

library, but it will still be too small. Wellpark has a small but good collection of very specific texts, but the collection needs to be bigger and broader. A major review has been carried out by a library consultant, and this should help with electronic access and access to journals, but overall the plan is inadequate for degree programme.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The criterion is met.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MONITOR

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

REQUIREMENTS

The panel requires

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

The panel recommends that

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

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

the clinical files are kept securely at the clinic.

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

an external academic is included on the Advisory Committee.

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

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

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

OUTCOME

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

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Course Approvals Adviser
NZQA

Date: 4 September 2006

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Create Date:8/09/2006 4:44:42p.m.

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

Sent_To:Phillip.Cottingham <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Re: Factual Accuracy from Wellpark

Dear Phillip

Thank you for your email re factual accuracy.

All the best for your endeavours ahead and enjoy that curry in India!

Kind regards

Lesley

Many

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

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

Telephone: 04 463 3188

Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

>>> "Principal1 " <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 8/09/2006 4:22:09 p.m. >>>

Dear Lesley,

Grace is not here today and has asked me to email you to confirm the factual accuracy of the report. This I am doing.

Thank you for the report. We will work through the issues and get back to you later in the year. Like you, I too am away in India for a month.

Phillip Cottingham ND BHSc

Principal

Wellpark College of Natural Therapies

Po Box 78-229

Grey Lynn

Auckland 1002

New Zealand

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Create Date:19/10/2006 5:04:46p.m.

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

Sent_To:Phillip.Cottingham <xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Re: Degree Programme

Thank you for your email. I am out of the office until 24th October 06.
If you need assistance from a Course Approvals Advisor before 24th October, please email
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx and another advisor will be able to help you.

Many thanks

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

>>> "xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx" 10/19/06 17:24 >>>

Dear Lesley,

It has been some weeks now since we received the report and we have been utilising it to determine the strategy that we are going to adopt to create a programme that will satisfy the requirements and work for the College. As you can appreciate, this is not an easy task with complex issues to be sorted and we want to get it right without too much going back and forth to the NZQA. My questions to you are, "Is there a time frame in which this would be expected to be completed?" and "Does the NZQA require a response from us within a certain time-frame?"

Phillip Cottingham ND BHSc

Principal

Wellpark College of Natural Therapies

Po Box 78-229

Grey Lynn

Auckland 1002

New Zealand

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Create Date:25/10/2006 11:49:02a.m.

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

Sent_To:Phillip.Cottingham <xxxxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Re: Degree Programme

Dear Phillip

Thank you for your email and my apologies for not getting back to you sooner. I just returned to work yesterday after 6 weeks leave - India was very exciting and intriguing!

There is no timeframe set by NZQA for your response to the requirements, although if the timeframe went on for years the current material would lose currency. There also a danger of panel members disappearing (overseas or somewhere) and it can be complicated replacing them. But, as you say, there are complex issues to be sorted and I agree that it would be better to take time to sort those out properly so there isn't a lot of to-ing and fro-ing to NZQA.

I would suggest that you begin work on the task asap, work out your own timeframe and send me that. It will help with our planning this end. It would also be useful if you were to keep me posted from time to time about your progress.

Kind regards

Lesley

>>> "Principal1 " <xxxxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxx.xx.xx> 19/10/2006 5:24 p.m. >>>

Dear Lesley,

It has been some weeks now since we received the report and we have been utilising it to determine the strategy that we are going to adopt to create a programme that will satisfy the requirements and work for the College. As you can appreciate, this is not an easy task with complex issues to be sorted and we want to get it right without too much going back and forth to the NZQA. My questions to you are, "Is there a time frame in which this would be expected to be completed?" and "Does the NZQA require a response from us within a certain time-frame?"

Phillip Cottingham ND BHSc

Principal

Wellpark College of Natural Therapies

Po Box 78-229

Grey Lynn

Auckland 1002

New Zealand

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

15 February 2007

Phillip Cottingham
Principal
Wellpark College of Natural Therapies
PO Box 78 229
Grey Lynn
AUCKLAND 1245

Dear Philip

Thank you for your letter of 17 January 2007 seeking further information regarding the re-development of your proposed degree programme. Please accept my apologies for the delay in this reply. I appreciate that you and your colleagues are faced with a demanding task in responding to the requirements.

In response to your comment about seeking approval first and then accreditation, I would urge you to re-consider that intention and seek both together as both aspects are very intertwined and interdependent. Two visits, (which would probably be required if you sought these separately), would be very expensive.

The bullet points that you have raised in your letter are all related to comments made in the body of the report. They are there to record the panel's concerns or views and could be used by you to help you to meet the requirements. You do not need to respond directly to those individual points, but you do need to respond to the requirements set on page 14 of the report.

Nevertheless, in response to your bullet points, the first three are generally about the level of the content and I doubt that a few examples will assist you there. Requirement number one requires a total review and a re-write of the programme, as the panel did not consider that the submission was consistent with what would be expected for a degree programme. The level should be addressed as part of that exercise.

You may however wish to look at course NT617 Clinical Practice for Naturopaths and Medical Herbalists. That is listed as a Level 7 course, but as a significant number of the learning outcomes are not at that level it is difficult to describe the course as such.

The bullet point relating to 2.3 is not so much about using other provider's material but the strength and security of the arrangement with the other provider. Panel members were not assured that it was secure and were concerned that that part of the course could be in jeopardy.

The queries regarding assessment (next two bullet points) are related to the learning outcomes. The assessments must relate to the learning outcomes and be appropriate for the

level of the programme. Revision of the assessments should be included in the work done to meet Requirement One.

Where it is stated in the report that the “criterion has been met”, there is no further work for you to do, although a holistic approach to the redevelopment of the programme is desirable.

In response to your “5.1 entry requirements”, this is a recommendation. Recommendations do not have to be met at this stage, but are advice to the college for good or better practice. The monitor will check on progress made on these during the monitoring visit.

In regard to the inclusion of “more than one external stakeholder” on the advisory panel, it is important that all degree programmes have ongoing external scrutiny and that the college is open to external advice and comment. With only one external stakeholder, the perspective can be limited or even biased, so more than one is better. This enables the course to remain current and relevant to stakeholder needs and prevents complacency among the staff in the delivery of the degree and a tendency to become inward looking.

It would be of great benefit to the college to actively liaise with academics from other institutions offering a similar degree, during the redevelopment of the programme. It may be advisable to set up an advisory group, with people who are expert in the development and/or delivery of degrees programmes, especially for this re-development. That is normal practice. That group cannot include anyone from the panel of course.

The College is required to meet the requirements set by the panel before the degree programme can be approved by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority Board. The redevelopment group should concentrate on this.

Yours sincerely

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Course Approvals Advisor
Quality Assurance Division
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Paragraph

Nāku noa, nā / Yours sincerely

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor - Course Approvals
Approvals, Accreditation and Audit

Phone: 04 463 3188

Cell:

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

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Sender:Principal1 <Phillip.Cottingham@Wellpark.co.nz.SMTP.NZQADOM> Sent_To:accounts
<accounts@Wellpark.co.nz.SMTP.NZQADOM>
Sent_CC:
Sent_BC:

Create Date:20/02/2007 2:26:50p.m

Subject:FW: RE Degree Application

Phillip Cottingham ND BHSc

Principal

Wellpark College of Natural Therapies

Po Box 78-229

Grey Lynn

Auckland 1002

New Zealand

—
From: Principal1

Sent: Tuesday, 20 February 2007 1:21 p.m.

To: 'lesley.edgeley-page@nzqa.govt.nz'

Subject: RE Degree Application

Dear Lesley,

I received your letter today regarding our application and would just like some clarification on a point. You state that if we applied separately for approval and accreditation it would require two more visits. It was my clear impression at the end of the last panel in the summing up, that there would be no more visits by the panel and no more subsequent costs. Is this not the case?

To be honest, I am still not happy with the response to my letter. There are still a lot of vague areas to be clarified in what we would be required to do before resubmitting. For example, if the panel does not accept the NT617 - Clinical Practice for Naturopaths is not written to a level 7 standard, why is this so? What verbs are not acceptable? What is required of a level 7 outcome that is not there, or is included inappropriately?

In which portions of the application is there too much breadth and not enough depth? What is the justification for the panel making such a statement? Whilst I am not necessarily contesting the verity of that statement (as we have been given no examples to make such a judgement) I am asking for greater clarity from the panel.

This process has come with considerable costs, and to get such a vague report, is unacceptable to the College. We are being expected to pay for an outcome that does not allow us to move the process forward with any degree of certainty. If NZQA cannot offer a more concrete and constructive report, in my capacity as a representative of the College Board, I will be taking this matter further.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

I hope that we can work through this and come to an outcome that is satisfactory to ourselves and NZQA.

Thanking you.

Phillip Cottingham ND BHSc

Principal

Wellpark College of Natural Therapies

Po Box 78-229

Grey Lynn

Auckland 1002

New Zealand

out of scope

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]



Create Date:12/03/2007 4:39:58p.m.

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

Sent_To:Phillip.Cottingham <xxxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xx.xx.xxxx.NZQADOM>

Sent_CC:

Sent_BC:

Subject:Degree application

12 March 2007

Dear Phillip

Thank you for your email of 20 February 2007 regarding your degree application. Please accept my apologies for the delay in this response, but I have been away.

I'm sorry if you found the letter I sent you in response to yours, to be vague and non-specific. The requirements in the panel report were not just set by NZQA but the whole panel of experts. As the NZQA representative and a panel member, I cannot give you specific answers and thereby assist you in the development of your programme. It is the panel's task to evaluate and judge your application against the gazetted criteria. None of us on the panel can advise you and then judge that same application. It would become a conflict of interest.

As I recommended in the letter, you should seek such advice elsewhere, preferably from someone who has had experience in the development of a degree programme.

In regard to the comment about two visits, if your re-submission takes a long time the panel may have to re-visit as the original application would have lost currency. It is usual to apply for approval and accreditation at the same time. I suggest that you do so, because to split it into two processes, may well result in an extra visit.

I hope that this helps and all the best with your endeavours.

Lesley

Lesley Edgeley-Page
Advisor- Course Approvals & Accreditation
Quality Assurance Division
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

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

Telephone: 04 463 3188
Fax: 04 382 6895

Email: xxxxxx.xxxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxxx.xx

Released under the Official Information Act 1982