



COUNCIL PAPER

TO	Members of Council
FROM	Professor Grant Guilford, Vice-Chancellor
DATE	24 September 2018
SUBJECT	Simplification of the University's Legal Name to the University of Wellington
REF TO STRAT PLAN	
DOCUMENT #	VUWC 18/131

Executive summary

On 27 July 2018, the University Council made a unanimous draft decision:

1. to make a recommendation to the Minister of Education under section 162(5) of the Education Act 1989 that the legal name of the University be changed from the Victoria University of Wellington to University of Wellington;
2. subject to the Minister's approval of a change in name to University of Wellington, to change the University's Māori name from Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui to Te Herenga Waka; and
3. subject to the Minister's approval of a change in name to University of Wellington, to maintain the use and heritage of the word 'Victoria' in a meaningful way by the ongoing use of the word Victoria in the life of the University.

Following the release of the draft decision, the Council sought further and final feedback on the draft decision. Feedback was open until 5:00pm on Monday 27 August. Late feedback was still accepted for management analysis until 10:00am on Tuesday 28 August. All feedback, including feedback after this date, was provided to Council.

This paper sets out:

- the background to, and summary of reasons for, my recommendations,
- the statutory context and considerations for your decision;
- a summary of the consultation process followed and the legal requirements for consultation; and
- a summary of the consultation feedback and University management's consideration of that feedback.

Background

In 2014, the University community developed a shared vision for the long-term success of this University. It set us on an unreservedly ambitious path, in keeping with the confidence and aspirations of the University's Council, staff, students, alumni and communities. In developing our Strategic Plan, together we defined our vision to be a world-leading capital city university and one of the great global-civic universities.

As a community, we also defined strategies to help us achieve our aims. These included choosing areas of academic emphasis befitting a capital city university, giving close attention to the quality of research, teaching and student experience, and focusing on inclusivity, our engagement with our communities and our intellectual influence in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond.

Together we rallied behind the concept of civic engagement, which provides the opportunity to enrich cultural and intellectual life in New Zealand and to lead thinking on major societal and environmental issues. It positions the University to play an important role in the facilitation of innovation, entrepreneurship and sustainable economic and social development.

Consistent with that civic university tradition, the University must be closely linked with New Zealand's capital city. Rather than being a university in a capital city, we need to be a capital city university—one that lives and breathes its capital city location. Our staff and students rely on the privilege of access to the nation's archived heritage, its cultural taonga and our strong and unique links with government departments and agencies, political leaders, business, iwi, the judiciary, research institutions, cultural and environmental organisations and the diplomatic community.

In order to continue on the path toward realising the University's shared and unique vision, we began considering whether changing the University's name could be an important first step in a wider programme to further enhance our global reputation. Differentiation and improved international reputation are both critically important to enhancing our international competitiveness. This, in turn, ensures that we provide high quality learning and research outcomes, and secure the University's long-term viability.

The proposed name also places us as the prominent University in Wellington, and it has the recognition, differentiation and memorability required for our future.

We sought appropriate professional advice and, in May of this year, began discussing a potential name change with our staff, students, alumni and stakeholders – a process that included a robust period of formal consultation and ultimately culminated in this paper to Council.

The name change is not the solution in itself rather it is the enabler of other activities to be undertaken by the University to grow engagement with Wellington, build international reputation and achieve the ambitious goals in our strategic plan.

This process has left me in no doubt that realising our ambitions in an increasingly competitive and financially challenging sector requires the University to have a name

that is both aligned with Wellington and more distinctive internationally: University of Wellington.

Recommendations

I recommend to Council:

1. That, under section 162(5) of the Education Act 1989, the Council recommend to the Minister of Education that the legal name of the University be changed from the 'Victoria University of Wellington' to 'University of Wellington'.
2. That the Chancellor be authorised to make this recommendation on behalf of the Council.
3. That provided Council's recommendation is approved by the Minister of Education:
 - a) the University's Māori name be changed from Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui to Te Herenga Waka, with effect from the effective date of the *Gazette* notice published by the Minister under section 162(5) of the Education Act 1989;
 - b) the use and heritage of the word 'Victoria' be maintained in a meaningful way by the ongoing use of the word Victoria in the life of the University; and
 - c) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to do all things necessary or desirable to implement the change to the University's name.

Summary of reasons for my recommendations

Adopting a distinctive, simple name which is descriptive of our identity and place in the world is fundamental to ensuring we can attain the highest standards of excellence and deliver our ambitious goals, as set out in our Strategic Plan.

The name University of Wellington is unique, aligns with our identity as New Zealand's capital city university, and explicitly links the University with our city and region.

Great cities have great universities that share their name. This common bond results in the achievements of the one building the reputation of the other. We are determined that all of the communities of which we are a part will benefit from our world-class research and teaching programmes. In turn, a vibrant and successful Wellington offering an enhanced student experience is critical to the University's future.

The name University of Wellington also more accurately captures our role as New Zealand's globally ranked capital city university than our current name and, in particular, its pervasively used abbreviations of 'Vic', 'Victoria' and 'Victoria University'. It creates a sense of partnership with Wellington—a critical component of our global-civic University aspiration. It also highlights our pre-eminence in Wellington relative to

other universities, which operate branches in our city, and prevents any misapprehension that we are a subsidiary of Victoria University (in Melbourne).

Our financial sustainability and long-term viability—let alone our ambition to be one of the great global-civic universities—cannot be assured on domestic tuition fees and Government funding alone.

We must build an even greater global reputation. One that strengthens our international competitiveness and that thereby reduces the likelihood that the current financial pressures and disruptions affecting the tertiary sector will set us on a path to mediocrity. To strengthen our global reputation, we must have a distinctive name that stands on its own in the more than 100 countries from which we recruit our staff and students, and in which our graduates work.

I consider that this proposal is financially responsible and an efficient use of resources. The initial financial investments are outweighed by the long-term economic benefits of the University gaining a clear and distinctive international identity and reputation.

It will enable activities to secure our economic future from high-quality partnerships, attract international students, increase overseas research funding and philanthropy and recruit world-leading staff. These outcomes will support the University in fostering high quality learning and research outcomes for our students and staff and attaining even higher standards of excellence into the future.

Based on the evidence before me, I am in no doubt that the simplicity, clarity and descriptive nature of the name University of Wellington will enable us to achieve these outcomes. It is a crucial foundation to a bigger and bolder programme of work to enhance and leverage our international reputation and competitiveness and ensure our prestige accurately reflects the calibre and achievements of our staff, students and graduates.

The above is why I recommend the change of the University's name to University of Wellington.

I also recommend the adoption of the Māori name Te Herenga Waka. Our intention is to provide a more meaningful name in te reo Māori than just a simple translation of the legal name. The wharenuī, To Tumu Herenga Waka (the mooring post of canoes) provides a non-iwi, non-denominational name that offers a unique analogy to draw communities together and anchor them at the heart of the University.

I do not underestimate the challenges involved in undertaking this change. I also acknowledge there are many for whom the current name holds deep significance. It is also true, however, that as Vice-Chancellor my first responsibility must be to the future of this great institution and it is with that in mind that I make these recommendations.

As with any change there are risks involved. However, I am confident the risks can be effectively managed and that we will deliver the benefits this change offers to the University while protecting and enhancing the interests of our students and graduates. The depth of this debate has made us better prepared for what lies ahead and we sincerely wish that all of our community, whether supportive or against this change, continue to feel part of their university.

Council can have confidence that management understands what is required to implement not only this change, but also to develop a broader programme focused on improving engagement with our region and enhancing our international reputation. The change of name is a fundamental first step, and will be followed by implementation of a range of other initiatives to enhance civic engagement increase international reputation, and ensure we are the best University that we can be.

In making the above recommendations I also note that, subsequent to the changes, the University as a legal entity will continue without pause, its role in society will be unchanged and the institution's proud legacy will not be rewritten. We will be launching a programme of work to ensure that our history and legacy is honoured and protected appropriately.

Further detail on the above can be found in the Draft Decision paper and in the supporting material released alongside that paper.

Finally, I would like to thank every person who has provided feedback and to acknowledge the detailed work that many have undertaken to fully participate in the process. This feedback has highlighted the depth of commitment and sense of loyalty and pride that we all feel in this University.

Professor Grant Guilford
Vice-Chancellor

Statutory context and considerations

Statutory process for changing the University's name

The power to change a university's legal name is vested in the Minister of Education under section 162(5) of the Education Act 1989. This states:

The Minister may, on the recommendation of the council of the institution concerned, change the name of an institution by notice published in the *Gazette*.

Victoria University of Wellington is an 'institution' for the purposes of the Education Act 1989. Section 162(5) allows the University's name to be changed notwithstanding section 3(1) of the Victoria University of Wellington Act 1961 which states:

For the advancement of knowledge and the dissemination and maintenance thereof by teaching and research there shall be a University to be called the Victoria University of Wellington.

The section 162(5) process has been used on 14 previous occasions in relation to other tertiary education institutions in New Zealand, most recently in 2016.

Statutory framework for the Council's decision

In considering this recommendation, the Council must act reasonably, in the best interests of the University, and in accordance with section 181 of the Education Act 1989 which sets out the duties of councils:

It is the duty of the council of an institution, in the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers,—

- (a) to strive to ensure that the institution attains the highest standards of excellence in education, training, and research:
- (b) to acknowledge the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi:
- (c) to encourage the greatest possible participation by the communities served by the institution so as to maximise the educational potential of all members of those communities with particular emphasis on those groups in those communities that are under-represented among the students of the institution:
- (d) to ensure that the institution does not discriminate unfairly against any person:
- (e) to ensure that the institution operates in a financially responsible manner that ensures the efficient use of resources and maintains the institution's long-term viability:
- (f) to ensure that proper standards of integrity, conduct, and concern for—
 - (i) the public interest; and
 - (ii) the well-being of students attending the institution—
 are maintained.

Also relevant to Council's decision is section 159AAA of the Education Act 1989, which sets out the overarching objects of Act regarding tertiary education. The Council must be guided by these objects in reaching its decision.

The object of this Part, Parts 13A to 18, and Part 19 (which relate to tertiary education), and of the provisions of Parts 18A and 20 to 24 that relate to tertiary education, is to foster and develop a tertiary education system that—

- (a) fosters, in ways that are consistent with the efficient use of national resources, high quality learning and research outcomes, equity of access, and innovation; and
- (b) contributes to the development of cultural and intellectual life in New Zealand; and
- (c) responds to the needs of learners, stakeholders, and the nation, in order to foster a skilled and knowledgeable population over time; and
- (d) contributes to the sustainable economic and social development of the nation; and
- (e) strengthens New Zealand's knowledge base and enhances the contribution of New Zealand's research capabilities to national economic development, innovation, international competitiveness, and the attainment of social and environmental goals; and
- (f) provides for a diversity of teaching and research that fosters, throughout the system, the achievement of international standards of learning and, as relevant, scholarship.

Ministerial considerations

Section 162(5), which enables the Minister to change the University's name by *Gazette* does not contain any express mandatory considerations that the Minister must consider in exercising the power under this section. Like the Council, the Minister must be guided by section 159AAA. The Minister must also consider the wider scheme of the Education Act 1989 and section 160 in particular, which states that the object of the provisions of the Education Act 1989 relating to institutions:

“is to give [institutions] as much independence and freedom to make academic, operational, and management decisions as is consistent with the nature of the services they provide, the efficient use of national resources, the national interest, and the demands of accountability”.

Section 161(4) is also relevant as it requires the Minister (and the Council) to give effect to the intention of Parliament expressed in section 161(1) that “academic freedom and the autonomy of institutions are to be preserved and enhanced”.

In July 2018, the Ministry of Education published a set of criteria that the Minister intends to have regard to in assessing a recommendation.¹ The Minister is entitled to develop these criteria to guide the assessment of Council's recommendation.

¹ Tertiary Education Institution Name Change Criteria – available at <https://www.education.govt.nz/further-education/policies-and-strategies/tertiary-education-institution-name-change-criteria/>

However, in doing so, he may not improperly fetter the exercise of his discretionary power under section 162(5) or give weight to criteria inconsistent with the statutory purpose and objectives.

Further legislative steps

If the recommended name change proceeds, the Victoria University of Wellington Act 1961 and a small number of other pieces of legislation that refer directly to 'Victoria University of Wellington' will need to be amended following the Minister's decision.

This could be done by inclusion of the relevant amendments in a future Statutes Amendment Bill or Education Act Amendment Bill or, potentially, through an Order in Council from the Governor-General on recommendation of the Minister under section 301A of the Education Act 1989. We would discuss these options with officials from the Ministry of Education.

Summary of process undertaken

While not required by the Education Act 1989 to consult, the University has chosen to undertake a consultation process prior to these recommendations.

An outline of all consultation steps undertaken by the University since February 2018, including both the initial feedback period (1 May – 8 June) and the formal consultation period following the draft decision (27 July – 27 August), is set out in Appendix A.

Below is a brief summary of the consultation process since Council made its draft decision.

- **Staff:** The draft decision was notified to staff via an all staff email on 27 July and on the University website. Staff forums were held on 17, 20, 21 and 22 August during which the Vice-Chancellor explained the rationale behind the draft decision, engaged in discussions and encouraged staff to provide feedback. In addition to the forums, feedback was encouraged via emails, meetings and internal newsletters.
- **Students:** The draft decision was notified to students via 39 posts on various social media channels aimed at students, the University website and on digital display boards on all campuses. All students who provided feedback through the earlier process were directly emailed. Student forums were held on 6 August and 16 August. As with the staff forums, the Vice-Chancellor explained the rationale behind the draft decision, engaged in discussions and encouraged students to provide feedback. In addition to the forums, various other student-specific channels were used to encourage feedback and the Vice-Chancellor met and spoke with a number of student representatives and leaders. The draft decision was also communicated to students by VUWSA.
- **Alumni:** The draft decision was notified to alumni via the alumni enews (an electronic newsletter sent to more than 50,000 alumni) on 27 July, 11 posts on alumni specific social media channels, a press release on 27 July, and advertisements in the Dominion Post newspaper on 4, 6, 11, 18, 22 and 25 August, all of which included details on how to give feedback. In addition, all alumni who provided feedback through the earlier process were directly emailed. Public forums were held on 6, 7 and 8 August. During these forums,

all of which were more than two hours long, the Vice-Chancellor explained the rationale behind the draft decision, engaged in discussions and encouraged people to provide feedback.

- **Stakeholders:** The University identifies key stakeholders as decision-makers and advisors with whom we interact regularly. Included in this group are individuals such as mayors and local body councillors, members of parliament, trustees of the Victoria University of Wellington Foundation, members of the University's advisory boards, prior Chancellors and Vice-Chancellors, and leaders of the public and commercial organisations with which we have day-to-day interactions in the conduct of our mission. Stakeholders were invited to attend a briefing on the draft decision on 22 August, which was cancelled due to only receiving one RSVP. The Vice-Chancellor personally phoned a number of stakeholders to discuss the draft decision and seek their feedback. The Vice-Chancellor was also invited to give a presentation to Wellington Club members and their guests on 20 August and attended the Wellington Mayoral Forum.

Overall, ten forums (including a presentation at the Wellington Club) were held. The four staff forums were reasonably well attended, with total attendance being approximately 180 staff. In total, the two student forums attracted approximately 80 students and the three public forums approximately 100 people.

Legal requirements for a consultation process

An effective consultation process requires that:

- prior notice of the issue and proposed decision is given to those who may have an interest in the decision;
- reasonable information is provided to those being consulted, including the reasons for the proposed decision and the material relied upon by the decision maker;
- those consulted are given a fair opportunity to provide feedback; and
- proper consideration is given to the feedback received before a decision is made.

Consultation does not require negotiation or reaching a consensus. Nor does it require a detailed argument with, or response to, every piece of feedback provided. Rather, it requires a decision to be made after giving proper consideration to the feedback received.

To enable the Council to do this, all feedback was provided to Council on 31 August and Members of Council held a workshop on 17 September 2018. The purpose of the workshop, which ran for over three hours, was to assist members of Council to engage with the feedback, consider the points made, and ask any questions of relevant senior staff. University management, including the Vice-Chancellor, left the discussion after 75 minutes to enable Council members to discuss without management present.

Criticisms of the consultation process

A number of submitters in the formal consultation raised concerns with the consultation process. These included:

- Consultation wasn't genuine because the decision was predetermined (or was a 'fait accompli').
- The University should have conducted a poll, survey or referendum.
- The University should have attempted to reach a consensus view.
- The mechanisms used by the University to notify, and seek the views of, those consulted were ineffective.
- The Vice-Chancellor did not have a genuinely open mind on this matter.
- The Vice-Chancellor was an inappropriate person to receive feedback given that he did not have a genuinely open mind on the matter and is also the employer of all University staff.
- The consultation period was too short.
- Relevant supporting data and information was not provided.
- The University should have initially consulted on whether or not the name should change.

In addition, a number of people proposed alternative consultation processes (including making references to processes run by, or mechanisms used by, other sectors or organisations—including Select Committees, the Law Commission and the use of White/Green Papers).

We have considered these issues and are satisfied that the process adopted was robust. In particular, we note that:

- In making its draft decision, the Council formed and expressed a preliminary view on a proposed name change. Such a preliminary decision does not, in and of itself, create predetermination. What is required is that the Council, as the decision-maker, consider the matters outlined in this paper, the feedback provided, and the other information it has considered as part of the process with an open mind.
- The Council is entitled to determine the form of consultation process and is not required to undertake a poll, survey or referendum.
- The University used a wide range of mechanisms to notify the proposed name change and seek feedback, as detailed. There is no requirement for notifications to be in any particular form; the University's mechanisms included direct emails, meetings, e-newsletters, social media posts and advertising.
- We consider that sufficient information was provided to enable people to be adequately informed. A draft decision paper was released on 27 July and placed on the University's website along with a range of supporting information. Following that, further explanatory material was disseminated through three public forums, two student forums, four staff forums and advertisements in the Dominion Post.
- Sufficient time was provided and people were given a fair opportunity to comment on the draft decision. The consultation period was extended from an initial period of just over two weeks to just over four weeks.
- There was a particular concern expressed in submissions that the Vice-Chancellor cannot participate in this decision with an open mind. As the Council is aware, it was considered appropriate that the Vice-Chancellor explain the reasons behind the draft decision, respond to criticism of the draft

decision and the process, and encourage submissions on the draft decision. Having done so, the Vice-Chancellor acknowledges that he may no longer be able to bring a genuinely open mind to the matter and will not participate in Council's discussion of, or vote on, this matter (other than responding to questions asked by members of Council). Given this, the Vice-Chancellor also did not participate in the Council workshop on 17 September beyond answering initial questions from members of Council before Council moved to a Council-only discussion (which the Vice-Chancellor and other members of University management did not attend).

- It is correct that the Vice-Chancellor is the employer of all staff. However, the Council requested that email feedback on the draft decision be sent to feedback@vuw.ac.nz rather than to the Vice-Chancellor and written feedback be addressed to the Chancellor. This reflects that it was Council's draft decision and it was the Council, not the Vice-Chancellor, seeking feedback.
- Some feedback was received from submitters expressing support for the consultation process undertaken.

The University has been advised throughout this process by law firms Simpson Grierson and Chapman Tripp.

Consultation feedback

At the conclusion of the formal consultation process, the University received 2,053 email, phone, verbal or written submissions. Of these, 1,379 were from alumni, 219 from staff, 185 from students, 86 from stakeholders and 184 from people who we could not assign to a particular group.

Feedback provided to the Council

A full record of all email, phone and written feedback received via consultation channels and links to the University's public social media accounts containing comments was made available for review by Council members on 31 August 2018. Late submissions were provided on 14 September 2018.

Email, phone and written submissions

In analysing the feedback, people were assigned to a group based on how they identified themselves. Where a person could be classified into more than one group (i.e. they identified as an alumni and a staff member), that person was classified into the group that they identified as their primary group. Where a person could not be identified, they have been classified as 'public/unidentified'.

Some submissions were signed by more than one person. For processing purposes these submissions have been counted once and assigned to the person who sent the feedback. However, Council members were provided copies of these submission in full which included the details of those who co-signed.

The University has also received a change.org petition titled 'Keep Victoria in Victoria University of Wellington's name' containing 6,128 signatures. This petition was attached to the submission of an alumnus and has been provided to Council.

The table below summarises the volume of feedback received by the University from 27 July 2018 to 10:00am 28 August 2018. Late submissions are not included in the below, but were provided separately to Council.

Overall summary	Total number	Number of respondents	Supportive	Against	Neutral
Staff	3,300	219	117 (53%)	96 (44%)	6 (3%)
Student	22,000	185	15 (8%)	170 (92%)	0 (0%)
Stakeholders	N/A	86	69 (80%)	9 (10%)	8 (9%)
Alumni	50,000 ²	1,379	229 (17%)	1,121 (81%)	29 (2%)
Unidentified	N/A	184	28 (15%)	152 (83%)	4 (2%)
Change.org petition	N/A	6,128	N/A	6,128	N/A

We note that the submissions come from only a small minority of the total potential pool of staff, students and alumni.

Social media comments

In addition to feedback received through the formal process, there was also wide public discussion of the draft decision, including on social media. Social media responses on the University's social media pages were predominantly opposed to the proposal—over 430 comments were made.

Other external poll results provided in submissions

Submissions received from the Tertiary Education Union (TEU), Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association (VUWSA), and the Victoria University of Wellington Law Students' Society (VUWLSS) contained results from polls run by those organisations. Below are those results.

Name change	Total	Supportive	Against	Neutral
VUWLSS	575	55	520	N/A
VUWSA	777	48	722	7
TEU	418	133	208	77

Māori name change	Total	Supportive	Against	Neutral
TEU	418	258	60	100

² This is the approximate number contacted via e-newsletter.

Consultation process	Total	Sufficient	Insufficient	Neutral
VUWSA	777	45	714	18
TEU	418	120	247	51

Note there are people who have taken part in these polls and petitions who have also provided formal submissions. Polls and petitions run by persons external to the University and which were not provided to the University have not been included.

Consideration of consultation feedback

Prior to making our recommendations, we have reviewed and considered all submissions in detail.

We acknowledge there are arguments made against the recommendation, and there is a strength of feeling in opposition to this proposal. However, having considered the submissions, we remain of the view that the University's future and strategic vision is best secured by simplifying our name to 'University of Wellington'.

To enable members of Council to consider these matters for themselves, we have set out these themes and provided our analysis below.

Key themes from feedback

In identifying themes, we applied a low minimum threshold—the themes outlined below appear in at least two per cent of the written submissions (including the comments accompanying the change.org petition).

Feedback on the consultation process itself has been addressed above.

Themes considered in the draft decision paper

The following themes discussed in the draft decision paper were also prominent in feedback during the second formal round of consultation. We have re-considered the themes and each of the submissions in light of the draft decision and remain comfortable with the overall assessment in the draft decision document.

These themes are as follows:

- **The name Victoria holds value due to its prestigious history and how it distinguishes the University from others**

The feedback included concerns that the proposal would sacrifice the prestige and point of difference associated with the University due to the lost inclusion of 'Victoria' in its name. This feedback was the most common amongst those opposed to the proposal, particularly among alumni.³

Victoria University of Wellington has a proud history and those associated with the University understand its role, value and distinctive strengths. We note that the University's role in society will be unchanged and we are confident the institution's legacy will remain with a changed name.

Regarding the comments about Victoria distinguishing the University from others, we agree that Victoria (like Wellington) has distinguishing characteristics in the New

³ A table analysing the themes is provided at the end of this section.

Zealand market. However, in the global market we note a number of other universities also use Victoria prominently in their name and our analysis shows that the name 'Victoria' has not distinguished the University from others globally.

If the name change is approved, the University will establish an initiative to ensure that the legacy of the name is respected and honoured. As previously outlined, we intend the initiative to be led by a senior academic and may include the use of 'Victoria' in our awards, annual lectures, symposia, rooms and buildings.

- **Victoria University of Wellington is well regarded overseas; this change will have a negative impact on recognition and association with this strong position**

A number of submitters stated that the University has a strong reputation overseas and that a change in name will negatively impact on this. This view was particularly strong among alumni.

We acknowledge that any name change will need to be carefully managed to minimise the risk of negative impact during transition.

Professional advice from University ranking agencies indicates this is a relatively low risk. Marketing professionals at QS and THE were confident that simplifying the University's name was a good idea based on their experience of similar changes made by other universities.

Our research and advice also suggest that simplifying and clarifying our name will assist with the process of building positively on the University's international standing.

- **The use of Victoria in the name results in misidentification and/or misappropriation of work; and 'Victoria' is overused in the world and not distinctive**

A number of submitters agreed with our assessment that 'Victoria' was overused and insufficiently distinctive and that there was a risk of misidentification or misappropriation of academic work. These two themes featured strongly in the submissions made by staff who supported the proposal.

A number of submitters also provided their own examples or evidence of problems faced with the current name. These highlighted concerns with the use of the name offshore and confusion created from the prominence of Victoria in our name.

- **Alumni, staff and students are invested in the Victoria name and have a strong connection to the current name**

A number of staff, and many alumni and students, expressed their personal connections to the existing name.

We acknowledge that the current name holds significance for a number of people. In many, but not all, instances this significance appeared to relate to a concern regarding the University's history and prestige being linked to its name.

On a practical level, it should be noted that previous graduates would continue to be graduates of Victoria University of Wellington and would not be required to replace their official certificate, unless they wish to.

- **The proposed name is modern and progressive**

There was a view among some submitters that the name change created the impression of a modern and progressive university and/or aligns better to the future direction of the University.

This theme was mentioned by a number of the staff who supported the proposal and a number of stakeholders.

- **Concerns with Wellington as an identifier and that the name University of Wellington is very generic**

A number of submitters expressed concern that the proposal would not have the intended effect of enhancing our identity and reputation. Many commented that there are a number of other 'Wellingtons' in the world, or other universities in Wellington, which the University could be confused with. This feedback was largely provided by alumni of the University.

We do not consider that this is supported by our research and analysis.

There are no other universities with this name in the world, and no other cities named Wellington with universities. Of all the places named 'Wellington' in the world, Wellington, New Zealand is the largest and the only capital city.

The enhanced focus on the word Wellington in the proposed simplified name is consistent with our civic university ethos and our positioning as New Zealand's globally ranked capital city university. These commitments are outlined in our strategic plan. The change allows us to leverage the considerable investment made by Wellington City Council and others in marketing the word 'Wellington' on an international scale.

We are also by far the largest university in Wellington. Other universities only operate branches in Wellington.

Some submitters also commented that Wellington itself has low recognition, so linking our name to the city is not a good thing. We do not agree that Wellington's reputation will hold the University back. As New Zealand's capital city university our fortunes are tied and we believe that the University and the city can continue to grow the reputation of each other.

A smaller number of submitters also noted that distance from the city name could be good, in case the city has reputational issues itself. We do not agree and believe together our joint identities can achieve more than our individual efforts can.

- **The proposed name provides a stronger link to our geographical location**

A number of submitters considered that the suggested name offered greater connection to Wellington and our geographic location. These submitters emphasised the importance of this clear tie to Wellington.

Conversely many other submissions urged the University to use the current name of the University in full to achieve the same effect. This is discussed later in this section under the theme heading 'Alternative measures should be considered instead of a name change'.

Related to this theme a number of stakeholders who support the proposal are leaders within the Wellington community and represent organisations tasked with ensuring the vibrancy and prosperity of the region. This list includes, but isn't limited to, the region's Mayors and the Wellington Regional Economic Development Agency.

It should also be noted that a number of prominent Wellingtonians also oppose the proposal and this group includes some city councillors.

- **Potential impact on the University's domestic brand as Victoria is well regarded in New Zealand**

A number of submitters highlighted the University's strong domestic brand and commented this could be impacted negatively by a name change. We acknowledge this concern and consider that it would be mitigated by the careful and considered implementation of any change.

We would ensure ongoing consistency in our domestic positioning and recruitment campaign materials. Any changes beyond the name and logo would be kept to a minimum. We know from regular student surveys that the top four motivators for students choosing to study here are; that it offers the best option for the programme the student wants to study; that it is close to where family is; the lifestyle of living in Wellington, and University reputation.

We believe the name simplification proposal would not impact negatively on these motivations. Also, domestic students have relatively rich sources of information about the University which includes parents, careers advisors, peers, alumni and knowledge and awareness gathered over time through factors such as University visits and discussions with supervisors. These sources, together with strong University communications, will provide sufficient context, making a simplified name a minor consideration for prospective domestic students.

We also consider that a name change is unlikely to undermine our domestic reputation more generally.

We are intending the change to be positive, to more closely link our University with our city, its vibrancy and excellent international reputation. We consider this should be further enhanced by the proposed inclusion of Te Herenga Waka.

- **Renaming will have little impact, and any change in prospects of the University cannot be attributed to a name change**

A number of submissions consider that the renaming will have little impact and any change in prospects of the University could not be attributed to a name change. Here, many submitted that people would still refer to the University as 'Victoria' or 'Vic' even after a name change.

Professional advice suggests that simplifying and clarifying the name of the University will have a positive impact on the University's international prominence. This advice is supported by the research and analysis we have undertaken and the discussions with other institutions that have experienced such changes.

As described in the draft decision, the name simplification project is a foundational step in a wider programme of work the University is undertaking to further improve international reputation and enhance the University's financial sustainability.

- **Concern with the costs of a name change, with funds better used elsewhere**

The second most common theme among those submitters opposed to the proposal related to the cost of the change. The responses often cited other areas they viewed this money being better spent on.

In our view, the financial investment in the name simplification is prudent and appropriate. We consider that the proposal is an investment in the University's future as a world-renowned university. Further financial expenditure on international reputation would be more effective and directed in areas to result in additional revenue.

If the name change is approved, the costs will be managed prudently with the level of expenditure to be kept within assessed benefits.

The expenditure in this area also does not detract from our commitment to providing excellent teaching, research and student support services across the University.

- **Feedback regarding the proposed Māori name**

Some of the supporting submissions referred approvingly to the proposed Māori name, Te Herenga Waka. This idea also received support from some submitters who were otherwise opposed to the proposal to change the University's legal name.

A small number of submitters did not like the new Māori name, many preferring the existing Māori name instead.

Opposition to having a Māori name was infrequent and its inclusion is important to reflect our culture, values and our obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi.

- **Alternative name suggestions**

A number of submitters provided alternate potential names for the University including Victoria University New Zealand, University of Aotearoa, University of Poneke and many others.

We remain of the view that University of Wellington is the most appropriate name.

New themes from submissions on the Draft Decision paper

There were six themes that arose in the submissions that did not appear in the earlier round of feedback or the draft decision paper. These are outlined below.

- **The arguments and reasons presented in the draft decision paper are not compelling.**

Many submitters analysed the draft decision document or provided submissions with references made to other public critiques of the draft decision materials. These critiques ranged from short summary statements regarding the submitters' reviews of the material to detailed consideration of multiple parts of the document. As well as the concerns discussed in the section above, these also included concerns with:

- Inadequate evidence of name confusion;

- Inadequate evidence of change in international student numbers/reputation;
- Concern with the naming principles presented, for example the value of a distinctive name, two nouns are better than three;
- Concern with the use of Google tools for analysis;
- Concern with the Colmar Brunton analysis, both in the analysis approach and conclusions from the research;
- Concern benefits are overstated;
- Concern costs are understated;
- Concern with references to the University of Manchester;
- Concern with the lack of cost benefit analysis or discounted cash flow analysis shown in the presentation; and
- Other potential options to improve international reputation without changing the name (e.g. changing emphasis of Wellington in the current branding).

We have thought carefully about these concerns and after review of this material we continue to be comfortable with the research, analysis and professional advice we have received. In particular, management is satisfied that the evidence about the shortcomings of our current name is inescapable and that the benefits of improved name clarity, distinctiveness and memorability are compelling. The word Victoria is not unique in the tertiary sector. To gain cut through in an international context we rely on our name being used in full, something which is uncommon and far from controllable. By removing one word from our current name we are left with a brand that is unique, clear and distinct. It also reduces the number of variants which can be used when attributing our research and success.

Concern costs of the name change are understated

As part of planning for any potential implementation of the name change, we have conducted a detailed assessment of key cost areas for the change. These estimated costs have been detailed in the draft decision document where funding would be required for external costs above levels that can be re-prioritised in existing budgets. For some items, such as signage, we have engaged in detailed costings with third party providers and are confident that the costs to the University of these changes will be able to be managed by reprioritising existing maintenance budgets. These costs are not in the order of magnitude expressed by many from examples at United States universities, and reflect our commitment to effective and efficient development of signage at our campuses.

We have also compared the overall costs of our planned name change with publicly available information from other universities that have planned and/or implemented such a change. Our figures for the name change cost are in line with those who have provided costs for the name change alone, these predominately being examples from the United Kingdom.

It should be noted that the name change is part of a wider programme of work planned to increase the University's international reputation. The costs provided for the name change are exclusive of any wider programme costs.

Concern benefits of the name change are overstated

We recognise that many of the financial benefits of a name change will be indirect. These will come from a closer connection to our city and our vision, and through the benefits of enhanced international name clarity, distinctiveness and memorability.

The name change will also provide a critical component in the development of the University's international reputation, and enable the effective delivery of other components of work within our international reputation programme. This programme is expected to deliver significant benefits to the University. If quantified in international student revenues alone, which is to significantly downplay the wider benefits international students and reputation will bring, these would be measured in the tens of millions of dollars annually to the University. The name change will not achieve this on its own, rather it is a key enabler for other initiatives to effectively grow the University's international reputation.

Given the nature of these benefits we have also not sought to subjectively quantify them in a discounted cash flow analysis. Rather we have provided discussion of benefits, costs and risks through relevant sections of the draft decision document.

Complaint regarding research

Concerns were raised with the Colmar Brunton research. A complaint was lodged with the Research Association of New Zealand (RANZ) alleging that the way the research had been designed, conducted and reported breached RANZ Code of Practice.

RANZ found this complaint to be without merit in a final decision issued mid-September 2018. A statement on RANZ's website states:

On 31 July, a complaint was lodged against Colmar Brunton alleging they breached the Code of Practice in a number of ways. After review of all the information provided by the Complainant and Colmar Brunton, including consultation with subject matter experts in Statistics, the Professional Standards Group found the complaint to be without merit. Colmar Brunton was found to have complied with the Code of Practice and to have conducted the research in line with industry standards in all respects that were brought to our attention.

The full text of RANZ's final decision, together with a letter of objection from the complainant, has been provided to members of Council.

- ***Alternative measures should be considered instead of a name change***

A number of submitters suggested alternate measures that could be used to increase the international reputation of the University. There were two key areas:

1. Activities outside of naming and branding to increase international reputation, for example targeted research funding, conferences, targeted outreach and increased international marketing; and
2. Changes that could be made to the current branding without changing the name, for example greater emphasis of Wellington in the logo, or introducing New Zealand to the logo.

We agree with the first point above; there are other activities we can undertake as a University to improve our international reputation.

As described in the draft decision, the name simplification project is just one part of a wider programme of work the University is undertaking to improve its international reputation. This programme of work is investigating and implementing a series of

initiatives targeted to further increase the international prominence of the University and increase international name recognition. This programme includes work on bilateral relationships, improving our research publication credentials, international promotion and other multiple streams to help distinguish ourselves internationally and improve international perceptions of the University by potential staff, students, funders, donors, alumni and other stakeholders.

We believe the name change is an essential first step, by providing name recognition, differentiation and memorability to help us deliver on the University's positioning and vision, and to make other activities in the programme more effective. Advice from ranking agencies QS and THE, and from Assignment, the Wellington-based branding and communications company, support this.

Regarding the second point above—potential changes to our branding without a name change—our research, analysis and external advice suggest that investment in promoting the current name would be ineffective given our current name's lack of clarity and memorability. The importance of including New Zealand in our brand however, has been well canvassed and would be taken on board regardless of the outcome of this process.

- **A name change would result in further confusion/loss of reputation/loss of prestige and this risk has not been correctly accounted for in the draft decision paper.**

A number of submitters have highlighted that the potential risk of loss of reputation and prestige have not been accounted for sufficiently in the draft decision document.

In the short term, any change in name would need to be carefully communicated to key groups prior to the change taking place.

University name changes are not uncommon. Both the ranking agencies and the publication databases have advised that they have well tested processes for managing institutional name changes through use of algorithms and aliases that ensure accurate collation of the outputs of a newly-named institution with the outputs produced under the current name.

Longer term, we consider that reduced confusion about our name, and the ability to reflect and promote the work of our community, will ensure our prestige accurately matches our capability.

- **Concerns around degree value and employment consequences.**

Some submitters, particularly current students, expressed concern about the impact that a name change could potentially have on the value of their degree and associated consequences for finding employment.

University name changes are not uncommon. However, the University would carefully work through these concerns to ensure that people are not disadvantaged from this change.

Prior to any name change taking effect, we are planning that all contactable alumni would receive a formal letter from the University outlining the name change. This letter would also serve as a formal document that could be used by graduates, alongside existing documentation, to verify the change of name for the University.

When employers contact the University to verify qualifications, we would also confirm a graduate's status as a graduate of Victoria University of Wellington or University of Wellington. Currently, virtually all internet searches for the University of Wellington and Victoria University of Wellington are directed to our website. We would ensure this continues, so employers could easily contact us for verification checks. There will be no change to other contact details for the University such as phone numbers and physical address.

There would be no official need for graduates to replace their qualification certificates, but some may choose to do so.

- **Concern about potential acronyms and what would replace 'Vic'.**

Many submitters expressed their personal connections to the shortened name 'Vic' (as well as 'VUW') and their concerns about any replacement acronym associated with the new name.

We acknowledge these concerns and the connections people feel to these terms.

While 'Vic' is not a term officially used by the University, any abbreviation associated with University of Wellington would need to be considered during implementation. It may need to be reflected in shortened web urls, email addresses and in other ways, to ensure it is consistent.

- **Negative impact on donations, financial support and goodwill.**

A further concern expressed in submissions was the potential impact a change would have on the University's receipt of donations, financial support and goodwill.

We do not consider that a name change would pose a long term risk to donations and financial support.

The Chair of the Victoria University of Wellington Foundation, a charitable trust set up to raise private funds for projects of strategic importance at the University, supports the name change.

Most of our donors give to the University in order to benefit society by way of our teaching and research roles. The proposed change to our name would not affect our role in society. Key University donors were spoken to throughout the process and donors received a copy of the draft decision when it was released. Very limited feedback has been received that would indicate that there might be a long term negative impact.

The wider alumni community is important to the University and support and advocacy from that community is highly valued. Graduates of Victoria University of Wellington would remain alumni of the University and the University is committed to continuing to provide the alumni community opportunities to remain connected with each other and with students and staff (via mentoring, communications, events etc).

- **Lack of support from staff, students and alumni.**

This theme was raised in a number of submissions and with particular reference to the 4th criterion in the criteria published by the Ministry of Education on 13 July 2018. That states:

4. The council can demonstrate that there is support for a name change

The Council should provide evidence that there is demonstrable support for a name change from the relevant affected parties consulted with as per criterion 3.

Management has provided members of Council with the analysis of the support (and otherwise) from the submissions, so that the Council can make its own assessment of the level of support.

Under the relevant legal framework, the Education Act 1989 does not require a Council making a recommendation to the Minister under section 162(5) to demonstrate support for a name change or require the Minister to consider levels of support in making a decision.

Rather, and as discussed above, the Education Act 1989 requires a Council to make a recommendation to the Minister in accordance with the statutory duties of the Council and the applicable statutory purpose and objectives. These statutory duties require members of Council to make this decision in the best interests of the University.

Demonstrable support

We have sought advice regarding what is meant by 'demonstrable support'. We note that is not to be equated with *majority* support.⁴

From the submissions received, we consider that there is 'demonstrable support' for the proposed change. The majority of staff submissions (53%) support the change, as does a significant majority of the stakeholder submissions (80%).

However, a strong majority of those alumni and students who made submissions do not support the proposal, for the reasons outlined above.

Occurrence of themes

To assist the Council, we have captured the following data to track the commonalities in the themes raised by the submission.

While this task has been undertaken carefully, there is an element of interpretation involved so the numbers should be seen as indicative, rather than forensic.

⁴ The only legislative reference to 'demonstrable support' in New Zealand is in clause 8(1) of Schedule 3 to the Local Government Act 2002, relating to local government reorganisation proposals. Where the Local Government Commission decides to assess a reorganisation application, the Commission must first be satisfied that "there is demonstrable community support for local government reorganisation in the district of each affected territorial authority". The Local Government Act goes on to state that 'demonstrable community support' is not to be regarded as majority support. Clause 8(3) of Schedule 3 states that the Local Government Commission "does not need to determine whether the persons who support local government reorganisation are a majority of the persons in an affected area".

Themes in the Draft Decision paper

Theme	Staff	Students	Stakeholders	Alumni	Unidentified	Total	Petition
The name 'Victoria' holds value due to its prestigious history and how it distinguishes the University from others	28	61	4	411	51	555	175
Victoria University of Wellington is well regarded overseas, this change will have a negative impact on recognition and association with this strong position	13	16	2	136	8	175	30
The use of 'Victoria' in the name results in misidentification and/or misappropriation of work	25	0	11	16	3	55	0
'Victoria' is overused in the world and not distinctive	39	5	13	56	9	122	0
Alumni, staff and students are invested in the Victoria name and have a strong connection to the current name	14	34	2	205	5	260	48
The proposed name is modern and progressive	37	6	16	48	8	115	0
Concerns with Wellington as an identifier and that the name University of Wellington is very generic	16	29	4	201	19	269	37
The proposed name provides a stronger link to our geographical location	23	4	19	38	6	90	0
Potential impact on the University's domestic brand as Victoria is well regarded in New Zealand	4	16	1	95	9	125	24
Renaming will have little impact, and any change in prospects of the University cannot be attributed to the name change	18	17	2	110	18	165	6
Concern with the costs of a name change, with funds better used elsewhere	49	84	1	286	41	461	125
Support for the proposed Māori name	21	15	5	102	6	149	1
Alternative name suggestions	18	9	2	63	17	109	3

New themes

Theme	Staff	Students	Stakeholders	Alumni	Unidentified	Total	Petition
The arguments and reasons presented in the draft decision paper are not compelling	48	62	3	410	34	557	90
A name change will result in further confusion/ loss of reputation/loss of prestige and this risk has not been correctly accounted for in the draft decision paper	19	29	4	137	15	204	10
Lack of support from staff, students and alumni	30	43	4	99	6	182	16
Concerns around degree value and employment consequences	8	19	2	139	9	177	19
Concern about potential acronyms and what would replace 'Vic'	18	17	4	81	9	129	33
Negative impact on donations, financial support and goodwill	5	0	1	40	5	51	2

Error in draft decision paper

One submission highlighted an error in Appendix A, page 36, of the draft decision paper. In this appendix the paper stated:

Note: Victoria University in Melbourne, Australia was historically named Footscray Institute of Technology, but changed its name in 1990 after being granted university status by the Victoria State Parliament and undergoing amalgamations with other Melbourne tertiary institutions.

The submitter correctly advised the change in name in 1990 was from Footscray Institute of Technology to Victoria University of Technology, not to Victoria University. The subsequent name change to Victoria University occurred in 2005.

Next steps

If the recommendations are approved by Council, the next step in the process would be to send a letter formally recommending the change to the Minister of Education. This would be done promptly after the decision is made by Council.

At the same time, we would also release a brand narrative and associated logo for public viewing. The development of this has been done in conjunction with Assignment Group as part of the review of University brand architecture discussed in the draft decision.

As outlined previously, more detailed implementation planning would also commence to develop a phased approach leading up to an official change in January 2020. This timeframe will allow the University to both communicate the change and the rationale as well as develop a plan to roll out changes in a way that utilises existing resources and prudently manages costs.

Central to the planning will be ensuring that staff have access to the information they need, and that our students, graduates and alumni have the documentation which provides assurance their qualification and status is not affected.

Appendix A – Timeline

The following is an outline of all consultation steps undertaken by the University since February 2018 and includes both the initial feedback period (1 May – 8 June) and the formal consultation period following the draft decision (27 July – 27 August).

February 2018

- Engagement started with audiences outside the University in confidence and a forum was held with senior University leaders.

May 2018

- Five forums attended by more than 550 staff presented by the Vice-Chancellor were held **1-4 May**, on all campuses. A video of the Vice-Chancellor's presentation was placed on the staff intranet for people unable to attend.
- The story was widely reported in media and the Vice-Chancellor was interviewed a number of times. Outlets that covered the story included TVNZ, Newshub, NewstalkZB, Dominion Post, the Herald and Radio NZ.
- Student forum was co-hosted with VUWSA in the Hub on **4 May**.
- Publicity on University website began, including the front page of the Current Students' Hub, Facebook, Alumni Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and LinkedIn as well as external media, with details of how people could provide feedback. A column in VicNews (internal staff newsletter) on **7 May** provided more background for staff.
- Alumni e-newsletter was sent out to 45,000 alumni on **9 May** with a column from the Vice-Chancellor about the proposal and a link to more information on the web page. The e-newsletter also contained a story from Associate Professor Dan Laufer with his perspective on the proposal. An upcoming public meeting was advertised in the e-newsletter.
- Public forum was held on **23 May** at Rutherford House – this was promoted in a media release on **11 May**. The media release was picked up by Newstalk ZB (Auckland), Salient and NZCity. The invitation was posted on Victoria University's social media channels including alumni Facebook and website.
- Stakeholder forum was held **30 May**. Personal invitations sent to over 200 stakeholders.
- Potential name change was discussed at well-attended alumni events in London, Edinburgh, New York and San Francisco.

June 2018

- Alumni e-newsletter sent on **1 June** with a story about the continuing discussion on the name change and an invitation for alumni to provide feedback to an email address. This was the most opened story in the e-newsletter.
- The official feedback period ended on **8 June** but feedback continued to be welcomed and received until 19 July. This was publicised through social media channels and on the website.
- Post uploaded on the Alumni Facebook page **11 June** thanking alumni who made a submission and advising those who were unable to do so to date that they still could make a submission to the email address.
- Vice-Chancellor continued to complete media interviews.
- Ongoing updates to material were made on the University's website.

27 July 2018 – University Council makes draft decision and begins period of formal consultation

July

- University Council reached a draft decision on Friday **27 July** and announced a further period for feedback. This was communicated through an all-staff email, alumni e-newsletter, emails to people who had made submissions and to stakeholders, a media release and social media posts on all University pages. We answered questions and provided links to more information on the website.
- Vice-Chancellor completed a number of media interviews.
- Information about the draft decision has been in a prominent position on the front page of the University's website since **27 July** (and at other times during May and June).

August, 2018

- Opinion piece from the Vice-Chancellor appeared in the Dominion Post on **3 August**.
- Advertisement placed in Dominion Post on **4 August** publicising public meetings on 6, 7 and 8 August and advising how to give feedback on the draft decision.
- Advertisement placed in Dominion Post on **6 August** publicising public meetings, how to give feedback and providing some of the thinking underpinning the Council's decision.
- Student forum held on **6 August** at Rutherford House and broadcast live via Facebook.
- Article on the draft decision appeared in Salient on **6 August**.
- Public meetings held on **6, 7 and 8 August**.
- While not arranged by the University, a student protest was held outside the Hunter Building on the University's Kelburn Campus on **7 August**. Approximately 30 people attended.
- A student perspective on the proposal published on the MyView blog, which sits alongside the University's website, on **6 August**
- A video of the Vice-Chancellor's presentation at one of the public meetings was posted on the University's website on **8 August** and the link publicised through social media channels.
- Ongoing additions were made to the University website material on the proposal.
- On **9 August**, the feedback period was extended for two weeks until Monday 27 August. This was widely publicised through the University's website, social media channels, a media release, a letter to alumni, a letter to stakeholders and a letter to everyone who had provided feedback to the official feedback channels.
- Advertisement was placed in Dominion Post advising of extension to the feedback period on **11 August**.
- A further student forum was held on **16 August** at the Kelburn campus.
- Further staff forums were held on **17, 20, 21 and 22 August**.

- Advertisements appeared in the Dominion Post on **19, 22 and 25 August** answering frequently asked questions about the draft decision and publicising how to provide feedback.
- The Vice-Chancellor has personally responded, where possible, to hundreds of emails from students, staff, alumni and stakeholders. The Vice-Chancellor and members of the Senior Leadership Team have also had numerous face-to-face meetings and conversations about the proposal.
- Formal consultation closed at 5:00pm on **27 August**. Late feedback was still accepted until 10:00am on **28 August**.