will need to feature:

- flexible delivery options that respects differences between different tertiary learning institutions;
- The integration of preparatory content with subject-specific learning outcomes;
- skills embedded into academic content, in particular analytical thinking and specific feedback for student assessment that reinforces the expectations of the institution and discipline that the student will be transitioning into; and
- the recognition that transition to higher study involves an acculturation process, which requires considered and student-centred course advice, and orientation activities designed to introduce the student to the institution that they hope to transition into.

Whenever possible, degree preparation programmes should also feature opportunities for learners to acculturate with their desired institution of further study.

Introduction

Through the Tertiary Education Strategy (TES) 2011-2015, the government has provided investment advice for universities to move away from offering sub-degree programmes that generate Category 1 EFTS funding. Instead, the TES suggests polytechnics and other non-university tertiary providers are the more appropriate institutions to assist students with progression to higher levels of tertiary education.

Significantly, not only does the TES prioritise students under 25 achieving at tertiary Level 4 and above, but also outlines equity imperatives that aim to increase participation and success of Māori and Pacific students at level 4 and above. Tertiary practitioners and researchers agree that there is a dire need to support the transition of Māori (and Pasifika) students into degree level study in ways that improve their likelihood of success (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, & Teddy, 2007; Klinger & Wache, 2009; Loader & Dalgety, 2008; Madjar, McKinley, Deynzer, & van der Merwe, 2010; May, 2009). Historical data from 2007-2009 indicates that Level 4 bridging programmes in New Zealand have high rates of participation by learners under 25 (65% on average) Māori (26%) and Pasifika (15%) learners (Educational Attainment Working Group, 2011a).

There are other groups, although not currently targeted within the TES, who are also either currently under-represented in higher-level study or for whom additional preparation and support is also warranted. Such groups include second-generation, apparently fluent, refugee background students, first generation learners, students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, students with disabilities, and students from migrant communities.

Currently, limited pathways are available for students requiring Level 4 preparation. Within the capped funding environment, some regional tertiary providers have initiated managed enrolment strategies, which require higher levels of academic achievement from secondary school than simply university entrance. Additionally, Special Admission students – those over twenty without entrance qualifications – are no longer offered open entry to degrees at certain universities. This indicates the need for pathways into degree level programmes, particularly for these equity students, many of whom leave secondary school without university entrance.

Following the Tertiary Education Commission's (TEC) investment advice, Victoria University of Wellington will discontinue its Level 4 preparatory programme for domestic students, the Certificate of University Preparation (CUP), from Trimester 1, 2012, and discontinued domestic funding for the Foundation Studies Programme. Massey University also stopped offering the CUP from Trimester 2, 2011. Relatively, there is significant demand for regional Level 4 degree preparation programmes, which Victoria alone has served an average of 322 total students per year (during 2007-2010). Accordingly, 2012 presents a significant gap in Level 4 bridging provision in the Wellington region.

To assist learners affected by this change, three tertiary providers in the region, Wellington Institute of Technology (WelTec), Whitireia New Zealand (Whitireia) and Victoria University of Wellington (VUW), who have a proven history of working collaboratively in the best interests of learners, have initiated the development of a Level 4 qualification to prepare learners for degree study. The TES has also prioritised collaboration and shared resources as well as efficient institutional transfer. Therefore, three institutions have led a collaborative project to develop a single new qualification for learners preparing for degree level study requirements in different contexts at different providers. Other providers, such as Te Wānanga o Aotearoa and The Open Polytechnic of New Zealand, have been consulted through this process (please see Acknowledgements section) and further consultation with other providers is anticipated.

The cross-institutional team aims to develop a regional shared approach and qualification for preparing prospective students for degree level study in polytechnics, universities and wānanga. National data from 2009 revealed that over 1,700 domestic students accessed level 4 courses at universities in New Zealand, whereas the entire institutional sector serves approximately 70,000 students (Educational Attainment Working Group, 2011a). Therefore, in developing a shared regional approach to pathways into degree

study, the collaborating institutions also seek to generate articulation agreements between the providers in the region with the goal of extending these agreements nationally. A pilot of this programme may inform considerations of a possible 'New Zealand' qualification and other providers adopting a similar model.

The following report reviews current pathways at levels 3 and 4, and considers alignment of academic preparation programmes offered in the Wellington region and their effectiveness in preparing learners for degree study. Additionally, this report reviews literature related to the key competencies required for degree level study (including context and subject specific skills). It also outlines drafted Course Outlines and recommendations for a suggested new qualification: The Certificate of Degree Preparation.

Programme Development Process

In developing a new qualification, it is important to consider the existing alignments, overlaps, complementary content, and potential opportunities. Regional consultation is also paramount. Accordingly, existing qualifications at levels 3, 4, and 5 were assessed through the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) database, current prospectuses, and staff consultation with following institutions in the Wellington region: Wellington Institute of Technology, Whitireia New Zealand, Te Wānanga o Aotearoa, The Open Polytechnic of New Zealand, Massey University, and Victoria University of Wellington (See Appendices A & B). Private Training Establishments (PTEs) in the region have not yet been included in this project.

Subject experts and local practitioners were first consulted in the initial stage of programme development, adjacent to a literature review addressing key competencies required for degree level study. The developers utilised existing Course Outlines from VUW's CUP programme as a basis and re-worked the curriculum to be more inclusive of a variety of pathways, not solely focused on universities. The developers also merged two existing courses (Academic Writing & Research, and University Study Skills) into one Academic Communication course. This redevelopment also incorporated feedback from VUW CUP students (from Trimester 3, 2007- Trimester 1, 2011), as well as the literature review findings. The consideration of empirical factors and the development of learner competencies will need to be embedded into any preparatory curriculum.

Consultation was sought in order to address a variety of competencies required for transition into anticipated pathways. To further address this, drafted course outlines were circulated and considered by cross-institutional experts in degree subjects that potential students may transition to. Subsequently, a workshop was facilitated by the Project Team to consider feedback on drafted course outlines. Workshop participants were asked to consider, from their subject perspective, how well the drafted course outlines represent the knowledge, skills and competencies required for their programme. They were also asked to reflect on key subject literacies, and what should be retained, included or excluded. Summaries of feedback from this Curriculum Subject Expert Workshop are available in Appendix D. In addition to the fundamental competencies required, courses were revised in consideration of the accessibility to cater to a variety of degrees, embedding applicable mathematics concepts, computing technology and incorporating Māori and Pasifika content.

All subsequent drafted course materials were circulated and scrutinized by critical reviewers. The development team subsequently considered feedback and made amendments. This process resulted in the development of a new generalized qualification: The Certificate of Degree Preparation. In consideration of the regional requirements, it is proposed that the Certificate in Degree Preparation adopt the following structure:

- A one-trimester, Level 4, 60 credit Certificate, which includes three 20 credit courses, although maintains institutional autonomy for delivery.
- All students enrol in a core Academic Communication Course (20 credits) and choose two optional courses from the following subjects(See Appendix C for the drafted Course Outlines):
 - Social Science (20 credits);

- Humanities (20 credits);
- Business (20 credits);
- Science (20 credits); and
- Mathematics (20 credits).

It was decided that the following courses would be reviewed, and perhaps developed at a later date: Human Development; and Art & Design. Extending the Science options to prepare for specific disciplines could also be addressed at a later date. The development team also agreed to assess feasibility of offering the Academic Communication course to supplement existing certificates offered with other providers or through other programmes.

Ultimately, all institutions require high standards and consistent learner demands as contained within the Course Outlines and learner objectives. The proposed options, paired with flexible delivery would be instrumental for maintaining learner-centred general degree preparation. The main differentiation with the proposed new qualification is the focus on general degree preparation, which is not specifically tailored for a specific programme or institution- although the delivery and institutional contexts may reflect differences relating to these two factors. A culture of expanding collaboration suggests a new generalized preparatory programme could enable institutional and credit transfer; shared resources, funding and services; flexible enrolments and course portability.

Existing Regional Degree Preparation Pathways at Levels 3 & 4

Presently, there is a reduction in regional preparatory programmes that pathway learners into higher study. As previously mentioned, Wellington universities, have discontinued the provision of Level 4 preparatory programmes.

Current regional Level 3 preparatory programmes include the collaborative Certificate in Preparation for Tertiary Study (CPTS, 60 credits), developed and delivered by staff from Whitireia, WelTec, and Victoria (hosted by WelTec), and Certificate in English Language (60 credits) offered by Whitireia and the Certificate in English for Further Study (60 credits) available through WelTec respectively. Additionally, the Foundation Studies programme at Whitireia embeds some Level 3 courses in their Level 4 qualification. It is anticipated that these programmes will continue to be offered in 2012, but of these Level 3 qualifications, only CPTS and Whitireia Foundation are not solely focussed on Non-English-Speaking Background (NESB) learners.

From 2012, the NZQA 'mixed-field' Level 4 preparatory programmes that will be offered in the Wellington region for domestic students (who are expected to have English language competency) include:

- Whitireia Foundation Studies: 120 credits (Health/Social Science or Business focus)
- Open Polytechnic Tertiary Study Skills: 40 credits (distance)
- Whitireia Pre-entry to Degrees: 3 x 10 credits (modular, distance)
- Victoria's Tohu Māoritanga Programme: 80 credits (Māori studies)

There are also English language preparatory programmes:

- Te Wānanga's Certificates in Practical English (63 credits) & English for Speakers of Other Languages (60 credits)
- Victoria's Certificate of Proficiency in English: 48 credits focussed on English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

Certificate of University Preparation programmes (60 credits) at both Massey and Victoria University have been discontinued.

Distance preparatory options may prevail. The Open Polytechnic offers a distance-based Level 4, 20-credit Tertiary Skills course aiming to develop autonomous learners with the goal of demonstrating effective learning strategies, writing, information literacy, computer and numerical skills. Students who pass this course are entitled to undertake a complimentary distance 20-credit, Level 5 degree course at the

institution, with the purpose of solidifying their tertiary skills knowledge in a context of their choice. This programme is currently under review.

Additionally, Whitireia's Pre-entry programme (30 credits) is delivered online and provides options to earn 10 Level 4 credits each in course such as: Academic Skills, Computers, Cultural Perspective, Paramedics, Anatomy & Physiology, and Biological Science. Students seeking to develop particular skills and confidence elect to take this option. Therefore, general preparatory programmes will only be available by distance in 2012, offered by both The Open Polytechnic and Whitireia.

A challenge for the distance learning model is that bridging students may benefit from learner engagement and participating in a learning community. A mixed delivery option may be preferable to could promote learner cohesiveness, whilst maintaining flexibility. Research supports the need to initiate a learner cohort achieved through face-to-face delivery that allows learners' needs to be inculcated into the particular institution they are transitioning into (Kantanis, 2000). Transition has been more successful in programmes that place emphasis on the particular nature of that institution, and should therefore be ideally be located on the site of that institution, and be inhabited by other students who are making the same transition.

Other Level 4 options are tailored to particular study areas, such as business, digital arts, engineering, music, journalism or mental health (See Appendix A). In addition, Whitireia's Foundation course is specifically focussed on preparing learners for applied degrees with a Health/Social Science/Business focus, with progression to Early Childhood Education (ECE), Nursing, and/or Social Work. Learners typically transition to the applied degree within the institution where they studied because these programmes have been tailored for that particular programme. How well learners transition to other disciplines or other institutions from these programmes has yet to be investigated.

Although this current proposal caters to domestic, English-speaking students, cross-institutional concern has been expressed for Non-English-Speaking Background (NESB) domestic students who would benefit from a Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) focused Academic Skills or English for Academic Purposes course. Currently VUW's Foundations Studies or English Proficiency Programmes focus on necessary skills such as reading information, writing, listening, speaking and grammar. These programmes currently only accept international funding, although NESB domestic students would benefit from further developing their academic skills at Level 4, and that would be more conducive to degree-level achievement. In particular, opportunities to practice listening and speaking in English will help students acquire the level of English proficiency required for successful English-medium study. Allocated domestic funding or flexible enrolments could enable these students to enrol in a more appropriate Level 4 programme, such as Foundations Studies at VUW.

Distinctive from general preparatory programmes, NESB students benefit from a particular focus on language and academic skills. Although Borland and Pearce (2002) note that many domestic students also struggle with language and academic skills, they found that these are areas that are especially problematic for international students and domestic students from recent-arrival migrant communities. Further, students who are inadequately prepared in the areas of language and culture face other obstacles in their academic pursuit (Zhang, 2004). It is acknowledged that the newly developed programme will not necessarily cater to all NESB students, necessitating an IELTS entry requirement, or flexible delivery options with existing suitable programmes.

Under current proposals, options that encompass a wide range of study options or more general degree preparatory skills will be significantly reduced regionally after 2011. With the imminent disestablishment of university preparation courses, a significant opportunity exists to provide preparatory programmes for Level 4 learners (Refer to Appendix B).

Tertiary Preparedness and Achievement

In general, literature seems to demonstrate that a good indicator of success in tertiary study is academic achievement at secondary school. There have been a number of New Zealand studies that have examined this question. Scott (2003, 2009), Scott and Smart (2005), examined this with respect to qualification completions, whereas Earle (2008) examined the link for Māori students. In the most recent study, Engler (2010a) considered factors affecting academic success. His conclusion was that school academic achievement, when measured against passing papers in the student's first year, showed a high correlation.

However, there were some caveats. In particular, Engler (2010a) found that lower-achieving students from low-decile schools performed better in their first year of tertiary studies than similar students from high-decile schools. This suggests that NCEA may underestimate the ability of some students – those whose results suggest low achievement – from lower decile schools. Conversely, NCEA overestimates the ability of low-achieving students from higher decile schools. An Australian study, using a socio-economic basis, found that when controlling ability level, students from middle-level socio-economic backgrounds performed better than lower socio-economic students, who performed better than higher socio-economic students (Birch & Miller, 2004). Taken together, these studies would seem to support widening the focus of preparation, and potentially New Zealand could strategise to include students from lower socio-economic backgrounds alongside that of ethnicity.

Engler (2010a) also presented findings of interest relating to the benefit or otherwise of a “gap-year” and relating to Pasifika students, who underperform in tertiary study as against their peers who have similar school results. Among those with lower school achievement, students who took a year off before starting their tertiary studies—particularly students from low-decile schools—showed higher levels of performance at university than those who progressed directly to tertiary study after leaving school, although this better performance among those who took a gap year was not seen in European, or sole-Pasifika students (Engler, 2010a).

Further, there is contradictory international evidence to the claim that secondary school student achievement should be the only criterion for admission. Conley (2008), for example, concludes that high schools prepare students to enter college, but not to succeed in college, pointing to low completion rates, particularly within what are considered normal timeframes. So although there is a high correlation between secondary school success and tertiary achievement, secondary school study does not necessarily correspond with students prepared for higher education. An increased focus on retention and completions by the Tertiary Education Commission suggests that these are also issues in New Zealand.

Australian studies also suggest that a significant number of students drop out of tertiary study citing unsatisfactory study skills and a lack of prerequisite knowledge (West, 1985). These appear to be strongly influenced by practices at secondary school (Ramsden, 1991). Further, a New Zealand study (Tuuta et al., 2004) found that teachers' low expectations of Māori school students contributed to Māori students' lack of success at secondary school. It may be that this is replicated at tertiary level, resulting in poorer performance of Māori students, but of at least equal concern is the implication it might be having of depressing Māori students' school success and therefore their ability to progress into tertiary study at all. Bridging programmes, such as CUP, may disrupt this perception and assist the increase of educational attainment for those students who were otherwise not well supported at secondary school.

Cantwell, Archer, & Bourke (2001) reviewed the changing demographic profile of tertiary institutions in Australia, specifically the increasing presence of mature-aged students and the increased acceptance of non-traditional qualifications allowing entry into undergraduate programmes. This study showed that such changes had not been accompanied by a dilution of academic standards, suggesting that the students coming from alternative pathways are at least as able as those who come directly from secondary school.

In New Zealand, the majority (70.4%) of learners studying a Level 4 certificate did not achieve higher than level 1 at secondary school, although a national analysis of these learners' achievement indicated that approximately 60% of them complete their qualification, a completion rate that is even higher (~75%) if they study at a wānanga or university (Educational Attainment Working Group, 2011b). Correspondingly, unpublished VUW reports that have reviewed the achievement of students who have completed the VUW's CUP programme showed that these students do as well as students who enter through having achieved New Zealand Vice-Chancellors Council (NZVCC) requirements for NCEA-based university entrance (VUW, 2010). This is the subject of on-going studies. These findings have significant implications for pathways for those from disadvantaged academic backgrounds in an environment of restricted entry to tertiary study that is largely based on NCEA results.

Transition

The transition process to an institution must be more than simply an accumulation of relevant academic skills. For Monash University, for example, transition is a process of:

... enculturation into the teaching and learning styles, life, procedures, practices and culture of the university. It is also a matter of engagement with the university, a particular course, subjects and people at a specific campus (Kantanis 2002, pg. 3).

An effective strategy to increase tertiary retention and achievement involves engaging with appropriate learning communities, in particular when institutional culture deviates from personal representations of culture (Tinto, 1993). Transition is far simpler for students from higher socio-economic backgrounds because they typically share similar cultural norms assumed by the dominant culture. For students from 'non-traditional' backgrounds, socialisation into such discourse communities and communities of practice cannot be so easily assumed and involves cultural transition which needs to be approached both sensitively and critically (David Gough, personal communication on July 28, 2011).

The size of the institution, and the type and nature of the course can have significant influence on whether or not the student remains at the institution (Tinto, 1993). In particular, measures to ensure that students feel enculturated into the institution and integrated into learning communities are useful for retention. Transition programmes have been found to be most effective when they are designed for the specific learning environment they are aimed for (Boddy & Neale, 1998; Gillespie & Noble, 1992; Pargetter, 1999; Tinto, 1993). Knowledge of and access to support services such as academic skills advisers, counsellors, medical services, financial management advice as well as equity support officers can provide a vital resource for student experiencing difficulties, particularly in the first year (Promnitz & Germain, 1996).

Kantanis (2000) found that social transition also underpins successful transition to university, noting that the development of a friendship network was major contributing element in this process. These findings suggest that a programme designed to effect transition into a particular institution needs to be related specifically to the nature of that institution, ideally be located on the site of that institution, and be inhabited by other students who are making the same transition.

In the current environment, to ensure that effective pathways into degree-level programmes continue, universities, ITPs and wānanga may wish to collaborate in making bridging programmes appropriate for degree-level study at any institution. Most current provision does not make it easy for learners to complete a bridging programme successfully at one institution, and have that recognised as an entry criterion for a degree at another – even though similar elements identified as important in the literature about first year tertiary experiences, transition from school to university, and bridging pedagogy are to be found in programmes throughout the country. Movement towards more learner-focussed collaboration, rather than EFTS completion is considered a strength of this new initiative.

Elements that have been found to assist transition, as illustrated by Evans (1999), include:

- the provision of sound course advice and career and study planning;
- orientation that introduces students to the tertiary environment and provides an opportunity for interaction with other students and staff (having both academic and social engagement improves student retention);
- culturally appropriate course content; and
- well-designed programmes that use scaffolding and provide students with specific feedback to enhance their learning.

Research evidence suggests that initiatives to improve transition are likely to be more effective if they are directly integrated with teaching and learning or part of the programme curriculum (Tinto, 2008). Anae *et al.*'s (2002) study of Pasifika students' transition concluded that integrating academic and social support into courses means that it is directly applicable to students' studies. Additionally, research has suggested that the preferred learning approaches for Māori are often the positive interdependence and collaborative styles evident in cooperative learning, which allow for family involvement and emphasise oral communication. Such culturally relevant approaches were found to be linked to increased positive self-esteem (Rubie, Townsend, & Moore, 2004).

According to the research literature, educators are to be encouraged to embrace diversity, acknowledge the various layers and dimensions of cultural identity and practise holistic and flexible pedagogy (Bishop *et al.* 2007). Culturally responsive teachers reject deficit theories and are committed to facilitating Māori students' educational achievement (Bishop *et al.* 2007; Earle 2008). Educators who care about their students' success and create a culturally responsive environment are thought to be preferable for Māori adult learners (McMurphy-Pilkington 2009). The importance of acknowledging cultural identity for Māori has been stressed in the literature (May 2009; McMurphy-Pilkington 2009) and Gavala & Flett (2008) found that Māori perceived cultural autonomy as paired with a higher sense of well being while engaging in university study.

While the focus of a bridging programme is primarily focussed on providing support for the transition process into tertiary study, this evidence suggests that changing the teaching and learning practices within the tertiary institutions will also be beneficial to enabling students accessing from different pathways to succeed. Such changes towards individual and culturally appropriate learning methods will be of benefit to every student, not only those who access tertiary education through a bridging programme.

Preparatory Factors to be Addressed within the Bridging Programme

Psychological

Knowledge of learning strategies, goal commitment and academic motivation have all been shown to be important in tertiary performance (Evans, 1999), as has self-efficacy (Chemers, Hu, & Garcia, 2001). However, Otunuku and Brown (2007) found that even with high expectations, positive attitudes and self-efficacy, Pasifika students still have low academic achievement. Madjar, McKinley, Deynzer, & Van Der Merwe (2010) identified cultural capital and the competences and skills required to fit into the tertiary environment, as predictors of success.

Evans (1999) indicated that students' own goals for tertiary study may be influenced by their parents', gender expectations, and family background. She cites a 1997 study by the Higher Education Funding Council for England found that one of the most significant factors in UK non-completions was a lack of commitment to the course, particularly where students applied because of parental and peer pressure. Yet US studies suggest that (despite this) a student's stated intention of their persistence and motivation is a strong predictor (Astin et al., 1993; Boddy & Neale, 1998).

These findings will have implications for the nature, structure and content of any bridging programme, but also suggest that some testing of these attributes would be a useful component of entry requirements.

Social Support & Finances

West, Hore, Bennie, Browne, & Kermond (1986) found family support to be an important factor in support for some students considering dropping out, and that peer support enhance students' performance. Although the study also found the difficulty of combining study with familial commitment could be a cause of withdrawal. For example, Anae et al (2002) found for example that for some Pasifika students' families and communities actively discouraging progression to tertiary study either because of the need for wage earners to assist families and contribute to community activity or because of lack of confidence that tertiary education would deliver for their children.

Financial problems are the most significant factor in withdrawing in West's study, and the third most important in Abbott-Chapman, Hughes, & Wylde (1992). The Australian National Board of Employment, Education and Training (1992) rated only student achievement in the final year of secondary school as more important as a factor likely to restrict the course choices that students face. The 1997 HEFCE study found financial hardship as one of the five main factors in non-completion in the UK. Further, US research suggests that financial aid in the form of long-term loans does not completely remove the deterrent effect of large tuition fees on low SSE individuals, and that this has impact on persistence as well as access (Astin, Henson, & Christian, 1980; Stampen 1983).

Financial problems also manifest themselves in students engaging in part-time (or even full-time) work, with consequential detrimental impact on their studies. In a review of international literature, McInnis (2001) noted that research findings suggest that younger college students who work part-time are likely to spend fewer days on campus, spend less time with other students, and study less consistently throughout the semester. Accordingly, monitoring of the impact of work on their study will need to be part of the pastoral care provisions of the bridging programme provider.

Pedagogical Approach

In any curriculum re-development, it is important that content is not overloaded or overwhelming, but scaffolds, supports, and supplements learning skills. Study skills can actively be embedded into the elective options to assist with assignments. More integration of study skills should enable transfer of learning with versatile skills applicable to other contexts. Leach and Zepke (2010), find that a redesign of the curriculum towards promoting interaction, autonomy and reflection combined with a collaborative programme integrating appropriate language and learning skills development with course content, can potentially benefit all students, and especially transitional students.

Although distinctions may be observed in institutional culture, all tertiary providers are tasked with the responsibility of delivering high quality learning and teaching. Institutional conditions conducive to academic success include opportunities for interaction and collaboration, respecting diversity, active learning, feedback, support, tutor contact, and high standards (Beasley, 1999; Kuh *et al.* 2005).

Flexibility in delivery is also an important feature. If learners perceive themselves to be reflected in the curriculum, learning may be more likely to be perceived as relevant. This can be achieved by the learner and instructor co-creating the learning activities to achieve set learning objectives. Agreed demonstration of learning objectives and assessment tools would ensure learners achieve at equitable levels, whilst maintaining options to engage with practical, academic, applied and/or theoretical concepts.

In a recent study, Victoria's CUP students from 2007-2010 nominated the following aspects as the most important ones from their own bridging programme:

- High quality teaching staff who are supporting and encouraging;
- Group work and interactive discussions;
- Variety in teaching structures (large lectures, small hands-on workshops, etc.) to ease transition and inform decision-making; and
- Strict deadlines and high expectations of mature and committed approach to study.

Related elements (such as academic challenge, active learning, student/staff interactions, enriching educational experiences, and a supportive learning environment) have also been found to assist with student engagement at Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs), as well as universities (Radloff, 2011). These elements have assisted students with developing a similar level of higher order thinking skills and general learning outcomes across the sectors, therefore all tertiary institutions are tasked with incorporating these in order to encourage student engagement.

Learner Competencies

The development of particular learner competencies may further enable student success. Feedback from CUP students at Victoria University signalled the utility of reading and understanding academic material, taking notes, and developing autonomous study habits for degree-level study. Their feedback was also consistent with what Conley (2008) identifies as "Four Key Dimensions of College Readiness":

1. Key Cognitive Strategies
 - a. Analytic reasoning, problem solving, inquisitiveness, precision, interpretation, evaluating claims.
2. Key Content Knowledge
 - a. Writing skills, algebraic concepts, key foundational content and "big ideas" from core subjects.
3. Academic Behaviours (self-management)
 - a. Persistence, time management, study group use, awareness of performance.
4. Contextual Skills and Awareness ("college knowledge")
 - a. Admission requirements, cost of college, purpose and opportunities of universities, types of higher education institutions, college culture, and relations with professors.

With respect to university and applied degree requirements, Cantwell and Grayson (2004) argue that a university-based enabling programme requires fundamental metacognitive and affective development. He has also argued that to be successful in transitioning students to university, a programme needs a significant amount of deep learning (Cantwell & Grayson 2004). Coates (2010) similarly distinguishes “higher-order thinking—cognitive operations that involve analysing, synthesizing, judging and applying” to be distinctive to universities, whereas “general learning outcomes such as communication, writing, speaking and analytic skills” to be applicable to general degree-level study (p7).

A thorough European study conducted by Tuning (2004) provides a reference point for what are termed generic competencies as rated by employers, students, and educational providers. The list is exhaustive and applies to the competences required to be achieved from the degree-programme itself. All tertiary institutions have their own “graduate attributes” as well. The goal of the bridging programme will be to sufficiently prepare students so that they are enabled to achieve what is required from them in their subsequent study.

Subjects: General or specific?

The question as to whether a programme should be “general” or specific to a particular programme that the students are transitioning into requires further investigation. Further, there is considerable literature around whether the “core-skills” required for success at tertiary level should be taught independently or integrated into content-based courses.

Success in science subjects at a tertiary level has been found to be better predicted by school results than in the humanities (Everett & Robins, 1991), and performance in relevant school subjects enables success at university (McClelland & Kruger, 1993). Further, there has been a long-standing belief that a background in mathematics is generally associated with success at tertiary study (Sadler & Tai, 2007; Brown, 2009), and that a background in languages is regarded as important in the study of law (Kok, 2007).

However, a more recent, and New Zealand-based, study found that when adjusted for school achievement, most associations diminish or disappear altogether (Engler, 2010b). Performance in engineering, for example, is independent of whether or not a student took physics, mathematics or chemistry at school. However, in society and culture papers, not taking English may be associated with lower university achievement, at least relative to not taking other subjects. Engler’s initial assumption was that students with below-average school achievement would perform better in subjects by having taken them, compared with those who did not (but had higher levels of school achievement in general), though this was not born out in his study.

Only for closely related topics – such as mathematics and mathematical science, chemistry and chemical science – is a particular school subject associated with an increase in university performance, and even then Engler (2010b) found that the increase in performance was marginal. The only significant correlation was in accounting, where having studied accounting at school was strongly associated with performance in accounting courses (likely because there was significant overlap between school and tertiary content). There was a weak association between having taken mathematics at school and achievement in economics at university. Exploring the alignment between secondary and tertiary curriculum would be worthwhile.

Parker’s (2003) conclusion, with respect to a study focusing on English literature, was that no simple ‘orientation’ or ‘deficit’ package will enable incoming students to engage with the curriculum. She cited approvingly the conclusion Ballinger (2003) came to that despite the existence of specific skills required in order for a student to succeed at tertiary study, this should not take place in school – or at least should not be allowed to obscure the needs of students already struggling with the demands of secondary school. These studies suggest that tertiary study skills should be addressed in the early part of degree-level study, and they confirm that there will need to be a component of specific tertiary-preparation study skills in any bridging programme. How to go about this is addressed below.

Embedding Study Skills

A key factor in the efficacy of study skills workshops is that they are discipline-based rather than specific (Durkin & Main 2002). Kuo (1993) and Swales (1990) argue that generic material is unable to cater for the precise needs of students following a particular course within a particular institution. Ladd (1999) also claims that study skills support needs to be directly related to the students' immediate and specific needs. Research by Angelova and Riazantseva (1999) concludes that there is no single academic community with unified standards and expectations but rather that every specific discipline has its own conventions, values and practices. Therefore, it is fundamental that flexibility and adaptability are inherent in a general preparatory programme.

The use of subject specialist teachers and the identifiable location of subjects in relation to future study tend to underline the importance of the material to both staff and students (Wolf, 1992). The maintenance of subject boundaries, traditionally derived from the defining methodologies, concepts and knowledge fields of respective disciplines, underlines the importance of coherent, sequential and accumulative approaches to learning (Green, 2010). The use of teaching methods consistent with what the students should expect in their further study reinforces the norms regarding standards to be achieved and the expected pace of learning (Reynolds & Farrell, 1996).

It follows that just as a study skills programme needs substantial liaison with the teaching staff (Keech, 1994), so too would a preparation programme. It would further need to be tailored to the specific needs of the degree course to which students were being transitioned. Therefore, curricula need to be flexible enough to allow for effective transfer of learning and learning objectives should incorporate the assistance of discipline-specific transition. A generalised qualification could bridge students to degree-level study at a range of different institutions, but enable practitioners to tailor the programme to specific discipline areas.

Regional Level 4 Degree Preparation Programme

The *Tertiary Education Strategy 2011-2015* (TES) outlines current government priorities for tertiary education. The TES differentiates between the teaching roles of different tertiary providers. It sees university teaching as being “to provide a wide range of research-led degree and postgraduate education...” (p18) while polytechnics are to deliver vocational education and teaching “to assist progression to higher levels of learning or work through foundation education.” (*ibid*). Ultimately, overlap exists between the providers, and provision for progression must be established in order to enable access to higher levels of study.

One consideration is to distinguish between a “degree” and an “applied degree”. According to Dunlop (2004):

In very simple terms, an applied degree at the undergraduate level may be defined as a baccalaureate qualification, with a strong vocational orientation, offered by a community college, technical institute, polytechnic or private training establishment, or PTEs as they are generally referred to in New Zealand. These degrees are usually distinguished from those offered by universities which are described in some circles as academic or foundational degrees (p1).

The project team acknowledges that this definition may be shifting to acknowledge the role of academic preparation in any type of degree, regardless of how it is classified. Specifically, for any degree, it would be appropriate for parents and students to perceive any higher study with an equal amount of prestige, whether it be classified as applied, vocational or academic. A desire exists to shift the perception towards a more learner-centred approach that legitimises and respects multiple pathways (Middleton, 2011).

Any programme in degree-level preparation should have clear guarantees regarding articulation. Universities New Zealand has agreed guidelines about entrance level qualifications from New Zealand and overseas for admission *ad eundem statum* (admission with equivalent standing to NCEA entrance qualifications). New Zealand university degree preparation programmes (e.g. Certificate of University Preparation and Foundation Studies programmes) are accepted as basic *ad eundem* entrance qualifications. Level 4 bridging programmes at polytechnics are currently not included in the *ad eundem* list of recognised entrance qualifications. Therefore, it is imperative to extend regional collaborations, with articulation agreements between institutions in the same geographical area for shared degree-level preparation programmes.

NZQA is also tasked with reducing the amount of qualifications currently on the framework. During 2012, NZQA will be performing a targeted review of ‘Mixed-field’ or general education programmes, of which foundation and bridging courses will be reviewed. This has presented significant implications for the development of any additional qualifications. NZQA guidance indicates that a nationally shared and nationally recognised qualification – such as a certificate of degree-level preparation – adaptable to suit different contexts and different institutions or with teaching to be shared among one or two institutions should be considered. Such a programme would need to be recognised for university admission *ad eundem statum* wherever it was taught. Therefore, the newly developed Certificate of Degree Preparation may serve as a pilot for a national initiative.

Degree Preparation Recommendations

There are many considerations for the development of a degree preparation programme. The application process into the programme should include some assessment as to the appropriateness of the qualification for the student's learning needs, and to facilitate a learner-focussed approach. The content of the transition or bridging programme should include psychological, social and subject-driven preparatory content, and requisite "tertiary skills" should be integrated, wherever possible, into discipline and subject-specific content courses. It is important that students have developed effective self-management, learning discipline, persistence and proven study strategies (cognitive and metacognitive) to succeed with their further study. Additionally, students should be encouraged to consider their academic motivation, goal commitment, and aspirations and how these are linked to further tertiary study.

It is also expected that students will have demonstrated mastery of key foundational content required for particular demands of their further study. This includes the ability to demonstrate ability in analytic reasoning, problem solving, inquisitiveness, precision, interpretation and evaluation such that they will be able to transition into degree-level programmes. Students should be enculturated into the specific teaching and learning contexts, life, procedures, practices and culture of the institution they will transition into. Students should also have the opportunity to engage autonomously with both theoretical and applied concepts. A shared challenge faced by this general degree preparatory programme is ensuring that many approaches and potential pathways are respected.

The development of a collaborative regional degree bridging programme should ensure that learning outcomes allow flexibility in delivery to accommodate for learner and institutional diversity, whilst ensuring accountability to each institution's (or group of institutions') required standards. Within the collaborative culture, it is imperative that institutional culture, perspective and philosophy are respected. It is expected that learning needs and the best interest of the particular learner will inform practice and process. With the possibility of delivering a national standard, institutional autonomy must be maintained. This freedom is linked with each institution's responsibility for high standards when facilitating agreed learning objectives. Consequently, it is assumed that standards will encourage embracing diversity and innovation in the delivery of the programme. Accordingly, a single bridging programme designed to transition students into both polytechnics and universities needs to understand the needs of both the students and the institutions.

Discussion

Ultimately, student needs are paramount; therefore it is imperative to ensure options remain available for students to further progress into tertiary study in order to achieve their potential. All students, regardless of how well they achieved in secondary school, should have access to higher study.

Effective preparation involves psychological, social and pastoral considerations in addition to interacting with content, context and degree-level strategies and behaviours indicative of successful transition. It is also important to ensure useful cognitive strategies, such as analytical thinking and evaluation, are explicitly incorporated into the curriculum. Incorporating these key skills into a degree preparation programme allows portability for transition to a variety of degrees.

Maintaining a challenging programme may ease transition and equip students with useful skills, knowledge and competencies required for more successful study outcomes. Additionally, an appropriate level of challenge and high standards allows learners to understand their own capabilities and feel proud of their achievements whilst embarking on a more autonomous lifelong learning journey. Students also require access to a variety of institutional experiences in order to engage with contextual academic behaviours that enable them to expand their horizons.

Collaborative provision involves cooperative partnerships between student-centred tertiary institutions, clear agreements, and appropriate standards that maintain flexibility in delivery whilst ensuring accountability to the learning objectives. Clear and simple options for study and career pathways available nationally would assist all parties. The utility of clear articulation agreements that could enable national progression is important for all stakeholders, especially the students.

It is important to ensure a variety of tertiary providers, funding bodies, and policymakers, are working alongside one another to meet the best interests of our learners whilst respecting distinctions and diversity. Working together to understand and respect our differences would enable more educators to collaborate nationally. If learners, practitioners, leadership and policy-makers begin to understand the fluidity and utility of skills that can be transferred to integrated avenues, more cross-sector partnerships could potentially benefit all. It is hoped that the impact of initiating a more general degree-preparation curriculum that integrates study strategies into different curriculum disciplines may provide considerable direction for national collaborations.

Acknowledgements

The project team wishes to acknowledge the following individuals who have contributed to the development of the Level 4 Certificate of Degree Preparation (listed in alphabetical order under heading):

- *Support:*
 - Don Campbell, Chief Executive Officer, Whitireia NZ
 - Dr Peter Coolbear, Director, Ako Aotearoa
 - Nicholas Huntington, Senior Project/Research Analyst, Ako Aotearoa
 - Dr Linda Sissons, Chief Executive Officer, WelTec
 - Dr Pat Walsh, Vice-Chancellor, Victoria University
- *Project Steering Group:*
 - Karen Davis, Associate Director (Student Academic Services- Retention, Achievement & Equity), Victoria University
 - Gail Kirkland, Head of School (Foundation), WelTec
 - Mary Manderson, Programme Leader (Foundation), Whitireia
- *Project Developers:*
 - Peter Appleby, Teacher (Foundation), Whitireia
 - Liz Chinlund, Programme Manager (CUP), Victoria University
 - James MacKay, Teaching Quality Project Leader
 - Dr Alistair Shaw, Senior Teacher (CUP), Victoria University
- *Curriculum contributors and peer reviewers (including Project Steering Group and Developers):*
 - Dr Steven Archer, Course Coordinator (CUP), Victoria University
 - Brenda Bell, Team Leader (ESOL), WelTec
 - Glenys Bowman, Course Coordinator (CUP), Victoria University
 - Francesca Costa, Teacher (CUP), Victoria University
 - Beth Derby, Programme Coordinator (Foundation), Whitireia
 - Moira-Clare Donovan, Course Coordinator (CUP), Victoria University
 - David Gough, Dean (Faculty of Health, Humanities, and Science), Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology
 - John Hannah, Course Coordinator (CUP), Victoria University
 - Angela Joe, ELI Director (School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies), Victoria University
 - Lalitha Jonnavithula, Lecturer (Tertiary Study), Open Polytechnic
 - Axel Laurs, Director (Centre of Lifelong Learning), Victoria University
 - Ian Masters, Director (Foundation Studies), Victoria University
 - Dr Alistair Shaw, Course Coordinator (CUP), Victoria University
 - Carine Stewart, (Consultant), Ottawa University, Canada
 - Jan Stewart, Manager (Student Learning Support Services), Victoria University
 - Dylan Taylor, Course Coordinator (CUP), Victoria University
 - Dr Anne-Marie Tokley, Course Coordinator (CUP), Victoria University
 - Leith Wallace, Coordinator (ESOL), Whitireia
 - Craig Watterson, Engineering Pathways Project Manager, Victoria University
- *Subject expert workshop participants (including Project Steering Group and Developers):*
 - Dr Stephanie Doyle, Senior Lecturer (Education), Victoria University
 - Dr Peter Howland, Centre Manager (Social Sciences), Open Polytechnic
 - Ian Hunter, Head of School (IT), WelTec
 - Clare F Jay, Programme Leader (Hospitality Management), WelTec
 - Dr Samantha Lentle-Keenan, Discipline Leader & Lecturer (Communication), Open Polytechnic
 - Ed Philips, Kaiako (Social Services Degree), Te Wānanga o Aotearoa
 - Dr Geoff Plimmer, Senior Lecturer (Commerce), Victoria University
 - Ann Pocock, Assistant Manager (Student Learning Support Services), Victoria University
 - Mei Shortland, Academic Advisor, Te Wānanga o Aotearoa
 - MaryLou Sloane, Head of School (Social Services & Sector Engagement), WelTec

References

- Abbott-Chapman, J., Hughes, P., & Wyld, C. (1992). *Monitoring student progress: A framework for improving student performance and reducing attrition in higher education*, Youth Education Studies Centre, University of Tasmania.
- Anae, M., Anderson, H., Benseman, J., & Coxon, E. (2002). *Pacific peoples and tertiary education: Issues of participation. Final Report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Angelova, M. & Riazantseva, A. (1999). If You Don't Tell Me, How Can I Know?, *Written Communication*, 16, 491–525.
- Astin, A. W., Henson, J. W., & Christian, C. E. (1980). *SISFAP Study A: The Impact of Student Financial Aid Programs on Student Choice: Final Report*, Office of Planning, Division of Postsecondary Educational Programs, Washington, DC.
- Ballinger, G. J. (2003) Bridging the gap between A level and degree: some observations on managing the transitional stage in the study of English literature, *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 2(1), 65–71.
- Beasley, C. J., & Pearson, C. A. L. (1999). Facilitating the learning of transitional students: Strategies for success for all students. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 18, 303–321.
- Birch, E., & Miller, P. (2004). *The determinants of students' tertiary academic success*, in, Conference proceedings, Quantitative tools for microeconomic policy analysis, Canberra: Australian Government Productivity Commission.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T. , & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te Kōtahitanga Phase 3 Whānaungatanga: Establishing a Culturally Responsive Pedagogy of Relations in Mainstream Secondary School Classrooms*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Boddy, G., & Neale, J. (1998). A Three Year Longitudinal Study of the University Experience – A Progress Report, *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association*, 12, 48–55.
- Borland, H., & Pearce, A. (2002). Identifying key dimension of language and cultural disadvantage at university. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 25(2), 101–127.
- Brown, G. (2009) *Review of education in mathematics, data science and quantitative disciplines*, Canberra: The Group of Eight.
- Cantwell, R., Archer, J., & Bourke, S. (2001). A Comparison of the Academic Experiences and Achievement of University Students Entering by Traditional and Non-traditional Means¹, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26(3), 221–234.
- Cantwell, R. & Grayson, R. (2002). *Individual differences among enabling students: a comparison across three enabling programmes*. Paper presented at the 3rd Joint Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education and New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Melbourne, November–December.

- Chemers, M., Hu, L., & Garcia B. (2001). *Academic self-efficacy and first-year college student performance and adjustment*, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 55–64.
- Coates, H. (2010). Development of the Australasian survey of student engagement (AUSSE), *Higher Education*, 60, 1–17.
- Conley, D. (2008). *College Knowledge: What it Really Takes for Students to Succeed and What Can We do To Get Them Ready?*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dunlop, T. (2004). *Lessons from Down under: quality assurance, accreditation and the legitimization of the applied degree*, Ottawa: Association of Canadian Community Colleges.
- Durkin, K., & Main, A. (2002). Discipline-Based Study Skills Support for First-Year Undergraduate Students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 3(1), 24–39.
- Earle, D. (2008). *Hei titiro anō i te whāinga — Māori achievement in bachelors degrees revisited*, Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Educational Attainment Working Group. (2011a). Profiling priority learners EAWG data report 1: Who are they, where are they, and what are they doing? *Ako Aotearoa*. Retrieved August 2, 2011 from <http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/download/ng/file/group-5797/profiling-priority-learners-eawg-data-report-1.pdf>.
- Educational Attainment Working Group. (2011b). Profiling priority learners EAWG data report 2: Pathways, what's working well, and where are the issues? *Ako Aotearoa*. Retrieved August 2, 2011 from <http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/download/ng/file/group-5797/profiling-priority-learners-eawg-data-report-2.pdf>.
- Engler, R. (2010a). *School leavers' progression to bachelors-level study*, Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Engler, R. (2010b). *Are particular school subjects associated with better performance at university?*, Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Evans, M. (1999). *School-leavers' transition to tertiary study: a literature review*, Working paper 3/99, Department of Econometrics and business statistics, Melbourne: Monash University.
- Everett, J. E., & Robins, J. (1991). Tertiary Entrance Predictors of First-Year University Performance, *Australian Journal of Education*, 35(1), 24–40.
- Gavala, J. R., & Flett, R. (2005). Influential factors moderating academic enjoyment/motivation and psychological well-being for Māori university students at Massey University. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 34(1), 52–57.
- Green, A. (2010). Core Skills, Key Skills and General Culture: In Search of the Common Foundation in Vocational Education, *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(1), 23–40.
- Gillespie, M., & Noble, J. (1992). *Factors affecting student persistence: A longitudinal study*. Iowa, The American Testing Program.

- Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (1997). *Undergraduate non-completion in higher education in England*, No. 97/29. <http://www.niss.ac.uk/education/hefce/pub97>
- Kantanis, T. (2000). The role of social transition in students' adjustment to the first year of university. *Journal of Institutional Research*, 9(1), 100–110.
- Kantanis, T. (2002). *Same or different: Issues that affect mature age undergraduate students' transition to university*. Paper presented at the Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference: Changing Agendas- Te Ao Hurihuri. Christchurch: New Zealand, July 4–8.
- Keech, M. (1994). *Supporting for Development: The QUT Experience*. Paper presented at the Australia Development Studies Network Symposium, Canberra: Australia, 23–24 September.
- Klinger, C., & Wache, D. (2009). *Two heads are better than one: community building in the Foundation Studies program to promote student engagement in learning*. Paper presented at the 3rd National Conference for Enabling Education.
- Kok, A. (2007). Higher-grade mathematics the formula for success? Establishing the odds for prospective LLB students, *South African Law Journal*, 124(1): 47–56.
- Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J., Whitt, E., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuo, C. (1993). Problematic Issues in EST Materials Development, *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 171–181.
- Ladd, P. (1999). Learning Style and Adjustment Issues of International Students, *Journal of Education for Business*, 74, 363–371.
- Leach, L. J., Zepke, N. (2010). Making it into the pipeline: Transitions from school to tertiary education. *Journal of Adult Learning*, 38(1), 5–22. University of Canterbury, New Zealand.
- Loader, M., & Dalgety, J. (2008). *Students' transition between school and tertiary education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Madjar, I., McKinley, E., Deynzer, M., & Van Der Merwe, A. (2010). *Stumbling blocks or stepping stones? Students' experience of transition from low-mid decile schools to university*, Auckland: Starpath project, The University of Auckland.
- May, S. (2009). *Hangaia te matapuna o te mohio/Learning foundations for Māori adults*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- McClelland, A.A., & Kruger, P.W. (1993). *An Investigation of the Subsequent Performance in Tertiary Studies of Students Admitted Through the Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre in 1989-90*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- McInnis, C. (2001) Signs of Disengagement? The changing undergraduate experience in Australian universities. Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne.
- McMurchy-Pilkington, C. (2009). *Te pakeke hei ākonga/ Māori adult learners: Final report to the Ministry of Education*. Auckland: The University of Auckland.

- Middleton, S. (2011). Transitions: A discussion paper. *Ako Aotearoa*. Retrieved August 2, 2011 from <http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/project/increasing-educational-attainment-tes-priority-learners/resources/pages/key-issue-transition>.
- National Board of Employment, Education and Training (NBEET). (1992). *Assessment of the Impact of the Higher Education Contribution Scheme on the Potentially Disadvantaged*, Commissioned Report No. 15, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Otunuku, M., & Brown, G. (2007). *Tongan students' attitudes towards their subjects in New Zealand relative to their academic achievement*. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8(1), 117–128.
- Pargetter, R. (1999). Transition: From a school perspective. *Journal of Institutional Research*, 9(1), 14–21.
- Parker, J. (2003). Access and transition to education: A forum introduction. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 2(1), 63–64.
- Promnitz, J., & Germain, C. (1996). *Student support services and academic outcomes: Achieving positive outcomes*. <http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/eippubs/student/eip96-10.htm>
- Radloff, A. (2011). Student engagement at New Zealand Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics: Key results from the 2010 pilot. *Ako Aotearoa and the Australian Council for Educational Research*. Retrieved July 22, 2011 from <http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/ausse-itp>.
- Ramsden, P. (1991). Study Processes in Grade 12 Environments in Fraser, B.J. and Walberg, H.J. (Eds) *Educational Environments. Evaluation, Antecedents and Consequences*, New York: Pergamon Press.
- Reynolds, D., & Farrell, S. (1996). *World's Apart? A Review of International Surveys of Educational Achievement Involving England*. London: HMSO.
- Rubie, C. M., Townsend, Michael A. R. and Moore, Dennis W. (2004). Motivational and academic effects of cultural experiences for indigenous minority students in New Zealand. *Educational Psychology*, 24(2), 143–160.
- Sadler, P., & Tai, R. (2007). *The two high-school pillars supporting college science*, *Science*, 317, 457–458.
- Scott, D. (2003). *Retention, completion and progression in tertiary education 2003*, Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Scott, D. (2009). *A closer look at completion in higher education in New Zealand*, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 31(2), 101–108.
- Scott, D., & Smart, W. (2005). *What factors make a difference to getting a degree in New Zealand?* Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Stampen, J. O. (1983). *Student Aid and Public Higher Education: A Progress Report*, American Association of Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tertiary Education Strategy, (2010- 2015). Wellington: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from www.minedu.govt.nz/TertiaryEducationStrategy
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving University: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (Second Edition). Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (2008). *Access without support is not opportunity*. Paper presented at the 36th Annual Institute for Chief Academic Officers, Seattle, WA.
- Tuning (2004). *Generic Competencies*. Retrieved April 6, 2011 from <http://www.tuning.unideusto.org/tuningeu/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=183&Itemid=210>
- Tuuta, M., Bradnam, L., Hynds, A., Higgins, J., & Broughton, R. (2004). *Evaluation of the Te Kauhua Māori mainstream pilot project. Report to the Ministry of Education*, Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Victoria University of Wellington (VUW). (2010). Experience and Achievement of students who transitioned from University Preparation Programme: Certificate of University Preparation and Tohu Māoritonga. *Unpublished report*. Wellington, NZ: Victoria University of Wellington.
- West, L. H. T. (1985). Differential Prediction of First Year University Performance for Students from Different Social Backgrounds. *Australian Journal of Education*, 29(2), 175–187.
- West, L. H. T., Hore, T., Bennie, C.N., Browne, P.A., & Kermond, B. (1986). *Students Withdrawing from Full Time Higher Education*, HEARU, Monash University.
- Wolf, A. (1992). *Mathematics for Vocational Students in France and England: Contrasting Provision and Consequences – NIESR Discussion Paper 23*. London: National Institute of Economic and Social Research.
- Zhang, Z. (2004). *The Experiences and Perceptions of a Sample of Chinese International Students in New Zealand*. Research report, Department of Management and International Business. Albany: Massey University.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Regional Degree Preparation Options for Domestic Students

DEGREE PREPARATION		Existing Options available for domestic students		
Course Options	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	
Academic Communication	CPTS (Wel, 60)	Tertiary Study Skills (OP dist, 40); Academic Skills (Wh dist, 40)	All	
(EAP) Academic Communication	C Gen Eng. for FS (Wel, 60); Cert in Eng. Lang (Wh)	C of Proficiency in English (Vic, 48); C in English for Speakers of Other Languages (Wa, 60); C in Practical Eng. (Wa, 63)	All	
Social Science		Mental Health (Wh, 122; OP dist, 124); Foundation (Wh, 120); Trauma Studies (Wel dist, 40); NC in Soc Services (Wa, 125); C in Indigenous Research (Wa, 120); C in Community Innovation (Wa, 60)	Social Work (Wa; Wh); Trauma Management (Wel dist, 120); Health Psych (Wel, 120); Health leadership (Wel, 60); BA (Vic, OP)	
Humanities		C in Multimedia Journalism (Wh, 65)	BA Humanities (Vic, OP); Creative Writing (Wh); Journalism (Wh); Performing Arts (Wh);	
Business	NC in Business (OP; PTEs; Wa; Wh, 45); NC in 1st Line Management & Leadership (Wa, 64)	Business Management (Wel; Wh; PTEs, 45); NZIM C in Management (OP; TW; Wel; Wh, 40); NZIM Cert in Sm Bus Management (OP; Wh, Wel, 80); Environmental Foundation Cert (Wa, 40)	Diploma in Business/ Management (120: Wh; OP dist; Wel); BCA (Vic); Applied Business (Wh); Small Business Enterprise (Wa)	
Biological Science	Cert. Rec & sport (Wel); NC in Pharmacy Assistance (OP, 89)	Foundation (Wh, 120)	Cert. Exercise Sci (Wel); Vet Nursing (Wel, 5); Bachelor Nursing, BN Māori/Pacific; Bachelor of Health Science/Paramedic (Wh); BSci (Vic)	
Physical Science	Applied Mechanical Engineering (Wel)	Cert Achievement in Engineering Foundations (Wel); Applied Mechanical Engineering (Wel)	BE (Vic, OP, Wel); BSci (Vic)	
Mathematics & Statistics	Intermediate Mx for TS (OP dist, 15); CPTS Mx (Wel, 15)	Technical Mx for TS (OP dist, 15); Quantitative Business Methods (OP dist, 20); Foundation (Wh, 15)	BA (Vic); Statistical Analysis (OP, 20)	
Human Development	ECE (OP, 63)	Adult Edu & training (OP; Wel, 40); Family Day Care (OP, 63); Foundation (Wh, 15); Cert in Teacher Aiding (OP, 40)	Adult Edu & training (OP, 60; Wa); Adult Lit Edu (Wel); ECE (Wh; OP, 80); Nursing (Wh); BA (Vic)	
IT		Cert in Computing (Wel)	BA (Vic, OP); Bachelor IT (Wh)	
Art & Design	Diploma in Creative Technologies (Wel); C in Graphic Design (Wh)	Certificate in Creative Technologies (Wel); C in Digital Media (Wh, 120); Cert in Māori Visual Arts/Toi Paemataua (Wa, 121)	Diploma in Architectural Tech (Wel, Lvl 6); BA&D (Vic, lvl 7); Digital Design (Wh); Māori Visual Arts (Wa)	

Appendix B: Inactive Regional Degree Preparation Options for Domestic Students

DEGREE PREPARATION		NOT OFFERED in 2012 (Listed on NZQA)	
Course Options	Level 3	Level 4	
Academic Communication	NCEA (Schools, 80); Cert in General Studies (Wh, 40)	Academic Writing (Vic, 15); University Study Skills (Vic, 15)	
(EAP) Academic Communication	Cert in Upper Intermediate Lang Skills (Wel, 42)	C in English Lang (Adv) (Wh, 150); C in Prep for Tertiary Study (NESB) (Wel, 45); Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	
Social Science		C in Public Sector Knowledge (Wel, 79); Focus on Social Sciences (Vic, 15)	
Humanities	Nat Cert in Journalism (Wh, 66)	Focus on Humanities (Vic, 15); Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	
Business	Business Management (Wel); NZIM C in Management (Wel); NZIM Cert in Sm Bus Management (Wel)	Focus on Commerce (Vic, 15); Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	
Biological Science		C in Nursing (Wh, 120); C in Pacific Community Health Services (Wh, 120); Focus on Science (Vic, 15); Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	
Physical Science		Focus on Science (Vic, 15); Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	
Mathematics		Focus on Mathematics and Statistics (Vic, 15); Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	
Statistics		Focus on Mathematics and Statistics (Vic, 15); Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	
Human Development		C in Workplace Training (Wel, 40)	
IT		Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	
Art & Design	C in Art & Design (Wel, 42); Diploma in Creative Technologies (Wel);	Foundation Studies (Vic, 20)	

KEY:

C: Certificate

dist: distance

OP: The Open Polytechnic of NZ

PTE: Private Training Establishment

Vic: Victoria University

Wa: Te Wānanga o Aotearoa

Wh: Whitireia

Appendix C: Drafted Course Outlines

Academic Communication

Item	Suggestions
Title	Academic Communication
Identification code	<i>Tbd</i>
Date amended	20/4/11; revised 27/06/11
Level and credit value	<i>Level 4, 20 credits and/or an equivalent</i>
Mode of delivery	<i>Face to face facilitation/ blended delivery/ and/or an equivalent</i>
Method of delivery	Two x 2-hour tutorials & one 1-hour content-based lecture per week <i>and/or an equivalent.</i>
Clearly defined learning outcomes (that are consistent with the overall aims and the level of the component)	<p>Learners will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Demonstrate problem-solving strategies that enable active learning and autonomous study 2) Plan & prepare assignments using academic study strategies, available resources, and modern technology; 3) Develop analytical self-reflection, active listening, presentation, and note-making skills. 4) Research and read critically; analyse, evaluate and reference academic texts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identify appropriate information utilising library & databases; evaluate relevance and credibility of sources b) Summarise, paraphrase and reference a variety of academic texts; understand and avoid plagiarism reinforcing academic integrity 5) Write effective academic essays and/or reports for academic purposes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Develop techniques to analyse and interpret assessment tasks responding to purpose and context b) Understand a variety of academic writing functions and demands c) Demonstrate effective writing skills: utilise formal language, effective grammar, punctuation, clear sentences, paragraphs and essay formatting; demonstrate a coherent logical communication flow. d) Revise and edit in the writing process incorporating feedback and self-assessment. 6) Actively contribute to developing a productive learning environment/community whilst embracing diversity
Expected standards of performance for each learning outcome	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
The content of the component (i.e. The topics that will be covered that will allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes)	<p><i>Suggested content (subject to change):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic strategies and skills competence: • Organizing study; managing time; exam strategies • metacognition, study goals and goal commitment • increasing resilience, and overcoming procrastination • Self-efficacy, academic motivation and cultural/situational relevance, including application of Tiriti o Waitangi principles • critical reading and analysis • Note-making & paraphrasing, incorporating quotations • Academic integrity and referencing • Written and interpersonal communication
Assessment information	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
Teaching/learning resources	Academic Readings; Academic Writing Handbook; PowerPoint slides; Data show & projector; Online resources. Allow at least one hour per week in computer labs.

ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION: Suggested Assessments:

Task & Type	Format	%	Instructions	LOs	Marking Criteria
1. Presentation	Presentation /Seminar: 3-5 minutes per group member	15 %	You may work in groups of 3-4 or individually. For each group member, research and present one useful learning/study strategy allowing 3-5 minutes per strategy/person. In your presentation, explain how the strategy can be applied to study and how failure to apply may impact on study outcomes/achievement. Critically analyse your own academic practice of this skill. Different perspectives and productive debate are encouraged. You may utilize multimedia resources in your presentation. [Students may choose from a provided list of study skills topics. Presentations will take place fortnightly at the allocated time slots.]	1, 2, 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation: Research, Referencing, & Application Argument: Discussion & Debate Delivery: Effective communication, logical structure, & appropriate visuals Contribution: Group (or individual) productivity
2. Written Assignment	Literature Review: 500-800 words	20 %	<i>Literature Review- Analysis & Application:</i> After analysing your research essay question, choose 2-3 appropriate academic texts from provided reading lists. Paraphrase and reference relevant ideas. Discuss the application of ideas to a context of your choice. Outline your findings in an 500-800 word literature review.	1, 2, 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content & Structure Communication, Language & Mechanics Research & Referencing Analytical Thinking & Application
3. Written Assignment	Essay Plan	10%	You are required to write a plan for the upcoming essay/report. There are four main parts to this assignment: an introduction, four topic sentences, a paragraph explaining how you are approaching the essay question, and a references list. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction should include a thesis statement – the answer to the essay question and a clear assertion of the focus. List at least four different points, written as topic sentences, which will be raised in the essay to support your argument. Write a paragraph explaining how you are going to develop your essay: this is meant to be very informal and reflective. Provide a list of relevant references that will help you present your ideas (i.e. academic sources that will support your argument). 		Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content & Structure Communication, Language & Mechanics Research & Referencing Analytical Thinking & Application

3. Written Assignment (plan, draft, and final)	Essay or Report: 1,000-1,200 words	20, 35 = 55 %	<p>Provide a researched analysis of one of the following topics in a 1,000-1,200 word academic essay or report. Incorporate at least five academically referenced reliable sources to illustrate your claims. Plan: Identify main topics and paraphrase relevant sources using academic referencing.</p> <p><i>The essay topic ideas are merely suggestions. Ideally, the essay topic will emerge from the related context. Also, students may choose an essay topic from one of their elective papers or choose from provided list:</i></p> <p><u>Essay Topic Ideas:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Choose and clearly define a social or scientific issue. Identify and evaluate 1-3 strategies employed to address this issue in a clearly communicated and accurately referenced 1,000-1,200 word academic essay. b) Critically evaluate the benefits of an educated population. c) Critically evaluate the impact leadership, academic commitment, social support or cultural capital may have on creating an effective and productive learning community. d) Evaluate whether increasing social inequalities in New Zealand are contributing to higher rates of social dysfunction. e) Considering the social, economic, or cultural impact of earning a degree, critically evaluate the purpose of obtaining a degree in relation to opportunities, internationalized context, and/or relations with peers & staff. f) Evaluate the role of femininity or masculinity in the Sciences. g) Given the social purpose and cultural application of using euphemisms, critically evaluate the utility of a chosen historical or modern day euphemism. 	1, 2, 3	<p>Essay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding • Analytical Thinking & Application • Research & Referencing • Language & Structure • Organisation & Cohesion
--	------------------------------------	---------------	---	---------	---

ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION: LITERATURE REVIEW Marking Rubric

Measures	A – DISTINCTION	B – MERIT	C – PASS	D- NOT ACHIEVED
Content & Structure Organisation and quality of ideas (30%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completely logical structure, very good ideas and examples. All ideas flow logically; the topic focus is identifiable, reasonable, appropriate and understandable. Excellent paraphrasing and incorporation of relevant material from multiple perspectives, excellent demonstration of academic integrity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear structure; good ideas and examples. The topic focus is generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. Paraphrasing clearly communicated in own words and linked to relevant content areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some structure; some good ideas and examples. Logic may often fail; topic focus is generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. Paraphrases and incorporates appropriate material, adequately amending words. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poorly organised or no structure; ideas inadequate, unclear or unsuitable. Ideas do not flow at all. Unclear, often because focus is weak or non-existent. Simplistic view of topic. Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the task. Does not paraphrase or exhibit academic integrity.
Research and Referencing (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range and breadth of references exceed standard. Uses a variety of sources including an academic database that reveals various perspectives. Uses citations appropriately and effectively. No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References of quality academic standard. Uses a variety of sources including an academic database. Supports points using a range of relevant citations. Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context. Some errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overly reliant on single source. Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. Wording is not adequately paraphrased. Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. Use of evidence which was non peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). Referencing style incorrect or incomplete. Sources not referenced.
Communication, Language & Mechanics: sentence structure, grammar and punctuation. (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and easy to understand. Uses sophisticated sentences effectively; sentence structure excellent; correct use of punctuation; no run-on sentences or comma splices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most ideas can be understood easily. Sentence structure strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation often used correctly. A few mechanical difficulties or stylistic problems (split infinitives, dangling modifiers, etc.). May have one or two run-on sentences or comma splices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes difficult to understand. Some problems in sentence structure More frequent wordiness; unclear or awkward sentences; over-reliance on passive voice; some distracting grammatical errors (wrong verb tense, pronoun agreement, singular/plural errors, article use, preposition use, etc.). Errors in punctuation. May have a few run-on sentences or comma splices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to understand. Big problems in sentence structure. Some major grammatical errors (subject-verb agreement, sentence fragments, word form errors, etc.). Frequent major errors in punctuation. May have many run-on sentences and comma splices. Numerous grammatical errors and stylistic problems seriously detract from the argument.
Analytical Thinking & Application (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised complexity of issues and arguments. Reflects on and develops own critical response and established application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues and argument are recognised. Critical and reflective response Application clearly communicated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undeveloped understanding of issues and argument. Response not comprehensive Some application communicated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response not relevant to topic. No reflection or application demonstrated.

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria

ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION: ESSAY Marking Rubric (Draft & Final)

	A - DISTINCTION	B – MERIT	C – PASS	NOT ACHIEVED
Criteria 1 (25%) Understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates in depth understanding of specific contextual issues. • Central ideas are clearly and succinctly communicated. • Research validates argument and key focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates comprehension of specific contextual issues. • Clearly states and develops central ideas. • Exploration of central ideas from different points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a basic comprehension of salient issues overall. • Limited exploration of several points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface understanding. • Lacks central ideas. • Ineffective development of ideas. • Does not respond appropriately to the assignment task.
Criteria 2 (25%) Analytical Thinking & Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognised complexity of issues and arguments. • Develops critical response and evaluation from multiple perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues and argument are recognised. • Critical and reflective response. • Shows clearly established application of ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undeveloped understanding of issues and argument. • Response not comprehensive • Establish central idea and applications at basic level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reflection demonstrated. • No application. • All descriptions without adequate evidence. • Response not relevant to topic.
Criteria 3 (20%) Research and Referencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses evidence to convincingly support and justify argument. • Range and breadth of references exceed standard. • Multiple sources utilising a multiple of perspectives. • Uses citations appropriately and effectively. • No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence supported and justified. • References of quality academic standard. • Variety of sources including academic database utilised. • Supports points using a range of relevant citations. • Referencing style correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows basic understanding of supporting evidence. • At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. • Presents central ideas in general terms, often depending on generalisations and/or dictionary definitions. • Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context • Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting evidence misunderstood or inadequate. • Overly reliant on single source. • Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. • Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. • Use of evidence which was non-peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). • Referencing style incorrect or incomplete.
Criteria 4 (15%) Language & Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost entirely free of errors. • Chooses words precisely and uses discipline appropriate language. • Exceptional use of formatting and structure. • Writing is logical, coherent and well-developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains errors which distract but does not impede understanding. • Generally uses words and discipline appropriate language accurately and effectively. • Appropriate use of formatting, and structure. • Writing is concise with clearly developed structure and writes grammatically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains several errors which temporarily confuses the reader but not overall understanding. • Uses relatively vague and simple words. • Adequate use of formatting and structure. • Clear writing that is mostly grammatically correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient errors to impede readability. • Inappropriate use of Bias. • Assignment plus or minus 10% of word count. • Lack of formatting and structure. • Writing is unclear with many grammatical mistakes.
Criteria 5 (15%) Organisation & Cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are well integrated and linked to theme. • Relevant introduction and conclusion. • Cohesive flow of information throughout assignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are mostly well-linked. • Introduction and conclusion are clearly linked to central theme. • Presentation is generally clear and is easy to follow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are somewhat linked. • Structure is mostly easy to follow. • Introduction and conclusion are adequately linked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are not linked to theme. • Introduction and conclusion are not linked. • No logical flow of information apparent. • Does not construct coherent paragraphs.

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION: ESSAY PLAN Marking Rubric

Measures	A - DISTINCTION	B – MERIT	C – PASS	D- NOT ACHIEVED
Content & Structure Organisation and quality of ideas (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completely logical structure, very good ideas and examples. All ideas flow logically; the topic focus is identifiable, reasonable, appropriate and understandable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear structure; good ideas and examples. The topic focus is generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some structure; some good ideas and examples. Logic may often fail; topic focus is generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poorly organised or no structure; ideas inadequate, unclear or unsuitable. Ideas do not flow at all. Unclear, often because focus is weak or non-existent. Simplistic view of topic. Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the task.
Research and Referencing (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range and breadth of references exceed standard. Multiple sources (including an academic database) are well-utilised. Uses citations appropriately and effectively. No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References of quality academic standard. Uses a variety of sources including academic database. Supports points using a range of relevant citations. Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context. Some errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overly reliant on single source. Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. Wording is not adequately paraphrased. Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. Use of evidence which was non-peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). Referencing style incorrect or incomplete. Sources not referenced.
Communication, Language & Mechanics: sentence structure, grammar and punctuation. (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and easy to understand. Uses sophisticated sentences effectively; sentence structure excellent; correct use of punctuation; no run-on sentences or comma splices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most ideas can be understood easily. Sentence structure strong despite occasional lapses; punctuation often used correctly. A few mechanical difficulties or stylistic problems (split infinitives, dangling modifiers, etc.). May have one or two run-on sentences or comma splices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes difficult to understand. Some problems in sentence structure. More frequent wordiness; unclear or awkward sentences; over-reliance on passive voice; some distracting grammatical errors (wrong verb tense, pronoun agreement, singular/plural errors, article use, preposition use, etc.). Errors in punctuation. May have a few run-on sentences or comma splices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to understand. Big problems in sentence structure. Some major grammatical errors (subject-verb agreement, sentence fragments, word form errors, etc.). Frequent major errors in punctuation. May have many run-on sentences and comma splices. Numerous grammatical errors and stylistic problems seriously detract from the argument.
Analytical Thinking & Application (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised complexity of issues and arguments. Reflects on and develops own critical response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues and argument are recognised. Critical and reflective response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undeveloped understanding of issues and argument. Response not comprehensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response not relevant to topic. No reflection demonstrated.

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION: PRESENTATION Marking Rubric

Presentation MARKING	A Distinction	B Merit	C Pass	D Not achieved
Preparation: Research, Referencing, & Application (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates critical evaluation and application of material. • Excellent incorporation of quality evidence. • Excellent, in-depth analytical self-reflection of academic practice. • No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows clearly established application, using a variety of relevant citations. • Incorporated analytical self-reflection of academic practice. • Referencing style correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility of selected material is apparent. • Sources of evidence is appropriate and in context. • Self-reflected on academic practice. • Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information, relevance and self-reflection not communicated. • All descriptions without adequate evidence. Referencing style incorrect or incomplete, irrelevant and inadequate.
Argument: Discussion & Debate (30%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content assessed from different perspectives. • Facilitates critical debate. • Engages well with the audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different perspectives and productive debate is encouraged. • Good connection with audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different perspectives and productive debate is attempted. • Attempts made to engage audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discussion. Only one perspective considered. • Little or no eye connection with audience.
Delivery: Effective communication, logical structure, & Appropriate visuals (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent quality information. • Very logical presentation- easy to follow. • Visual materials consistently assist communication and used appropriately throughout presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good quality information. • Mostly logical presentation. • Visuals mostly assist communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some quality information. • Reasonably logical presentation. • Some visuals attempt to assist communication of material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no quality information. • Little logic in presentation. • Visuals do not support communication or add to information.
Contribution: Group (or individual) productivity (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively and efficiently contributed to developing a productive learning environment/comm unity embracing diversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good contribution to developing productive learning environment/comm unity embracing diversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some contribution to developing productive learning environment/comm unity embracing diversity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no contribution to developing a productive learning environment/comm unity embracing diversity.

How to achieve Grades:

Pass C	Pass in criteria 2 and 3 and one of 1 and 4
Pass C+	At least a pass in all criteria
Merit B	Merit in criteria 2 and 3 and one of 1 and 4
Merit B+	At least merit in all criteria
Distinction A	Distinction in criteria 2 and 3 and one of 1 and 4
Distinction A+	Distinction in all criteria

Business Studies

NZQA requirements	Suggestions
Title	Introduction to Business Studies
Identification code	tbd
Date amended	
Level and credit value	Level 4, 20 credits and/or an equivalent
Mode of delivery	Face-to-face facilitation/ blended delivery/ and/or an equivalent
Method of delivery, in terms of classroom, lecture, tutorial, workshop, fieldwork, work-based, distance and online	3 x 50 minutes lecture & 1 two hour tutorial and/or an equivalent
Clearly defined learning outcomes (that are consistent with the overall aims and the level of the component)	<p>By the end of this course students will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. be equipped with the basic knowledge and study skills needed for degree programmes in economics and business management 2. be familiar with a range of economic concepts used in discussion of economic and social developments 3. be able to use and critically engage with these economic concepts in individual thinking about economic issues in Aotearoa New Zealand and the Asia-Pacific region, and 4. be able to understand the terminology and simple analysis of business processes and strategies as applied to Aotearoa New Zealand and the Asia-Pacific region.
Expected standards of performance for each learning outcome	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
The content of the component (i.e. The topics that will be covered that will allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes)	<p><i>Suggested content (subject to change):</i></p> <p>This course offers a critical introduction to some of the commercial and economic concepts that students can expect to come across in their degree study. It examines these concepts with reference to the New Zealand/Aotearoa context, the Asia-Pacific region and contemporary global issues.</p> <p>The course covers a range of material that will be covered in degree-level courses but is organised around getting students into the disciplines and practices that students will need to embrace to be successful in their future study, including reading for understanding and practical exercises to reinforce knowledge of the material. All sections cover both basic technical understanding and the higher-level cognitive and critical engagement required for degree-level study.</p> <p><u>Topics covered (from):</u></p> <p><i>Topic 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Thinking like an economist</i> • <i>Money</i> <p><i>Topic 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Marketing</i> • <i>Consumer Society</i> <p><i>Topic 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Corporate Accountability</i> • <i>Global Financial Crisis</i> • <i>Political Economy</i> <p><i>Topic 4:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Introduction to Supply and Demand</i> • <i>People, Preferences, Society</i>

	<p><i>Topic 5:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Firms</i> • <i>Market Structures</i> <p><i>Topic 6:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Statistics for Business</i> • <i>Interpretation of graphs</i> <p><i>Topic 7:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Costs and Supply Decisions</i> • <i>Basic Accounting Principles</i> <p><i>Topic 8:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Accounting Practice</i> • <i>Cash Budgeting for a business</i> <p><i>Topic 9:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Labour Law</i> • <i>Employment Rights</i> <p><i>Topic 10:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Economics of Information</i> • <i>Consumer Law</i> <p><i>Topic 11:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Macroeconomics</i> • <i>Issues in the New Zealand Macro-economy</i> <p><i>Topic 12:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>People and Organisation</i> • <i>Human Resource Management</i> <p><i>Topic 13:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Law and Economics</i> • <i>Commercial Law: Torts and Contract</i> <p><i>Topic 14:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Economics and Development</i> • <i>International Institutions</i>
<p>Assessment information, including the number and type (e.g. Open book test, written assignment, oral presentation, practical observation) of all summative assessments</p>	<p><i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i></p>
<p>A list of the teaching/learning resources that will be used for the delivery of the component.</p>	<p><i>Suggested reading list for this paper (subject to change):</i></p> <p>There is no set text.</p> <p><u>Recommended Readings (in order of usefulness) chapters from:</u></p> <p>Bowles, S. et al. (2005) <i>Understanding Capitalism: Competition, Command and Change</i> Oxford University Press</p> <p>Goodwin et al (2009) <u>Macroeconomics in Context</u> M.E.Sharpe</p> <p>Goodwin et al (2009) <u>Microeconomics in Context</u> M.E.Sharpe</p> <p>Stilwell, F. (2002) <i>Political Economy: The Contest of Economic Ideas</i> Oxford University Press</p> <p>Stewart, J. and Moodie, B. (2004) <u>Economic Concepts and Applications</u>. Pearson</p> <p>Begg, D. <u>Economics</u>. McGraw Hill, 2nd edition.</p> <p>Manikiw, N. (1998) <i>Principles of Economics</i>. Harcourt</p> <p>Evans, G. (2001) <u>Senior Economics</u>. Longman Publishers</p>

BUSINESS STUDIES Suggested Assessments:

Task & Type	Format	%	Instructions	LOs	Marking Criteria
1. Tutorial exercises	8 written responses	25%	Summary of or response to assigned reading. Exercises to review understanding of particular course material.	1,2,3,4.	
2. Take-home test	1/3 multiple-choice 2/3 short-answer questions.	20%	Reviews first four weeks of the course.	1,2	
3. Group Project Groups of four where possible. Each group member will receive the same grade.	Presentation & Written assignment	15%	<p>Study of a business operating in New Zealand. This assignment is organized around applying both material introduced in class, and some that require self-directed research, to a specific case study of a particular business enterprise.</p> <p>There is a choice from the following firms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fonterra. • Foodstuffs. • Telecom. • Kiwibank. • Contact Energy. <p>(1) Introduction to the firm. This should include, but need not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The name of the firm and of the key individuals involved with it; b. Some historical background to the firm: when it was founded, how it has performed, how it has changed over the time since it started; c. Some particular features, what is special about the firm; and d. putting a dollar value on the firm. Groups should attempt to come up with at least two methods of doing this. Compare and contrast the different valuations. <p>(2) Provide a one-page exploration of a product or service produced by the firm. It needn't be the main product. Explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Why the firm produces this particular product? What niche does it fill? What need does it satisfy? How does it compare with products produced by other firms? b. What is special about it? Why has the group chosen it as the product to investigate? c. How is the product promoted? Analyse this in terms of the four 'P's of marketing (Product, Place, Price, Promotion). How does the promotion or the image developed around the product 'add value' to the product? d. Is the demand for this service elastic or 	2,3,4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See marking guide for presentation and marking guide for report. • Powerpoint/projection facilities will be available and are recommended. • The presentation of your findings will represent 5% of the 15% allocated for the project as a whole. Each person in the group will receive the same mark but do not have to be equally involved in the presentation, although this is also recommended. • Feedback that emerges from the presentation is expected to be incorporated into your final written work. Marks will be allocated for accuracy, to reward of independent and critical thinking and evidence of independent initiative including in your research.

			<p>inelastic with respect to price? How does this affect how it is marketed?</p> <p>(3) In one page, discuss the market that the firm operates in. Answer the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How is the market structure of the firm characterised? Why? Explain that market structure in terms of the economic theory for the general firm: how does this general explanation apply to your firm? How does this market structure impact on the firm's operations? <p><u>Assessment</u> The group is required to make a ½ hour presentation in tutorial time on its findings. The order of presentation shall be determined randomly.</p> <p>The group is required to present a joint report as their findings.</p>		
4. Essay	Written assessment	10%	<p>Review the corporate citizenship attributes of your chosen company. Identify how your firm deals with its responsibilities as a 'corporate citizen'.</p> <p>Cover as much as is appropriate of the following questions in 500 - 800 words.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is your general understanding of the responsibility of a business to society? How does your firm balance the expectations of shareholders/owners and other stakeholders – such as employees, customers, the public or the environment? How does your firm seek to influence the market that is it engaged in? How does the firm try to make it easier for it to make a profit? How does your firm present itself to the public, outside of its 'core business' activity? Is this representation justified in its practices? Evaluate the firm's behaviour in general. <p>Note this is an essay. Do not supply an answer with (a) (b) (c) etc. You will need to formulate a thesis statement and then provide evidence and argument to support this statement.</p>	3	See marking guide for essay.
5. In-class final test	Contains multiple-choice, short-answer questions and short analytical essays	30%	Covers whole of course content.	1,2,3,4.	

BUSINESS STUDIES: Marking rubrics:

BUSINESS STUDIES: ORAL PRESENTATION Marking Rubric

Oral Presentation MARKING	A Distinction	B Merit	C Pass	D Not achieved
Research, Referencing, & Application (35%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates critical evaluation of material. • Excellent incorporation of quality evidence No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows clearly established application, using a variety of relevant citations. Referencing style correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility of selected material is apparent . • Sources of evidence is appropriate and in context. • Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and relevance not communicated. • All descriptions without adequate evidence Referencing style incorrect or incomplete, irrelevant and inadequate.
Discussion & Debate (35%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content assessed from different perspectives. • Facilitates Critical debate. • Engages well with the audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different perspectives and productive debate is encouraged Good connection with audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different perspectives and productive debate is attempted. Attempts made to engage audience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discussion. Only one perspective considered. • Little or no eye connection with audience.
Effective communication, logical structure, & Appropriate visuals (30%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent quality information. • Very logical presentation- easy to follow. • Visual materials consistently assist communication and used appropriately throughout presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good quality information. • Mostly logical presentation. Visuals mostly assist communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some quality information. • Reasonably logical presentation Some visuals attempt to assist communication of material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no quality information. • Little logic in presentation. • Visuals do not support communication or add to information.

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

BUSINESS STUDIES: REPORT Marking Rubric

	A - DISTINCTION	B – MERIT	C – PASS	NOT ACHIEVED
Criteria 1 Understanding 50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In depth understanding of specific issues demonstrated in context. Central ideas are clearly and succinctly communicated. Research validates claim and key focus. Critical evaluation from multiple perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates comprehension of specific issues in context. Clearly states and develops central ideas. Shows clearly established application. Exploration of central ideas from different points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates a basic comprehension of salient issues overall. Establish central idea and applications at basic level. Limited exploration of several points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface understanding. Lacks central ideas. Ineffective development of ideas. No application. All descriptions without adequate evidence. Does not respond appropriately to the assignment task.
Criteria 2 Research and Referencing 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence supported and justified convincingly. Range and breadth of references exceed standard. Multiple sources utilising a multiple of perspectives. Uses citations appropriately and effectively. No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence supported and justified. References of quality academic standard. Variety of sources including academic database utilised. Supports points using a range of relevant citations. Referencing style correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows basic understanding of supporting evidence. At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. Presents central ideas in general terms, often depending on generalisations and/or dictionary definitions. Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context. Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting evidence misunderstood or inadequate . Overly reliant on single source. Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. Use of evidence which was non-peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). Referencing style incorrect or incomplete.
Criteria 3 Presentation 15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Almost entirely free of errors. Chooses words for their precise meaning and uses discipline appropriate language. Exceptional use of formatting and structure. Writing is logical, coherent and well-developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains errors which distract but does not impede understanding. Generally uses words and discipline appropriate language accurately and effectively. Appropriate use of formatting and structure. Writing is concise with clearly developed structure and use of grammar. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains several errors which temporarily confuses the reader but not overall understanding. Uses relatively vague and simple words. Adequate use of formatting and structure. Clear writing that is mostly grammatically correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient errors to impede readability. Inappropriate use of Bias. Assignment plus or minus 10% of word count. Lack of formatting and structure. Writing is unclear with many grammatical mistakes.
Criteria 4 Organisation 15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are well-integrated and linked to theme. Paragraphs and sections are coherent and relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are mostly well-linked. Paragraphs and sections are clearly linked to central theme. Topic presented but some points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are somewhat linked. Presentation is mostly easy to follow. Paragraphs and sections are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are not linked to theme. Paragraphs and sections are not linked. No logical flow of information apparent.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents a clear topic and all content. linked towards proving this by way of argument. • Cohesive flow of information throughout assignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not linked to argument. • Presentation is generally clear and is easy to follow. 	adequately linked.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not construct thematic paragraphs.
--	--	---	--------------------	---

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

BUSINESS STUDIES: ESSAY Marking Rubric

	A - DISTINCTION	B – MERIT	C – PASS	NOT ACHIEVED
Criteria 1 (25%) Understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates in depth understanding of specific contextual issues. • Central ideas are clearly and succinctly communicated. • Research validates argument and key focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates comprehension of specific contextual issues. • Clearly states and develops central ideas. • Exploration of central ideas from different points of view.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a basic comprehension of salient issues overall. • Limited exploration of several points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface understanding. • Lacks central ideas. • Ineffective development of ideas. • Does not respond appropriately to the assignment task.
Criteria 2 (25%) Analytical Thinking & Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognised complexity of issues and arguments. • Develops critical response and evaluation from multiple perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues and argument are recognised. • Critical and reflective response. • Shows clearly established application of ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undeveloped understanding of issues and argument. • Response not comprehensive Establish central idea and applications at basic level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reflection demonstrated. • No application. • All descriptions without adequate evidence. • Response not relevant to topic.
Criteria 3 (20%) Research and Referencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses evidence to convincingly support and justify argument. • Range and breadth of references exceed standard. • Multiple sources utilising a multiple of perspectives. • Uses citations appropriately and effectively. • No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence supported and justified. • References of quality academic standard. • Variety of sources including academic database utilised. • Supports points using a range of relevant citations. • Referencing style correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows basic understanding of supporting evidence. • At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. • Presents central ideas in general terms, often depending on generalisations and/or dictionary definitions. • Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context. • Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting evidence misunderstood or inadequate. • Overly reliant on single source. • Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. • Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. • Use of evidence which was non-peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). • Referencing style incorrect or incomplete.
Criteria 4 (15%) Language & Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost entirely free of errors. • Chooses words precisely and uses discipline appropriate language. • Exceptional use of formatting and structure. • Writing is logical, coherent and well-developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains errors which distract but does not impede understanding. • Generally uses words and discipline appropriate language accurately and effectively. • Appropriate use of formatting and structure. • Writing is concise with clearly developed structure and writes grammatically . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains several errors which temporarily confuses the reader but not overall understanding. • Uses relatively vague and simple words. • Adequate use of formatting and structure. • Clear writing that is mostly grammatically correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient errors to impede readability. • Inappropriate use of Bias. • Assignment plus or minus 10% of word count. • Lack of formatting and structure. • Writing is unclear with many grammatical mistakes.
Criteria 5 (15%) Organisation & Cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are well-integrated and linked to theme. • Relevant introduction and conclusion. • Cohesive flow of information throughout assignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are mostly well-linked. • Introduction and conclusion are clearly linked to central theme. • Presentation is generally clear and is easy to follow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are somewhat linked. • Structure is mostly easy to follow. • Introduction and conclusion are adequately linked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are not linked to theme. • Introduction and conclusion are not linked. • No logical flow of information apparent. • Does not construct coherent paragraphs.

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

Humanities for Degree Preparation

NZQA requirements	Suggestions
Title	Humanities for Degree Preparation
Identification code	tbd
Date amended	
Level and credit value	Level 4, 20 credits and/or an equivalent
Mode of delivery	Face-to-face facilitation/ blended delivery/ and/or an equivalent
Method of delivery	3 one-hour lectures and a two hour tutorial per week and/or an equivalent
Clearly defined learning outcomes (that are consistent with the overall aims and the level of the component)	<p>Having successfully completed this course, students will be able to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate understanding of some of the key concepts in the Humanities and be able to apply these to New Zealand settings. • Apply analytical, critical, and creative thinking to Humanities concepts. • Demonstrate study and research skills required to succeed in Humanities-based degree courses. • Demonstrate understanding of reading Humanities based texts. • Present effective academic writing related to Humanities discipline.
Expected standards of performance for each learning outcome	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
The content of the component (i.e. The topics that will be covered that will allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes)	<p><i>Suggested content (subject to change):</i></p> <p>New Zealand and identity, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colonialism • The nation state • Writing of Māori and Pakeha authors • Visual and performing arts
Assessment information	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
Teaching/learning resources	<p>Online, full-text readings from current text-books and journals related to the course topics.</p> <p>Data show projector and PowerPoint slides.</p> <p>Online learning facilities.</p>

HUMANITIES: Suggested Assessments

Task & Type	Format	%	Instructions	LOs	Marking Criteria
Written assignments	Five brief reading summaries	5 x 4% =20%	Each major topic of the course will be assessed utilising written assignments	1	
Written assignment	<p>Essay 1000-1200 words</p> <p>Plan</p> <p>Final essay</p>	<p>Two parts</p> <p>15%</p> <p>35%</p> <p>=25%</p>	<p><i>The following topics are merely suggestions, with the expectation that each institution would have the autonomy to generate a contextual topic.</i></p> <p>Write an essay on the following topic: New Zealand identity was not forged at Gallipoli as is popularly thought, but at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi</p> <p>Plan an essay using a graphic organizer (mind-map or similar), identifying the main issues to be discussed and at least one referenced academic source to support each point, and include an explanation of why the source is valid and reliable</p> <p>The final essay including an introduction and conclusion, in-text references and a reference list, free of technical errors.</p>	1-5	<p><i>See Assessment Marking Criteria.</i></p> <p><i>Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content & Structure. • Research & Referencing. • Analytical thinking. <p><i>Essay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding. • Sense of argument. • Research & Referencing. • Writing. • Structure/ • Organisation.
Final test	2 hour exam	30%		1-5	

HUMANITIES: ESSAY Marking Rubric- Certificate in Degree Preparation

	A - DISTINCTION	B – MERIT	C – PASS	NOT ACHIEVED
Criteria 1 (25%) Understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates in depth understanding of specific contextual issues. • Central ideas are clearly and succinctly communicated. • Research validates argument and key focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates comprehension of specific contextual issues. • Clearly states and develops central ideas. • Exploration of central ideas from different points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a basic comprehension of salient issues overall. • Limited exploration of several points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface understanding. • Lacks central ideas. • Ineffective development of ideas. • Does not respond appropriately to the assignment task.
Criteria 2 (25%) Analytical Thinking & Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognised complexity of issues and arguments. • Develops critical response and evaluation from multiple perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues and argument are recognised. • Critical and reflective response. • Shows clearly established application of ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undeveloped understanding of issues and argument. • Response not comprehensive. • Establishes central idea and applications at basic level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reflection demonstrated. • No application. • All descriptions without adequate evidence. • Response not relevant to topic.
Criteria 3 (20%) Research and Referencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses evidence to convincingly support and justify argument. • Range and breadth of references exceed standard. • Multiple sources utilising a multiple of perspectives. • Uses citations appropriately and effectively. • No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence supported and justified. • References of quality academic standard. • Variety of sources including academic database utilised. • Supports points using a range of relevant citations. • Referencing style correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows basic understanding of supporting evidence. • At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. • Presents central ideas in general terms, often depending on generalisations and/or dictionary definitions. • Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context. • Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting evidence misunderstood or inadequate. • Overly reliant on single source. • Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. • Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. • Use of evidence which was non-peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). • Referencing style incorrect or incomplete.
Criteria 4 (15%) Language & Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost entirely free of errors. • Chooses words precisely and uses discipline appropriate language. • Exceptional use of formatting and structure. • Writing is logical, coherent and well-developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains errors which distract but does not impede understanding. • Generally uses words and discipline appropriate language accurately and effectively. • Appropriate use of formatting and structure. • Writing is concise with clearly developed structure and grammatically correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains several errors which temporarily confuses the reader but not overall understanding. • Uses relatively vague and simple words. • Adequate use of formatting and structure. • Clear writing that is mostly grammatically correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient errors to impede readability. • Inappropriate use of Bias. • Assignment plus or minus 10% of word count. • Lack of formatting and structure. • Writing is unclear with many grammatical mistakes.
Criteria 5 (15%) Organisation & Cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are well-integrated and linked to theme. • Relevant introduction and conclusion. • Cohesive flow of information throughout assignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are mostly well-linked. • Introduction and conclusion are clearly linked to central theme. • Presentation is generally clear and is easy to follow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are somewhat linked. • Structure is mostly easy to follow. • Introduction and conclusion are adequately linked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideas are not linked to theme. • Introduction and conclusion are not linked. • No logical flow of information apparent. • Does not construct coherent paragraphs.

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

Essay Plan Marking Criteria Guidelines: Certificate in Degree Preparation

	A - DISTINCTION	B - MERIT	C - PASS	NOT ACHIEVED
Criteria 1 Content and Structure (40%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completely logical structure, very good ideas and examples. All ideas flow logically; the topic focus is identifiable, reasonable, appropriate and understandable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear structure; good ideas and examples. The topic focus is generally clear and appropriate, though may wander occasionally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some structure; some good ideas and examples. Logic may often fail; topic focus is generally unclear, often wanders or jumps around. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poorly organised or no structure; ideas inadequate, unclear or unsuitable. Ideas do not flow at all. Unclear, often because focus is weak or non-existent. Simplistic view of topic. Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the task.
Criteria 2 Research and referencing (30%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range and breadth of references exceed standard. Multiple sources (including an academic database) are well-utilised. Uses citations appropriately and effectively. No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References of quality academic standard. Uses a variety of sources including academic database. Supports points using a range of relevant citations. Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context. Some errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overly reliant on single source. Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. Wording is not adequately paraphrased. Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. Use of evidence which was non-peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). Referencing style incorrect or incomplete. Sources not referenced.
Criteria 3 Analytical thinking and application (30%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised complexity of issues and arguments. Reflects on and develops own critical response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues and argument are recognised. Critical and reflective response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undeveloped understanding of issues and argument. Response not comprehensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response not relevant to topic. No reflection demonstrated.

Pass C	Pass in criteria 1 and 2
Pass C+	At least a pass in all criteria
Merit B	Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and at least pass in 3
Merit B+	At least merit in all criteria
Distinction A	Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and at least merit in 3
Distinction A+	Distinction in all criteria

Mathematics

NZQA requirements	Suggestions
Title	Mathematics
Identification code	tbd
Date amended	20/4/11; revised 16/05/11; second revision 27/06/11; third revision 14/7/11
Level and credit value	Level 4, (15 or 20 credits) and/or an equivalent
Mode of delivery	Face to face facilitation/ blended delivery/ and/or an equivalent
Method of delivery	Three x 2-hour lecture /tutorial/practical sessions and/or an equivalent
Clearly defined learning outcomes (that are consistent with the overall aims and the level of the component)	Students will be able to:- 1. Demonstrate the knowledge, understanding and skills to solve problems. 2. Recognize and manipulate different types of equations and graphs. 3. Demonstrate knowledge, skills and understanding of basic geometry and trigonometry. 4. Interpret and apply statistical data in an appropriate context.
Expected standards of performance for each learning outcome	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
The content of the component (i.e. The topics that will be covered that will allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes)	<i>Suggested content (subject to change):</i> The module comprises three units as listed below. UNIT 1: Equations, Graphing and Problem Solving. UNIT 2: Basic Geometry and Trigonometry. UNIT 3: Statistical Data and Graphing. UNIT 4: Applying Statistics .
Assessment information	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i> Assessment can be broken down into two parts: 50% Tests 50% Assignment/Project
Teaching/learning resources	Student study guide Lecturer power point presentations Selected computer simulations and programmes

MATHEMATICS:: Assessment of Outcomes

Task & Type	Format	%	Description	LOs	Marking Criteria
Tests	Structured and multiple choice questions	50 %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four tests made up of structured questions on the content Pre- and post-tests: formative 	1, 2,3	
Assignment	Project	50 %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One extended assignment, or theoretical assignment 	4	

MATHEMATICS: Content Level 4

UNIT 1: Equations, Graphing and Problem Solving

- Solve linear equations graphically and algebraically.
 - Apply polynomial equations to solution of problems in other areas like the sciences or business.
- Exponential and logarithmic equations.
- Represent functions in different ways: graphs, formulae, tables of values etc. Reconstruct one type of representation from another.
- Solve problems related to graphs and find graphical solutions to problems that use equations.
- Rate of change and gradients.
- Curve sketching.
- Maxima and minima.

UNIT 2: Basic Geometry and Trigonometry

- Fundamental terms, points, lines, surfaces, solid, line segment and ray.
- Triangles, quadrilaterals and circles.
- Areas, perimeters and circumferences.
- Angle sums of triangles and quadrilaterals.
- Pythagoras and square roots.
- Define trigonometric functions, sine, cosine and tangent as well as sec, cosec and cot.
- Use trigonometry to solve simple problems.

UNIT 3: Statistical Data and Graphing

- Extract information from diagrammatic, symbolic, graphical, numerical or verbal forms of data.
- Translate information from one form to another.
- Draw and interpret graphs of data.
- Be aware of the possibilities and limitations of various forms of data representation.
- Recognize patterns, formulate hypotheses and draw conclusions.
- Generalize and extrapolate from data.
- Reduce a generalization to a form where it is applicable to a special case.
- Estimate and approximate.
- Make assumptions and use these assumptions in the making and testing of a conjecture.

Unit 4: Applying Statistics

- Manipulation and interpretation of data graphically and numerically.
- Extrapolation and prediction.
- Measures of mean, median, mode.
- Measures of range, mean deviation and standard deviation.
- Probability, expected value, variance, correlation.

MATHEMATICS: Standards of Performance

Criterion	Not Achieved- D	Pass- C	Merit- B	Distinction- A
<i>Knowledge and Understanding</i>				
<i>Solve problems</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot solve problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can solve simple single stage problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can solve two stage problems that require non-linear mathematics . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can solve complex problems that are multi-staged and use linear and non-linear mathematical functions.
<i>Recognize numerical and spatial relationships</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not recognise numerical and spatial relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can recognise simple linear numerical and spatial relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can recognise numerical and spatial relationships in simple linear as well as non-linear situations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can recognise and use numerical and spatial relationships in linear and non-linear situations.
<i>Interpreting and using data</i>				
<p><i>Extract information from diagrammatic, symbolic, graphical, numerical or verbal forms of data</i></p> <p><i>Translate information from one form to another</i></p> <p><i>Draw and interpret graphs of data</i></p> <p><i>Be aware of the possibilities and limitations of various forms of data representation</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot extract information from diagrammatic, symbolic, graphical, numerical or verbal forms of data. Cannot draw graphs properly and has no idea about the limitations of different forms of data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can extract information from diagrammatic, symbolic, graphical, numerical or verbal forms of data, but not much else. Can draw graphs that give some understanding of the relationship between two variables. Has no idea about the limitations of the data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can translate information from one form to another and make and interpret graphs of experimental data. Can draw graphs and can give some idea about the limitations of the data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can translate information from one form to another and make and interpret graphs of experimental data. Is aware of the possibilities and limitations of various forms of data representation.
<p><i>Recognize patterns, formulate hypotheses and draw conclusions</i></p> <p><i>Generalize and extrapolate from data</i></p> <p><i>Reduce a generalization to a form where it is applicable to a special case</i></p> <p><i>Estimate and approximate</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot interpret data in any way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can recognise patterns and explain some observations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can use data to recognize patterns, formulate hypotheses and draw conclusions. Explains familiar facts, observations and phenomena in terms of mathematical models. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can use data to recognize patterns, formulate hypotheses and draw conclusions. Explains familiar facts, observations and phenomena in terms of mathematical models. Can generalise and extrapolate from data, and use estimation and approximation as a tool to analyse and interpret data.

Science

NZQA requirements	Suggestions
Title	Science
Identification code	Tbd
Date amended	20/4/11; revised 16/05/11
Level and credit value	Level 4, (15 or 20 credits) and/or an equivalent
Mode of delivery	Face-to-face facilitation. blended delivery, and/or an equivalent
Method of delivery	Three x 2-hour lecture /tutorial/practical sessions and/or an equivalent
Clearly defined learning outcomes (that are consistent with the overall aims and the level of the component)	<p><i>Knowledge and Understanding-</i> Students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply scientific ideas, formulae and methods to solve quantitative problems (as laid out in the content section below). • Show knowledge and understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scientific phenomena, facts, patterns, laws, definitions, concepts, theories and models. ○ Scientific vocabulary, terminology, units and conventions. ○ Scientific instruments, apparatus, operating and safety procedures. ○ Everyday technological applications of scientific knowledge, with personal, social and environmental applications. ○ Scientific quantities and their determination. <p><i>Skills and Processes-</i> Students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent data graphically and symbolically. • Use apparatus safely and competently and record observation systematically. • Interpret and manipulate recorded data. • Design, Plan and carry out investigations. • Communication results and findings in an appropriate way.
Expected standards of performance for each learning outcome	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
The content of the component (i.e. The topics that will be covered that will allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes)	<p><i>Suggested content (subject to change):</i> The module comprises eight units; the topics covered in each unit are shown in appendix 1.</p> <p>UNIT 1: Measurement and analysis of data UNIT 2: Force and motion UNIT 3: Energy UNIT 4: Matter UNIT 5: Chemical Reactions UNIT 6: Biological processes UNIT 7: Shaping Life an Land in New Zealand UNIT 8: Project</p>
Assessment information	<p><i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i></p> <p>Assessment can be broken down into four parts: 20% Assessment of laboratory work 40% Tests 20% Assignments 20% Final Project</p>
Teaching/learning resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student study guide with associated lecturer PowerPoint presentations. • Laboratory with standard equipment for physics, chemistry and biology experiments. • Tools for making simple engineering projects. • Computers with selected computer simulations and data analysis programs loaded (Excel, Word, PowerPoint, Kaleidagraph, Wolfram Alpha, Interactive Physics).

SCIENCE: Standards of Performance

Criterion	Not Achieved- D	Pass- C	Merit- B	Distinction- A
<i>Knowledge and Understanding</i>				
<i>Scientific phenomena, facts, patterns, laws, definitions, concepts, theories and models</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has no understanding at all of scientific phenomena, facts, patterns, laws, definitions, concepts, theories and models. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can give a basic statement of scientific phenomena, facts, patterns, laws, definitions, concepts, theories and models. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can state all scientific phenomena, facts, patterns, laws, definitions, concepts, theories and models in the list of content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a deep understanding of scientific phenomena, facts, patterns, laws, definitions, concepts, theories and models covered in the content.
<i>Scientific vocabulary, terminology, units and conventions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to use scientific language and vocabulary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sometimes uses scientific vocabulary, terminology, units and conventions properly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses scientific vocabulary, terminology, units and conventions properly most of the time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Always uses scientific vocabulary, terminology, units and conventions.
<i>Scientific instruments, apparatus, operating and safety procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an understanding as to how scientific instruments, apparatus work. Has not used safe operating procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has some understanding as to how scientific instruments, apparatus work. Can use safe operating procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a good understanding as to how scientific instruments, apparatus work. Works safely at all times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has an excellent understanding as to how scientific instruments, apparatus work. Works safely at all times.
<i>Everyday technological applications of scientific knowledge, with personal, social and environmental applications</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to describe everyday technological applications of scientific knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can describe some everyday technological applications of scientific knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a good knowledge of everyday technological applications of scientific knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a wide knowledge of everyday technological applications of scientific knowledge, and can see connecting personal, social and environmental applications.
<i>Apply scientific ideas, formulae and methods to solve quantitative problems</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to apply scientific ideas, formulae and methods to solve quantitative problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can sometimes apply scientific ideas, formulae and methods to solve quantitative problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can solve simple two-staged quantitative problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to solve multi-staged problems.
<i>Skills and Processes</i>				
<i>Graphical and Symbolic Representation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to extract information from diagrammatic, symbolic, graphical, numerical or verbal forms of data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can extract information from diagrammatic, symbolic, graphical, numerical or verbal forms of data, but not much else. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can translate information from one form to another and make and interpret graphs of experimental data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can translate information from one form to another and make and interpret graphs of experimental data. Is aware of the possibilities and limitations of various forms of data representation.
<i>Use of apparatus and observation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to follow instructions accurately and carry out experiments. Has not demonstrated an ability to handle apparatus and materials effectively and with due regard to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to follow instructions accurately and carry out experiments. Is able to handle apparatus and materials effectively and with due regard to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to follow instructions accurately and carry out experiments, handle apparatus and materials effectively and with due regard to safety and observe, measure and record accurately and systematically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observes, measures and records accurately and systematically.

Criterion, cont.	Not Achieved- D	Pass- C	Merit- B	Distinction- A
<i>Planning and carrying out investigations</i>	<p>Has not demonstrated an ability to do any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulate hypotheses; devise procedures and select apparatus and materials to test hypotheses, the validity of data, generalisations and predictions. Organise and carry out investigations in a systematic way. Be aware of the validity of procedures and the difference between systematic and random uncertainty. 	<p>Can do some of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulate hypotheses. Devise procedures and select apparatus and materials to test hypotheses, the validity of data, generalisations and predictions. Organise and carry out investigations in a systematic way. 	<p>Is able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulate hypotheses. Devise procedures and select apparatus and materials to test hypotheses, the validity of data, generalisations and predictions. Organise and carry out investigations in a systematic way. Be aware of the validity of procedures and the difference between systematic and random uncertainty. 	<p>Is able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulate hypotheses. Devise procedures and select apparatus and materials to test hypotheses, the validity of data, generalisations and predictions. Organise and carry out investigations in a systematic way. Be aware of the validity of procedures and the difference between systematic and random uncertainty. Evaluate the design of experiments, experimental observations and other data.
<i>Communication Skills</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ineffective oral and written communication. Has not demonstrated sufficient reading and analytical capacity. Has not demonstrated sufficient skill in the use of information technology products and the selection and use of information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can read scientific texts and is able to communicate orally and write a simple laboratory report. Can provide a simple analysis of a problem and uses some sensible research strategies. Has a rudimentary understanding of information technology tools at his/her disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicates logically and concisely, both orally and in written briefs and reports Writes competent laboratory, design and feasibility reports. Can formulate an argument and uses sensible research strategies. Has a fairly wide ability to use a range of information technologies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is comfortable with a wide range of genres of scientific and / or engineering communication. Utilises rigorous research strategies in accessing and evaluating information. Selects and uses appropriate information technologies for the presentation of work done.

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

SCIENCE: Curriculum Content

UNIT 1: Measurement and analysis of data

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

- Estimate quantities, round off and determine the number of significant figures in a measurement.
- Identify sources of uncertainty in measurement and more broadly in an investigation; explain the difference between systematic and random sources of uncertainty in measurement.
- Design and carry out a scientific investigation:
 - Identify a question that needs to be answered or a topic that needs to be researched.
 - Formulate an hypothesis.
 - Design an experimental investigation that will test an hypothesis.
 - Plan and carry out the collection of data, recording the data in an appropriate manner.
 - Draw graphs, tabulate readings and perform reasonable calculations in order to analyse the data collected.
 - Identify limitations to the experimental design including the precision and accuracy of the equipment used.
 - Take cognizance of the uncertainties in the measurements taken when drawing conclusions from the data collected.
 - Write a report on the investigation carried out.

UNIT 2: Force and Motion

Topics:

- Calculation using linear equations of motion; using the definitions of velocity and acceleration to solve problems.
- Analysis and interpretation of graphs of motion: types of motion, direction of motion and turning points; draw, interpret and analyse graphs of motion for uniformly accelerated motion.
- Vectors (displacement, velocity, acceleration and force); Construct vector diagrams of two or more forces acting at a point; Determine the resultant of forces acting on a body using trigonometry; Use of scale diagrams to determine *resultant* forces; Investigations of bodies in equilibrium; using vector methods to solve problems involving translational equilibrium.
- Concurrent and non-concurrent forces; parallel and non-parallel forces.
- Torque; conditions for equilibrium; centre of gravity of an object.
- Newton's 1st, 2nd and 3rd laws and the law of universal gravitation; application of these laws to solve theoretical problems.
- Momentum and impulse; conservation of momentum, elastic and inelastic collisions.

UNIT 3: Energy

Topics:

- Mechanical Energy.
- Potential, kinetic and internal energy in calculations and explanations of phenomena.
- The work done in terms of force applied and distance through which that force is applied.
- The principle of conservation of mechanical energy.
- The power as the rate at which work is done.
- Levers; simple calculations on levers; torque and its application to simple machines.
- Mechanical advantage in wheels and axles, pulleys, screws, levers and gear systems.
- Thermal interactions.
- Definition and Identification of thermal interactions.
- Distinction between heat and temperature.
- The Kelvin and Celsius scales; liquid in glass thermometer; Calibration of a simple thermometer.
- Expansion and contraction in terms of the kinetic model of matter; relationship between temperature and the average kinetic energy; kinetic model; microscopic model of heat transfer.
- Heat capacity, specific heat capacity and latent heats of fusion and vapourisation.
- Calorimetric calculations that combine phase change with temperature increase.

- Relationship between the pressure temperature and volume of an ideal gas; gas law calculations; graphs of relationships.
- Electrical Energy.
- Positive and negative charges; electroscopes and use it to conduct investigations into the nature of electrostatics and charge.
- Electrostatic force; conservation of charge; transfer of electrons; force on a neutral object; van de Graaff generators.
- Coulombs law; Electric field strength, electric field patterns; the field strength around a charge and between parallel plates.
- Capacitance; the relationship between charge, potential difference and capacitance.
- Ohms law; distinction between resistance, equivalent resistance and internal resistance.
- Problem solving in electrical circuits; voltages and currents for series and parallel circuits; power in electric circuits; the relationship between current, potential difference, resistance and power; use of power ratings to select tools for different purposes.

UNIT 4: Matter

Topics:

- Solids, liquids, gases, crystals, mixtures, solutions and pure substances.
- Solutes and solvents, solubility and miscibility.
- Melting, boiling, freezing, condensation and sublimation.
- Atoms, structure of atoms in terms of protons, neutrons and electrons, molecule and macromolecules; elements and compounds, isotopes.
- The groups of elements in the periodic table; metals, non-metals and semi-metals.
- Atomic mass, molecular masses, the mole; molar calculations involving different concentrations of solutions.
- Microscopic interpretation of the mass, volume, density and temperature of matter, processes as cooling, freezing, condensation, boiling and sublimation.
- The valence of an element from its position in the periodic table; electron affinity, ionization energy, oxidation number, ion, cation and anion.
- Explain trends in the periodic table of electron affinity and ionization energy.
- Use Lewis and Aufbau diagrams to represent the valence structure of different atoms.
- Describe the origin and postulates of the Lewis theory of chemical bonding.
- Explain what is meant by electronegativity, describe trends in electronegativity in the periodic table.
- Explain what is meant by covalent, ionic and multiple bonds.
- Distinguish between covalent, van der Waals and ionic radii.
- Describe different types of intermolecular forces and factors affecting their magnitude.
- Describe and explain trends in structures and the properties of elements in the periodic table.

UNIT 5: Chemical Reactions

Topics:

- Balance chemical equations.
- Molar calculations, percentage yields and concentrations.
- The equilibrium constant, application of Le Chatelier's principle.
- Acids and Bases; strength, definition in terms of the Bronsted-Lowry theory.
- Ionization and dissociation, acid and base constant expression, meaning of pH and pOH.
- Rates of a reaction, activation energy, the effect of a catalyst:
 - Oxidation and Reduction, definition of oxidizing agent and reducing agent, Electrochemical cells.
 - Oxidation numbers and the use of oxidation numbers in balancing equations.
 - Use of the IUPAC system to name and identify simple hydrocarbons.
 - Identify and give the properties of the following functional groups: alkanes, alkenes, alkynes, halo-alkanes, alcohols, ether, amine, aldehydes, esters, carboxylic acids.
 - Purification, separation and cracking.
 - Saturated and unsaturated hydrocarbons.
 - Process of making soap from fats and sodium hydroxide.

UNIT 6: Biological Processes

Topics:

- Osmosis and diffusion.
- Cell Structure & Organisation.
- Cellular processes.
- Genetic Diversity.
- Health and the human body.
- Transport in Humans.
- Respiration.
- Excretion.
- Homeostasis.
- Coordination & Response.
- Use & Abuse of drugs.
- Microorganisms & Biotechnology.
- Relationship of Organisms with one another & with the Environment.
- Development of Organisms & Continuity of life.
- Inheritance.

UNIT 7: Shaping life and land in New Zealand

Topics:

- Different rock types, their formation and mineralogy.
- The evolution of the continents in terms of the theory of plate tectonics.
- Subduction, sea floor spreading, hot spots and other tectonic phenomena.
- The evolution of life on earth and how this is related to the evolution of the planet.
- The formation of volcanoes and the relationship between volcanism, earthquakes and plate boundaries.
- Geomagnetism and the relationship between the solar magnetic field and the earth's magnetic field.
- The greenhouse effect and the production of greenhouse gases.
- Formation and destruction of the ozone layer, factors that affect the rate at which the ozone layer is depleted.
- Alternative energy resources and technologies, calculations of power outputs of different energy sources.

UNIT 8: Project

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

Design and carry out an investigation in either engineering, pure science or health science:

- Identify a question that needs to be answered or a topic that needs to be researched and formulate an hypothesis.
- Research other peoples solutions to the problem you want to solve.
- Design an experimental investigation that will test a hypothesis or in the case of an engineering project, put in place plans for the development of your design.
- Plan and carry out the collection of data / making of the product, recording the data in an appropriate manner.
- Use apparatus and tools appropriately.
- Draw graphs, tabulate readings and perform reasonable calculations in order to analyse the data collected.
- Identify limitations to the experimental design including the precision and accuracy of the equipment used.
- Take cognizance of the uncertainties in the measurements taken when drawing conclusions from the data collected.
- Write a report on the investigation carried out / design developed.

SCIENCE: Suggested Assessment of Outcomes

Task & Type	Format	%	Description	LOs	Marking Criteria
Laboratory work	Reports	20 %	Five laboratory reports on selected investigations within the content specified.	1, 2	See attached Rubric
Tests	Structured and multiple choice questions	40 %	Two tests made up of structured questions on the content Pre- and post-tests (multiple choice) for diagnostic assessment	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content knowledge and understanding • Problem solving ability • Conceptual understanding • Procedural knowledge • Graphical and symbolic representation
Assignments	Homework Reports	20 %	One extended assignment, either a mini-investigation or an extended laboratory investigation and one theoretical assignment	1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content knowledge and understanding, • Use of scientific terminology • Application of scientific ideas, models and theories • Graphical and symbolic representation • Interpretation of data • See rubric for laboratory reports below for the investigation assignments
Final Project	Project work	20%	Design and make and evaluate project or scientific investigation as specified in unit 8	1, 2	See attached Rubric

SCIENCE: LABORATORY REPORT Marking Rubric

Criterion	Not Achieved (D)	Pass (C)	Merit (B)	Distinction (A)
<i>Use of apparatus and observation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to follow instructions accurately and carry out experiments. Has not demonstrated an ability to handle apparatus and materials effectively and with due regard to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to follow instructions reasonable accurately and carry out experiments when given a plan. Is able to handle apparatus and materials effectively and with due regard to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to follow instructions accurately and carry out experiments, handle apparatus and materials effectively and with due regard to safety, and observe, measure and record accurately and systematically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observes, measures and records accurately and systematically,
<i>Interpretation of Data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to interpret data in any way, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can recognise patterns and explain some observations, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can use data to recognize patterns, formulate hypotheses and draw conclusions, Explains familiar facts, observations and phenomena in terms of scientific laws and models, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can suggest scientific explanations for unfamiliar facts, observations and phenomena. Is aware that the pursuit of science is subject to practical constraints and theoretical uncertainties.
<i>Planning investigations</i>	<p>Has not demonstrated an ability to do any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulate hypotheses; Devise procedures and select apparatus and materials to test hypotheses, the validity of data, generalisations and predictions. 	<p>Can do some of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulate hypotheses. Devise procedures and select apparatus and materials to test hypotheses, the validity of data, generalisations and predictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulates hypotheses, devises procedures, and selects apparatus and materials to test hypotheses, the validity of data, generalisations and predictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigation is appropriately planned in consideration of hypotheses formulation, testing, procedure use, and use of apparatus. Demonstrates appropriate evaluation of investigative planning in consideration of validity of data, generalisations, and predictions.
<i>Carrying out investigations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to carry out the investigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to follow simple instructions and carry out a pre-planned investigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to organise and carry out investigations in a systematic way. Is aware of the validity of procedures and the difference between systematic and random uncertainty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to organise and carry out investigations in a systematic way. Is aware of the validity of procedures and the difference between systematic and random uncertainty and evaluate the design of experiments, experimental observations and other data.
<i>Communication Skills</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ineffective oral and written communication. Has not demonstrated sufficient reading and analytical capacity. Has not demonstrated sufficient skill in the use of information technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can read scientific texts and is able to communicate orally and write a simple laboratory report. Can provide a simple analysis of a problem and uses some sensible research strategies. Has a rudimentary understanding of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicates logically and concisely, both orally and in written briefs and reports Writes competent laboratory design and feasibility reports. Can formulate an argument and uses sensible research strategies. Has a fairly wide ability to use a range of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is comfortable with a wide range of genres of scientific and / or engineering communication. Utilises rigorous research strategies in accessing and evaluating information. Selects and uses appropriate information technologies for the presentation of work done.

	products and the selection and use of information.	technology tools at his/her disposal.	information technologies.	
--	--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------	--

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

SCIENCE: PROJECT (i.e. DESIGN and MAKE PROJECT) Marking Rubric

Criterion	Not Achieved (D)	Pass (C)	Merit (B)	Distinction (A)
<i>Use tools appropriately</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to follow instructions accurately. Has not demonstrated an ability to handle tools and materials effectively and with due regard to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is sometimes able to follow instructions accurately. Sometimes can handle tools and materials effectively and with due regard to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to follow instructions accurately. Handles tools and materials effectively at all times and with due regard to safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a detailed knowledge of the safety procedures as well as the tools and their use. Is able to help and advise others competently with regard to the use of tools.
<i>Investigate the design and manufacture of existing machines and design a electromechanical machine</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to investigate the design and manufacture of an electromechanical machine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has demonstrated sufficient skill in investigating and documenting design and manufacture details. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A well-organised, detailed investigation has led to a comprehensive report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The investigation carried out on existing machines is well-documented with more detail that is required.
<i>Put in place plans for making the machine</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to devise procedures and select tools and materials to make the machine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can put some procedures in place for the making of a machine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to devise procedures and select tools and materials to make the machine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans to make the machine are detailed and well-thought out, indicating a high level of organisation.
<i>Evaluate a machine and take steps to improve on the design</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to carry out any evaluation . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to follow simple instructions and carry out a pre-planned evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to organise and carry out investigations in order to evaluate the machine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is able to organise and carry out investigations to evaluate the machine and take steps to improve the design based on the outcome of the evaluation.
<i>Use physics and mathematical knowledge and skills to solve problems of design</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has not demonstrated an ability to apply any physics or mathematical knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can point to areas where physics or mathematical knowledge can be used to solve problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can solve simple problems of design using basic mathematics and physics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use physics and mathematical knowledge and skills to solve problems of design in an innovative way.
<i>Communication Skills</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ineffective oral and written communication. Has not demonstrated sufficient reading and analytical capacity. Has not demonstrated sufficient skill in the use of information technology products and the selection and use of information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can read scientific texts and is able to communicate orally and write a simple laboratory report. Can provide a simple analysis of a problem and uses some sensible research strategies. Has a rudimentary understanding of information technology tools at his/her disposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicates logically and concisely, both orally and in written briefs and reports Writes competent laboratory, design and feasibility reports. Can formulate an argument and uses sensible research strategies. Has a fairly wide ability to use a range of information technologies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is comfortable with a wide range of genres of scientific and / or engineering communication. Utilises rigorous research strategies in accessing and evaluating information. Selects and uses appropriate information technologies for the presentation of work done.

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

Social Science for Degree Preparation

NZQA requirements	Suggestions
Title	Social Science for Degree Preparation
Identification code	
Date amended	22/6/11
Level and credit value	Level 4 (15 or 20 credits) and/or an equivalent
Mode of delivery	Face-to-face facilitation/blended, and/or an equivalent
Method of delivery	3 one-hour lectures and 1 two hour tutorial per week and/or an equivalent
Clearly defined learning outcomes (that are consistent with the overall aims and the level of the component)	Having successfully completed this course, students will be able to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrate understanding of key concepts in the social sciences and be able to apply these to New Zealand settings; 2. Effectively study and research in Social Sciences-based degree courses; 3. Demonstrate critical analysis of their own social worlds; 4. Present effective writing and presentation skills necessary for degree study programmes; 5. Apply basic statistical skills to Social Science concepts.
Expected standards of performance for each learning outcome	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
The content of the component (i.e. The topics that will be covered that will allow learners to achieve the learning outcomes)	<p><i>Suggested content (subject to change):</i></p> <p>The individual:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ cognition ▪ behaviour ▪ development <p>Culture: Cultural – definitions/ reproduction/ processes/ associated phenomena – re: cultural relativism, ethnocentrism, emic/ etic; identity vs. culture etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ language ▪ symbolism ▪ beliefs and values <p>Society: Social forms – groups, categories, processes of reproduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Socialisation ▪ Social equality and inequalities (including the Treaty of Waitangi) <p>Statistics for Social Science: methodologies – enablement/ limitations</p> <p>Ethics, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and social science</p>
Assessment information	<i>See Assessment table for suggested assessment schemes (subject to change).</i>
Teaching/learning resources	<p>Online, full-text readings from current text-books and journals related to the course topics</p> <p>Data show projector</p> <p>Online learning facilities</p>

SOCIAL SCIENCE: Suggested Assessment

Task & Type	Format	%	Instructions	LOs	Marking Criteria
Written assignment	Four brief short answer assignments or tests based on readings	4x 5% =20%	Each major topic of the course will be assessed through short assignments or tests	1,2, 3	
Written or Multimedia Assignment	Short Essay (300-500 words) or Presentation (3-5mins)	20%	<i>Suggested topics(subject to change):</i> Review two academic readings from your course reader, noting their similarities and differences. Explain how they could be applied to a New Zealand context. Make a 5-10 minute oral presentation or a 3-5 minute multi-media presentation to the class on your research report.	1,2, 3,4	See rubric
Written assignment	Research proposal (500-800 wds)	20%	<i>Suggested topics(subject to change):</i> Using information from the Short Essay, present a social research topic (related to one of the course topics) and identify project scope. Include at least three main issues to be discussed and note (using appropriate academic referencing style) at least one academic source related to each issue and indicate the features of the sources that make them valid and reliable.	1,2, 3,-4	See rubric Explanation of topic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project scope noted • Indication of the importance of the topic • 3 main issues identified • Explanation of validity and reliability Understanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and referencing • Presentation • Organisation
Written assignment	Final report: 1200-1500 words	35%	Present a final research report that includes a title page, a table of contents, an abstract, and introduction, discussion of issues, conclusion, references, and recommendations.	1,2, 3,4, 5	See rubric

SOCIAL SCIENCE: RESEARCH PROPOSAL Marking Rubric

	A - DISTINCTION	B - MERIT	C - PASS	NOT ACHIEVED
Topic 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent explanation of the topic given. Thorough discussion of scope/detail. Excellent discussion of the importance/ application of the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good explanation of topic given. Good discussion of scope/detail. Good discussion of the importance/ application of the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic explanation of topic given. Some scope/detail noted and described. Basic discussion of the importance/ application of the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete explanation given. Little or no discussion of scope or the importance/ application of the topic.
Main issues 35 %	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 issues identified with excellent explanation. Very effective topic sentence for each issue/paragraph. Excellent explanation of the validity and reliability of sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 issues well identified and explained. Good topic sentence for each issue/ paragraph given. Good explanation of the validity and reliability of sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 issues identified with a very brief explanation Some attempt at a topic sentence for each issue/ paragraph. Some explanation of the validity and reliability of sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 3 issues identified with little or no explanation given. Inadequate attempt at a topic sentence for each issue/paragraph. Little or no explanation of the validity and reliability of sources.
Analytical Thinking & Application (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised complexity of issues and arguments. Develops critical response and evaluation from multiple perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues and argument are recognised. Critical and reflective response. Shows clearly established application of ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undeveloped understanding of issues and argument. Response not comprehensive. Establish central idea and applications at basic level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reflection demonstrated. No application. All descriptions without adequate evidence. Response not relevant to topic.
Research and Referencing (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses evidence to convincingly support and justify argument. Range and breadth of references exceed standard. Multiple sources utilising a multiple of perspectives. Uses citations appropriately and effectively. No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence supported and justified. References of quality academic standard. Variety of sources including academic database utilised. Supports points using a range of relevant citations . Referencing style correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows basic understanding of supporting evidence. At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. Presents central ideas in general terms, often depending on generalisations and/or dictionary definitions. Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context . Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting evidence misunderstood or inadequate . Overly reliant on single source Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. Use of evidence which was non-peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). Referencing style incorrect or incomplete.

Pass C Pass in criteria 2 and 3 and one of 1 and 4
 Pass C+ At least a pass in all criteria
 Merit B Merit in criteria 2 and 3 and one of 1 and 4

Merit B+
Distinction A
Distinction A+

At least merit in all criteria
Distinction in criteria 2 and 3 and one of 1 and 4
Distinction in all criteria

SOCIAL SCIENCE: REPORT Marking Rubric- Certificate in Degree Preparation

	A - DISTINCTION	B – MERIT	C – PASS	NOT ACHIEVED
Criteria 1 Understanding 50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In depth understanding of specific issues demonstrated in context. Central ideas are clearly and succinctly communicated. Research validates claim and key focus. Critical evaluation from multiple perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates comprehension of specific issues in context. Clearly states and develops central ideas. Shows clearly established application. Exploration of central ideas from different points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates a basic comprehension of salient issues overall. Establish central idea and applications at basic level. Limited exploration of several points of view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface understanding. Lacks central ideas. Ineffective development of ideas. No application. All descriptions without adequate evidence. Does not respond appropriately to the assignment task.
Criteria 2 Research and Referencing 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence supported and justified convincingly. Range and breadth of references exceed standard. Multiple sources utilising a multiple of perspectives. Uses citations appropriately and effectively. No errors in referencing style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence supported and justified. References of quality academic standard. Variety of sources including academic database utilised. Supports points using a range of relevant citations. Referencing style correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows basic understanding of supporting evidence. At least 5 references of appropriate academic standard. Presents central ideas in general terms, often depending on generalisations and/or dictionary definitions. Sources of evidence are appropriate and in context. Minor errors in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting evidence misunderstood or inadequate. Overly reliant on single source. Supporting evidence consistently not acknowledged. Uses irrelevant or inadequate supporting evidence/referencing material throughout. Use of evidence which was non-peered, not authorised or not attributed to an organisation (Questionable providence). Referencing style incorrect or incomplete.
Criteria 3 Presentation 15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Almost entirely free of errors. Chooses words for their precise meaning and uses discipline appropriate language. Exceptional use of formatting and structure. Writing is logical, coherent and well-developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains errors which distract but does not impede understanding. Generally uses words and discipline appropriate language accurately and effectively. Appropriate use of formatting, and structure. Writing is concise with clearly developed structure and use of grammar. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains several errors which temporarily confuses the reader but not overall understanding. Uses relatively vague and simple words. Adequate use of formatting and structure. Clear writing that is mostly grammatically correct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient errors to impede readability. Inappropriate use of Bias. Assignment plus or minus 10% of word count. Lack of formatting, and structure. Writing is unclear with many grammatical mistakes.
Criteria 4 Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are well integrated and linked to theme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are mostly well linked. Paragraphs and sections are clearly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are somewhat linked. Presentation is mostly easy to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas are not linked to theme. Paragraphs and sections are not linked

15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraphs and sections are coherent and relevant. • Presents a clear topic and all content linked towards proving this by way of argument. • Cohesive flow of information throughout assignment. 	<p>linked to central theme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic presented but some points not linked to argument. • Presentation is generally clear and is easy to follow. 	<p>follow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraphs and sections are adequately linked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No logical flow of information apparent. • Does not construct thematic paragraphs.
-----	---	---	---	---

How grades are awarded: Pass (C): Pass in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Pass (C+): At least a pass in all criteria/ Merit (B): Merit in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Merit (B+): At least merit in all criteria/ Distinction (A): Distinction in criteria 1 and 2 and one of 3 and 4/ Distinction (A+): Distinction in all criteria.

Appendix D: Curriculum Subject Expert Discussion & Workshop

Project Overview:

Title: Regional collaboration to develop a shared approach and qualification for learners preparing for degree level study

Aim and rationale for the collaboration:

The purpose of this proposed collaboration is to develop a regional shared approach and qualification for preparing prospective students for degree level study in polytechnics, universities and wānanga. A pilot of this programme could inform considerations of other providers nationally.

The Tertiary Education Strategy (TES) 2011-2015 differentiates between roles of tertiary providers. Investment planning advice indicates that it is the Government's intention that universities move away from offering sub-degree programmes that generate Category 1 EFTS funding and that these programmes be offered by polytechnics and other providers. The TES also outlines equity imperatives that aim to increase participation of Māori and Pacific students in tertiary study at Level 4 and above. This indicates the need for pathways into degree level programmes, particularly for these equity students, many of whom leave secondary school without university entrance.

From 2012, there will be a significant gap in bridging provision in the Wellington region with Victoria University of Wellington (and also Massey University) discontinuing a Level 4 preparatory programme for domestic students, the *Certificate of University Preparation*. This project proposes that a collaborative approach be taken in planning for the needs of learners who will be affected by this change.

Three tertiary providers in the region, Wellington Institute of Technology (WelTec), Whitireia Community Polytechnic and Victoria University of Wellington, have a proven history of working collaboratively in the best interests of learners. Using TEC Encouraging and Supporting Innovation funding in 2008, a Level 3 bridging programme was jointly developed and piloted by these providers. The programme, *Certificate in Preparation for Tertiary Studies*, puts the learner at the centre of the picture and enables both skill development and exploration of study/vocational choices by students prior to committing to studying with their programme provider of choice. This programme continues to be offered beyond the pilot to approximately 60 learners each year and WelTec is currently the lead provider.

Project design/method, activities

It is proposed that WelTec, Victoria University, and Whitireia NZ lead this collaborative project to:

- review literature related to the key competencies required for degree level study (e.g. critical thinking and ability to study autonomously) including context and subject specific skills.
- review and evaluate current pathways at Level 3 and 4, alignment of academic preparation programmes offered in the Wellington region and their effectiveness in preparing learners for degree study.
- investigate qualification and partnership options including possible new initiatives and models in place elsewhere.
- develop a shared regional approach to pathways into degree study, including articulation agreements between providers.
- develop a new qualification for learners preparing for degree level study that prepares them for study in different contexts at different providers.

Expected outcomes

This approach will result in:

- A sustainable regional solution based upon shared principles and provider collaboration.
- A degree preparation programme as a regional pilot to inform considerations nationally.
- Articulation agreements, as required.
- Dissemination of project outcomes nationally via a report and seminar.

MATRIX: Distribution of skills/competencies: Certificate of Degree Preparation – 2011

Skills/Competencies	Academic Communication	Business	Mathematics	Humanities	Social Science	Science
<i>Exam strategies</i>	Strategies	Exam	Tests	Exam	Short tests	Short tests
<i>Essay writing</i>	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
<i>Report writing</i>		✓			✓	✓
<i>Oral/multi-media presentations</i>	✓	✓			✓	✓
<i>Research strategies</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Analytical thinking</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Contextual Maths</i>		Acctg/Econ	✓		Stats	✓
<i>Use of IT</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Learning/cognitive strategies</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SUMMARY of FEEDBACK: Curriculum Subject Expert Discussion & Workshop

Subject Area	Assessments	IMPROVE	Learning Objectives	INCLUDE	General Comments
<i>Academic Communication</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay questions too complex. • Use essay topics from electives (contextual, skills based, allows cross discipline transfer, relevance). Could integrate/link thematic essay topics: gender, sexuality, soc relationships, economics of gifting (koha, community); domestic households (economic, social, cultural). • Add analytical self-reflection of academic practice (as a student)-aramatuwai. • Oral Presentation could be broader, with for example a poster presentation (more flexible) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report could be a writeup from the presentation. • Assignments provide the form/structure and skills the learners need: report/essay infers an end product. • Scaffold essay with marking criteria. • Video and Peer assess presentation. Assess contribution to group in constructive respectful way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend ordering to: 3,2,1,4; non-specific to allow contextualisation- “academic referencing vs. APA? • identify and evaluate relevant sources. • Include research skills. Incorporate analytical thinking, presentations, report writing, note taking, computer skills- modern technologies, library, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reading list/multicultural elements/cultural competency • Include other forms of writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be able to identify sources. • Development of strategies to evaluate integrity/credibility of sources. • Report writing • Essay writing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment #2: requires more guidance. 		lit review, annotated bibliography, summarising & paraphrasing.		
<i>Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report writing instruction & assessment – drawing conclusions, offering recommendations. For assessment 3, incorporate other business choices: Hotel chain, IRD call centre, airline, IT, Saatchi & Saatchi, cultural. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Try not to be too focussed on one discipline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpret descriptive stats? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisational management? Human behaviour component. Incorporate discipline specific vocabulary. Skill – looking at theory and relate to practical examples. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More consultation needed across sectors. Mary can give feedback.
<i>Humanities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short answer test – use paragraphs instead (4 summaries of readings). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critical analysis – of artefacts also. Assess writing in marking rubric. Reduce amount of assessment Create thematic content based on NZ Identity- interdisciplinary approach, apply concepts to theme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LO 1. Become familiar with some key concepts related to Humanities. Add critical analysis/evaluating content. Create more flexibility in LOs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use a matrix/framework for the draft so that it is clear what is expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open University approach – key theme – focus on all disciplines.

<i>Maths & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recombine Level 3 & 4 maths in a creative way. • Embed mathematics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove detail in learning outcomes – remove content focus from curriculum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate and contextualise maths to destination pathway. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenge to pathway into a range of destination programmes. Different maths needs for different pathways. • Suggest a follow-up workshop
<i>Social Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See suggested topics from group. • Create flexible contextualised assessments that are less prescriptive: written assignments, multimedia presentation/seminar/interpersonal Literature review: provide readings to choose from, locate & evaluate relevant and credible readings. Comment on Professional practice and ethics of social science research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments university focussed – add more flexibility (e.g. assessment – presentation media). • Test based assessment not reflective of multiple pathways . • Thematic content: introduction to basic ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual: Cognition, emotion, behaviour. • Culture: Language, symbolism, ritual. • Society: Whānau group, Tiriti, politics/law, socialisation, social groups, equity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add critical analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treaty of Waitangi. • Readings from social science area that are appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University centric – mode of delivery and assessment – could use a less prescriptive assessment.