



**TERTIARY EDUCATION UNION**  
Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa

**Submission of the Tertiary Education Union Te Hautū Kahurangi o  
Aotearoa (Northtec branch)**

**On the organisational change proposal documents**

**“The Case for Change at Northtec”**

**And**

**“Towards a New Northtec – Proposals for Change October 2017”**

*27<sup>th</sup> November 2017*

**For further information please contact:**

Chan Dixon  
TEU Organiser  
[chan.dixon@teu.ac.nz](mailto:chan.dixon@teu.ac.nz)

Bill Rogers  
Branch President  
[bill.rogers@northtec.ac.nz](mailto:bill.rogers@northtec.ac.nz)

Stephanie Morgan  
Branch President  
[stephanie.morgan@northtec.ac.nz](mailto:stephanie.morgan@northtec.ac.nz)

## 1. Introduction

This submission has been prepared on behalf of TEU members at NorthTec Tai Tokerau Wānanga in response to the organisational change proposal documents *“The Case for Change at Northtec”* and *“Towards a New Northtec – Proposals for Change October 2017”*. The submission also references further information requested by the TEU and provided by Northtec management as part of the organisational review process.

The NorthTec Branch of the Tertiary Education Union Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa has 160 members in academic and allied positions, spread across most of NorthTec’s delivery sites including (at and in the surrounds of) Raumanga, Dyer St, Kensington, Kerikeri, Rāwene, Kaitaia, Kaikohe, Ngāwhā, Awataha, Whangaparaoa, and Auckland. TEU members appreciate the opportunity to submit on the change proposal, which of course is of considerable interest and concern.

## 2. Our approach to this submission

Any complex organisation should from time to time evaluate and review its systems and processes – this is good organisational practice. It allows the organisation to take a step back from day-to-day activities and consider whether it is meeting its objectives and responsibilities in the best possible way. As well TEIs should regularly assess whether the programmes and courses they offer continue to reflect and support the needs of their community, iwi and hapū, businesses, and service providers and meet national goals for the sector.

The proposals contained in the two documents *“The Case for Change at Northtec”* and *“Towards a New Northtec – Proposals for Change October 2017”* have ostensibly done this, but the evidence base and rationale for the changes proposed have been addressed so superficially, it is difficult to form any clear picture of why NorthTec senior management have concluded this is the direction the institution should be heading in.

In the body of this submission, we will address areas of concern for TEU members outlined in the change proposal *“Towards a New Northtec – Proposals for Change October 2017”* as well as referencing the document *“A Case for Change at Northtec”* and other information provided by NorthTec senior management. We will also seek clarification on a number of the assumptions and assertions made in these documents, and provide additional perspectives and analyses to assist the management team and council in their decision-making.

### **3. General comments on the change proposal (references *“Towards a New Northtec - Proposals for Change October 2017”* and *“The Case for Change at Northtec”*)**

Our regional and urban ITPs have to a large extent borne the brunt of the previous government’s funding and policy decisions for the sector. The previous government presided over a sector forced into an increasingly constrained funding environment, where the focus for the sector has been on delivering economic outcomes with scant regard to other broader outcomes for tertiary education. Policy for the sector has pushed a much narrower focus on priority areas for teaching and learning (STEM), with little regard for the many other subjects and disciplines needed for social and economic prosperity. And regional ITPs have suffered within a political system that has paid little attention to regional development.

The current review initiated by NorthTec reflects this recent history - it proposes narrowing provision, shifting focus from important lower level courses that provide a viable pathway to further study or employment, and attempts to predict future employment trends for the region with seemingly little reference to available analysis.

The review document also further embeds a view of ITPs promulgated by the previous government, which moves them further away from their core purpose as stated in the Education Act – that of tertiary education providers responding to diverse local need at all levels of tertiary education, within a framework of national goals and priorities.

The change proposal document notes the following factors that have contributed to decision-making about the future shape of Northtec:

- Economic, social, cultural and environmental prosperity of our region
- People wellness
- NorthTec's prosperity
- Regional and national need for expertise in STEM
- Alignment with the region's two economic growth strategies
- Student, industry and community demand for programmes now and into the future
- Graduate outcomes of the programme
- Educational performance outcomes of the course<sup>1</sup>

The change proposal identifies a number of courses, programmes and campuses for closure as part of the organisational change process. However NorthTec has been unable to provide detailed analysis of why the affected programmes, courses and campuses have been selected for review. We received a table setting out the variables used to assess programme financial health (David Harrop 9<sup>th</sup> November 2017) but no other information about performance of programmes across the institution has been provided. This makes it difficult to assess decisions to close specific courses, programmes and campuses. For example, financial information for the range of courses and programmes has been unclear, particularly regarding the composition of the margins leading to courses being viewed as unviable. It has also been difficult to understand what the difference is between the financial position of programmes selected for closure and other programmes.

We understand that decision-makers also considered other factors as broadly described on page 6 of the *Case For Change* document, but the specifics of *why* these programmes and campuses didn't meet these very broad criteria remain unclear. Overall it is concerning that those who have the most detailed information about programmes and courses (programme leaders and the Group Manager (regions) were not involved in discussions about the mix of provision.

---

<sup>1</sup> Northtec 20117. *Towards a New Northtec – Proposals for Change October 2017* page 6

Without a clear evidence base provided by the institution, our comments about changes to the mix of provision and closure of campuses are the result of our analysis of available data from the institution, demographic data for the region, information we have been able to access with regard to current and future employment trends for the region, government data and statistics, and the in-depth knowledge TEU members have of their own courses and programmes.

### **Economic, social, cultural and environmental prosperity of our region**

The Northland region recently agreed the key areas for action that are needed to ensure the region can prosper economically, socially, culturally and environmentally. *“The Case for Change at Northtec”* notes on page 5 that:

The roadmap for regional economic prosperity rests on actions in: land and water (forestry and wood processing; agriculture; horticulture and honey; Māori land management; aquaculture development), visitor industry development, specialised manufacturing services (marine manufacturing; mineral extraction; digital industries), enablers (logistics and transport infrastructure; digital infrastructure; skills and capability development; fresh water usage and storage; business innovation and support; regional land information).

Yet despite this clear direction, NorthTec’s change proposal includes removal of courses or programmes in:

- Visual arts (business innovation and support)\*
- Sport and recreation (visitor industry development)
- Tourism (visitor industry development)
- Business administration and computing (skills and capability development)
- Foundation level 2 (skills development and capability)
- OSH level four (supports health and safety and compliance in all priority areas)
- Closure of Rāwene and Kerikeri campuses for the foreseeable future (agriculture, tourism, skills and capability development)

\*The brackets after each proposed closure indicate one example of how the programme directly relates to the regional development action areas. This submission will expand on other contributions the programmes or campuses make to the Northland region.

The proposal also notes uncertainty with agriculture and horticulture programmes, with the hope that applications for increased funding will be agreed.

It is difficult to understand how decisions about these particular programmes or courses were reached, given the priorities in Northland's regional development plans. The *Case for Change* document notes government policy priorities and a demographic profile for the region, but there is no obvious analysis of regional data such as employment and occupational outlooks or iwi/hapū development priorities. And the review document itself has not drawn together any of the available data and information for the region to present a coherent business case in support of its proposals. For example, regional and national occupational outlook forecasts indicate strong growth in the construction and tourism sectors, yet the review document proposes cutting all tourism and several construction programmes. Furthermore whilst the proposal presents a range of new initiatives to support Māori learner achievement, which is to be commended, it lacks any detail on why other changes in programme provision have been decided.

The review proposal is also at odds with the likely direction of the new government. The policy framework already outlined by the Labour Coalition Government does nothing to suggest further downward trend in EFTS. In particular, there has been an undertaking to begin a first year of free study which the government estimates will lead to a 15% increase in domestic enrolments. The review proposal does not respond to this new direction, and in fact places the institution on the back foot in terms of its ability to deliver to a new cohort of domestic students.

The funding model that currently operates within the tertiary education sector does not support our smaller regional ITPs, many of whom must cover wide geographical areas with very diverse populations. The TEU has lobbied nationally for a sector-wide conversation about a new approach for the sector and we urge NorthTec and other ITPs to do the same.

To this end, we recommend that large-scale changes such as that proposed in this review be held off until this conversation takes place.

### **Projected EFTS reduction**

The chief executive's presentation to staff when the review document was released for consultation noted that NorthTec anticipated EFTS reductions as follows:

2016	3941 EFTS
2017	3740 EFTS (forecast)
2018	3400 EFTS (initial budget)

Northland's population has increased from 168,300 in 2015 to 175,400 in 2017 (Statistics NZ 2017). A report prepared for Whangarei District Council in 2015 noted overall unemployment rates at 8.8 percent (these have reduced for June 2017 quarter to 7.5 percent) and Māori unemployment rates of 12.4 percent. In the same year amongst the general population, 25 percent had no qualifications, with Māori at 36 percent. (Seutter 2015: 3-4).

Yet despite this cohort of potential students, NorthTec senior management and council are anticipating a downward trend in EFTS for 2018. Once again this highlights the urgent need for a comprehensive community engagement, information and marketing strategy for the institution. It is unacceptable that academic staff are left to attempt to recruit students and market their programmes when it is clear that an overarching strategy is needed.

### **The issue of staffing levels and teaching hours**

The *Case for Change* document misinterprets comparative academic staffing data to attempt to illustrate that NorthTec is "significantly overstaffed in teaching positions". In fact the data shows that the staffing *mix*, rather than staffing numbers, is out of kilter with the sector, due to the high numbers of staff low in the salary structure. This is no surprise to us, and represents the cumulative effect of several years of deliberate salary deflating behaviour at NorthTec. For example:

- Staff are recruited in larger numbers at the lower ends of the salary structure;

- Promotion to SASM and PASM has been turned down at alarmingly high levels, such that members report an aversion to applying for promotion and disillusionment with the process and system.

However, even with these considerations the numbers still do not add up. What is clear is that the large number of ASMs NorthTec has reported for this review includes all academic staff on IEAs, who may be being paid at SASM or PASM rates, but are not specified as such. This is causing a mismatch in Tribal data, as NorthTec is the only ITP that we are aware of which doesn't accurately designate its staff as ASM, SASM and PASM, irrespective of whether they are on a collective or individual agreement. Most ITPs take the academic staff or general staff collective agreement as the universal basis on which to employ and promote its staff. Most ITPs don't have a strategy to make those agreements different, with the exception of NorthTec and one other.

We acknowledge that NorthTec is of the view that the figures relating to IEA staff who are not designated accurately are small; our position is that this fundamental inaccuracy in how NorthTec reports to Tribal leaves us with questions about the accuracy of all the data.

### **The issue of timetabled teaching hours**

The TEU raised concerns with Judy Campbell about the use of TTH data in the *Case For Change* document that drew the erroneous conclusion NorthTec academic staff teaching hours were much lower than academic staff in other ITPs. In fact, TTH averages are similar across ITPs. Given that the actual change proposals have no bearing on the TTH claims in the *Case for Change* document, we have agreed to discuss such matters with NorthTec representatives outside of this review, in early 2018.

## 4. Detailed response to the change proposals

### Mix of provision and impact on programmes and staffing (pages 6-9)

The opening paragraph of the review document “*Towards a New Northtec – Proposals for Change October 2017*” implies that mix of provision proposals are a result of the TEC capped funding environment and therefore where EFTS can be allocated. As far as we are aware, NorthTec’s new investment plan has not been signed off. This is particularly important to note, because the sector is now working under a new government who has already signalled a specific focus on regions and regional prosperity. The proposals in the review document mean that Northtec will limit its ability to respond to this new direction as well as previously mentioned economic and iwi development plans.

There has also been limited analysis, both in the *Case for Change* document and the review document itself, of the impact of what has been identified as an ad hoc approach to marketing, recruitment and communications for the institution. It is likely this has had a very significant impact on domestic EFTs in particular. Whilst the review proposal indicates some changes in this area, there is a real sense amongst TEU members that this is a case of “too little, too late”. The lack of strategy over a long period, despite the best efforts of staff to promote their own programmes, has clearly impacted on domestic student enrolments. This is an area that could provide just the support academic staff need to ensure their courses and programmes are well understood by local communities, and that they reflect current and future aspirations for these communities.

However instead of making focused changes in key areas such as marketing/recruitment and addressing issues brought about by poor leadership and communication, NorthTec has decided to undertake a costly (people and financial resources) organisational change process that uses dubious data and analysis to inform its decision-making, and that appears to have little connection to the priorities identified for the region. This adhoc approach is illustrated by the strategy the institution proposes to take in response to a changing context for the region:

- a. Revise its budgeted EFTS downward to 3400 (forecast to deliver 3740 in 2017);

- b. Attempt to choose which programmes are likely to see good enrolments, without a proper analysis of why domestic EFTs have been trending down.

The focus of the previous government and its funding policy framework has created an environment where institutions are forced to keep their focus firmly on returning a surplus, with important elements of tertiary education often coming a poor second. This funding environment has meant that decision-making about mix of provision has become less about a focus on breadth of provision coupled with identified regional speciality or national priorities, and more about responding to the previous government's limited view on what the tertiary education sector should provide.

To some extent then, it comes as no surprise that NorthTec's strategy also includes increasing management positions in terms of the ratio between managers and staff, reducing administrative and academic positions, with a focus on NorthTec becoming more 'business-like' and making little mention of how the changes outlined reflect what the region actually needs. And despite the emphasis on integrating kaupapa Māori, tikanga Māori and te reo Māori into the organisational structure, the proposal itself has given little indication of engagement with iwi and hapū that may have taken place prior to it being developed. Given population demographics for the region and NorthTec's stated commitment to working closely with iwi, hapū and Māori organisations, it is surprising that evidence of in-depth engagement with Māori and a summary of outcomes of these discussions is lacking in the review document.

In terms of affected programmes, it is interesting and important to note that several of the identified areas were among those which met or exceeded planned EFTS delivery targets in 2017– notably Arts, Computing and Administration, Sport and Recreation and Workplace Safety. Once again this leaves us questioning the impetus for this review and the evidence base on which decisions have been made.

We also note the gender impact of proposals to withdraw from disciplines such as Computing and Administration and Applied Arts, with a heavier focus on STEM and the traditional trades (which are currently male-dominated). Already the *Case for Change*

document states that 63 percent of domestic students are male. Is it NorthTec's intention to further skew this student gender balance and focus disproportionately on meeting the needs of Northland's men? What strategies does the institution have to ensure (1) women are encouraged to enrol in male-dominated trades programmes; and (2) a broad range of programmes and courses that meet the needs of *all* who may wish to participate in tertiary education in the region is maintained?

Our recommendation to NorthTec management and council is that all decisions about mix of provision and campus closures are put on hold until a much clearer picture of the intentions of the new government can be obtained. It is short-sighted and potentially damaging to the educational aspirations of Northland's communities to do otherwise.

*Agriculture and Horticulture* - We acknowledge and support NorthTec's wish to deliver agriculture and horticulture programmes in the region. We are particularly concerned that funding to deliver these programmes is allocated to a category 3 PTE, which is far less able and likely to deliver quality programmes than NorthTec. It has been, and continues to be, a key TEU policy position to advocate for public provision of tertiary education – in ITPs, wānanga and universities across the country. The TEU will continue to work at the national level lobbying for this, and at the local level to support good outcomes for agriculture and horticulture and all other programmes at NorthTec.

*Business (Administration and Technology)* – This programme enrolls higher numbers of female students (98%) and is very focussed on ensuring graduates have work-ready skills to enable them to enter the workforce. If the transition to online delivery does not meet the needs of this cohort of students, it will further exacerbate the gender imbalance of enrolments at NorthTec, as well as meaning women are missing out on tertiary education options in the region.

There is a significant body of research that indicates the preference of entry or pre-entry level students for face-to-face learning experiences, and that outcomes are better for these students when they are able to study in a physical classroom. For example, Neilson (2016) notes that Literat (2015) raises concerns about the 'participation gap' observing that:

“...the ‘participation gap’ in today’s society, which accessible education looks to address, may actually work against the outcomes of some sections of students by decreasing face-to-face interactions and assuming a certain level of technological capability. The reality is not everyone benefits from the provision of online content: a fact that reflects the diversity of learners, teachers and disciplines in tertiary settings. The naïve assumption regarding the ‘digital native’ and the tendency for technology to be viewed as leading changes in education, rather than being used as a tool to benefit the teaching and learning process, risks informing the development of policies which assume more technological change is in some way ‘better’ by definition.” (Neilson 2016: 4).

A number of other researchers have identified similar concerns as a result of their studies. Given the demographics for this particular programme, TEU members are therefore very concerned that the wholesale shift in delivery for this programme from 2018 will result in poor outcomes for students and ultimately a drop in enrolments.

The review document proposes a figure of 55 EFTS to move to fully on-line delivery for this programme. This is a considerable number to transition to full online delivery. Along with the issues noted above, for some areas in the region, internet access is an issue, which is unlikely to be solved in the near future. Literacy and numeracy is also an issue for the Northland region. This approach therefore risks cutting off options for students who are already marginalised either by geography or other factors. Consideration should be given to gradually introducing elements of online provision, and evaluating the impact of this after a year, rather than a wholesale shift to an untested new approach.

**Construction** – The review document proposes ceasing delivery for programmes in three locations: Awataha (painting); Swanson (construction) and Rāwene (painting and carpentry – to be catered for at Kaikohe campus).

New Zealand has been experiencing a very significant skills shortage across the construction sector and demand is high for workers in all parts of the sector. A recent MBIE report analysing future demand for construction workers noted the following:

“Across New Zealand demand for construction employees is projected to increase on average by 11 percent between 2016 and 2022.” (MBIE 2017: 15)

“The overall increase in construction-related occupations is approximately 56,000 between 2016 and 2022. Over the period to 2021 an additional 33,000 employees will be required to meet demand, when compared to the previous projections prepared in 2016.” (MBIE 2017: 15)

The report further notes that (depending on occupation type) between 2016-2022 increases of 9-15 percent are projected for the sector (MBIE 2017: 15), and Auckland will need an additional 4,700 employees to meet demand (MBIE 2017: 16). For the rest of New Zealand the report states:

“...the annual value of all building and construction is forecast to rise from \$6.5 billion in 2016 to a peak of \$7.9 billion around 2019. Non-residential building activity is forecast to slowly increase throughout the forecast period to a peak of \$1.7 billion in 2019. Residential building investment is forecast to rise by \$0.8 billion, from \$3.9 billion in 2016 to plateau at around \$4.7 billion from 2019 to 2020, before declining to \$4.1 billion by 2022. (MBIE 2017: 12)

We fail to understand why NorthTec would seek to close programmes when there is a clear current and future need for a range of skilled workers in the construction industry. The programmes themselves report good results – for example Awataha noted first semester course and qualification completions of 86.2 percent for Elementary Construction and 96.5 percent for Painting.

Within the Northland region itself, a long-term social housing shortage has been identified as requiring urgent attention. As well, the region is seeking to focus on a number of key infrastructure initiatives (as identified in the *Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan 2016*. NorthTec should instead focus attention on a robust strategy to increase enrolments in these programmes and undertake targeted consultations with service providers, business, industry, iwi/hapū to establish future needs for the region.

**Environmental studies and science** - The review document proposes ceasing delivery for the Certificate in Marine Adventure and Ecotourism and the Diploma in Applied Sciences (level 6), with a level 4 New Zealand Certificate in Science being introduced. (Note that we discuss the proposal to close Marine Adventure and Ecotourism later in this submission). With regard to the science proposals, there are currently international students enrolled in the level 5 Diploma who anticipated moving to the level 6 Diploma in 2018 as per their visa requirements to enrol in a two-year course. Additionally TEU members find it difficult to fathom why level 6 would be removed from programme offerings, given its ties to STEM, and alongside the plethora of research and reports emphasising the need for growth in the sciences.

**Foundation Studies (L2)** – The level two foundation courses provided at NorthTec (Business Administration and Computing; Hospitality; Retail) provide a valuable pathway to further study at NorthTec. These courses have very good pass rates and fit well into the region’s economic development plans, meeting identified community need. NorthTec’s desire to focus on level four and above is simply responding to a policy directive from the previous government which undermines the stated purpose of polytechnics outlined in the Education Act:

*...a polytechnic is characterised by a wide diversity of continuing education, including vocational training, that contributes to the maintenance, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge and expertise and promotes community learning, and by research, particularly applied and technological research, that aids development...*

Section 162 (4)(b)(ii)

Given the socioeconomic challenges facing the Northland region, and the need for providing clear pathways into tertiary education for those who may not have had the opportunity to engage in further study, we see Foundation Studies overall as being an essential part of NorthTec’s mix of provision.

**Hospitality** – The review document proposes not offering the Manaaki Marae programme in 2018 (currently not scheduled). It is unclear whether this decision is based on discussions

with iwi/hapū in the region to determine whether there is a continued need for the programme. This needs to be clarified, particularly in light of NorthTec's stated goal of working towards becoming a bicultural institution.

*Information Systems* – The review document proposed that information systems programmes are not offered in 2018. Little further information is provided, but we are left wondering why, in this era of rapid technological change, which relies on people being highly skilled in information systems, this part of NorthTec delivery is not expanding.

*Safe Trades* – The proposal is to no longer deliver OSH level four. What consideration has been given to impacts on the pathway for students moving from level three to level four? How will this decision contribute to STEPS goals for ITPs to teach at level 4 and above? This decision also seems at odds with requirements for ever more sophisticated knowledge of OSH requirements. As well, the decision does not support the *Northern Region Economic Plan's* economic development priorities.

During the course of this consultation there have been several attempts to correctly understand the viability statistics provided to us by NorthTec. Some of the information provided about Safe Trades shows that NorthTec believes the programme needs two full-time academic staff members to deliver this programme. That is not the case (it is not how the course is currently operating), and demonstrates the lack of on-the-ground understanding of programmes which are being proposed to be cut. There were 855 TTH given to this programme in 2017, which is slightly more than 1 FTE (in an area with high TTH per staff member).

There has also been anxiety expressed by decision-makers about “efficiency” because there are both day time and evening cohorts who undertake this programme. There is a clear and genuine need for this because the cohorts are completely different. Day time students are supported by their employer to be there, to gain higher skills and qualification for application in their workplace. The evening cohort is comprised of students who are not supported by an employer to attend, so are upskilling in their own time. Both cohorts

should be supported by NorthTec, and it is a mistake to view the day/evening uptake as an inefficiency.

***Sport and Recreation*** – This programme consists of a two year Diploma that has been running for the past 24 years and for the last decade the Diploma has stair cased into the third year of the AUT Bachelor’s Degree. The qualification consistently achieves EFTS targets and annually contributes approximately \$300,000 to NorthTec.

The majority of students enrol at level 5 with the intention to complete the degree. Current and past students are embedded within the Northland community in fields including health and wellness, PE teaching and high performance sport.

At time of writing, the Sport and Recreation programme reported they have 14 applications for level five, 18 students seeking to progress from level five to level six and 16 students wishing to enrol in the level seven degree.

The sport and recreation industry in Northland is the seventh highest employer within the region. Yet no rationale has been provided for the decision to cease offering this programme – there appears to be no analysis of Northland demographics, occupational outlook for the sector, or consideration of how the programme contributes to the region’s economic development plan or to other plans such as iwi/hapū planning. Furthermore, the cessation of this programme would undermine STEP goals relating to a focus on provision at level four and above. Finally aspects of the sport and recreation programme sit within STEM – another priority objective for the sector.

***Tourism*** –There has been extensive research and analysis undertaken on New Zealand’s tourism industry, which is our fastest growing sector in terms of visitor numbers and spend. The industry has identified a need for skilled and qualified staff across a range of visitor experiences and businesses. MBEs analysis of tourism within regions shows that the Northland region has experienced year-to-year growth averaging 9.5 percent [https://mbienz.shinyapps.io/mrte\\_interactive\\_map/](https://mbienz.shinyapps.io/mrte_interactive_map/). The Ministry will also release a report

on tourism skills and labour needs (expected 2017) which will contribute useful analysis to the sector in terms of skill and qualification needs.

The *Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan* (February 2016) notes on page seven that:

“The “game changers” for Northland are the things that underpin business growth.

These are:

1. Transport – better connectivity with Auckland, within the region and with export markets. Northland is a place-based economy. Roving in particular is critical for Northland to develop and affects virtually every part of the economy
2. Digital Infrastructure – full digital coverage (whether it is ultrafast broadband, rural broadband or mobile coverage) across the region at acceptable speeds and with a consistent connection to enable business to be conducted efficiently and effectively
3. Skills and Capability – governance, management, entrepreneurship, soft skills and technical and industry specific skills
4. Water – storage and management (including allocation), enable best use through making water more consistently available.

The Action Plan sees transport and digital infrastructure, skills and capability development and water at the heart of growth for all of the sectors. The Action Plan intends to support and leverage growth off existing private sector development.”

Yet despite clear evidence of a burgeoning industry, with strong regional growth, NorthTec still proposes to close its tourism programmes, in both Whangarei and Kerikeri.

Closure of Marine Adventure and Ecotourism, Sport and Rec and Tourism courses means North Tec would be unable to produce a single graduate for the tourism and outdoor industries. These are major economic players in Northland and New Zealand. Tourism in itself employs one in 10 people in New Zealand. Adventure and Ecotourism is a major area within strategic plans in the latest published tourism strategy.

The programme offering of the Marine Adventure course is unique. As a result it receives enrolments from all over New Zealand and internationally. Elsewhere nationally these types of curriculum focus on rock, white water and alpine pursuits, rather than open water. Marine, cultural and forest based tourism is essential for Northland's tourism sector and business start-up, especially for existing employers and hapū based tourism in rural Tai Tokerau post-treaty settlements.

Marine Adventure EFTS are down in 2017 due to a myriad of circumstances which lost a number of students, but that goes against the trend of previous years of exceeding enrolment targets. There are already 13 students enrolled for 2018. The retention and pass rates every year are 80-90 percent, exceeding North Tec averages for level 4 offerings, and tripling national averages for this level of study. Māori achievement statistics are also over 80 percent.

Aside from the deficit thinking involved in a proposal to cut tourism provision in Whangarei in the face of a growing industry, it is a source of some surprise to us that NorthTec wants to deliver agriculture and horticulture and is opposed to delivery by an out-of-region provider, but at the same time is happy to hand over delivery of tourism programmes to an out-of-region provider. We are opposed to this proposal for reasons consistent with our support for NorthTec's provision of agriculture and horticulture programmes – we support publicly funded tertiary education provision in appropriate public institutions such as ITPs, and not out-of-region PTEs. We would welcome consistency of position from NorthTec decision-makers.

At time of writing, enrolments for Tourism in 2018 were almost full.

***Applied Arts*** – The proposal to close two major offerings in the Applied Arts programmes (Visual and Digital,) highlights a serious lack of understanding from NorthTec management about what this programme delivers and how it responds to both local and national current and future needs. Being the only programme offered at this level in the region, the Applied Arts programmes provide graduates who can contribute directly to Northland's economic,

social and cultural prosperity, as well as being prepared to enter employment outside the region. Graduates from this programme are well prepared to enter a wide range of jobs, including within the arts and media sector, advertising and marketing, creative design, culture and heritage and information technology. The technology sector – in New Zealand and across the world – is the fastest growing sector in terms of employment, but critically also in terms of innovation and creativity.

Applied Arts programmes at NorthTec are closely tied to community – offering adult and community education classes, arts academy for school students and importantly the Bachelor in Māori Art - Maunga Kura Toi (which is not affected by this review). The ACE and school programmes give local people the chance to explore their creativity in a safe and supportive environment, as well as providing a pathway to further study at certificate, diploma or degree level.

The Applied Arts programmes meet government priorities for level four and above programmes, a focus on learners 25 years and younger (the majority of students enrolled), STEM; and a focus on Māori learners (40 percent of students). As well these programmes attract older students who are looking to enhance their digital skills for use in the education sector. Previous graduates from the programmes have found employment in a diverse range of occupations including: video editing and video production; film and television production; telecommunications; technology specialists; web design and social media management, graphic designers; illustration and more.

Importantly, the Applied Arts programmes have consistently contributed to the financial viability of NorthTec, showing steady increases from 2014 to July 2017: 2014 - \$43,274 (40 percent); 2015 - \$408,267 (42 percent); 2016 - \$450,170 (44 percent); 2017 - \$456,863 (49 percent). The programmes have also exceeded domestic EFTS targets for 2017, and shown consistently high graduate outcomes and achievement rates for Māori and Pacific learners.

Given these outcomes, it is perplexing that NorthTec management has identified these programmes for closure. It illustrates a concerning lack of understanding of the programmes

themselves as well as the future needs of our region and country with regard to our creative and digital technology sectors.

*Closure of Rāwene and Kerikeri campuses* – It has been extremely difficult getting accurate information regarding overheads, student EFTS and outcomes for Rāwene and Kerikeri campuses. This has limited our ability to provide accurate feedback about viability. However beyond pure financial measures, NorthTec has a moral obligation with regard to its public good contribution to these communities, and should prioritise seeking accurate and fair community feedback before making any decisions about these campuses. Should these campuses close, Northtec is likely to experience loss of goodwill in the community, which may further impact on enrolments around the region. NorthTec should instead be focusing its energies on a focused strategy of iwi/hapū/community engagement to establish current and future educational needs. As well the institution needs to rethink this proposal in light of regional development initiatives that are likely to be implemented under the new Labour Coalition Government.

It is worth noting some relevant history with regard to these campuses. Kerikeri campus has been managed into the ground over several years. Once flourishing, it is now facing closure rather than strategic development to revitalise a campus in the largest population and employment centre Northland has outside of Whangarei.

Rather than focusing solely on Kaikohe as proposed in the review document, we recommend both should remain open, and partner and staircase students between the two. For example, Tourism, Business, Horticulture and a level 5-7 blended delivery hub could be located in Kerikeri, with Trades, Forestry, Agriculture and level 2-3 foundation programmes in Kaikohe. The area is in desperate need of effective marketing, and an effective college liaison manager to rebuild relationships with schools and attract under 20's. Transport from outer areas for both campuses should be investigated, and between campuses for stair casing and curriculum selection.

Rāwene campus proudly serves an isolated community which does not generally fit the urban Pākēhā model of student outcome/destination measurements. Those measurements

do not account for critical factors such as contribution to community, to whānau, to iwi, to ahikā, which is a very strong feature for small communities within our region. We note that the Rāwene community came in to support EER processes and visits. If NorthTec decides to close the campus, there will be ill will which will be very hard to remedy, particularly given the bad feeling and negative media attention when Arts courses (at both Rāwene and Kerikeri) were closed.

Along with the closure or 'resting' of these campuses, the review document proposes that the current permanent campus services positions be made redundant, and these services are out-sourced. This includes a 0.4 FTE gardener position in Rāwene. Additionally the review document recommends on page 58 that a 1 FTE manager and 1 FTE supervisor be retained - to manage and supervise just one caretaker and one gardener.

TEU members are firmly opposed to any proposals that result in permanent positions being out-sourced. Aside from the personal impact on those affected, out-sourcing globally is recognised as an opportunity for ratcheting down pay and employment conditions for those contracted or employed by the out-sourced service provider. We are shocked that NorthTec management would favour such an approach, especially given the values framework Northtec purports to operate under (whānau, inspiration, sharing, excellence).

## **5. Organisational structure changes outlined in the proposal for change**

### **Finance Directorate – proposed team structure (pages 14-16)**

The placement of the Student Advisor Finance (sitting under the Corporate Accountant) in this directorate is incorrect. The other positions in the Directorate are directly related to the finances of NorthTec. The Student Advisor Finance position exists to provide students with advice around financial matters which are in no way linked to the institution's finances and accounts. If the position moves to this Directorate, it risks being invisible and inaccessible to students, and undermines the student-centred approach which NorthTec states as a vision. The role should remain within Student Support and Success in the Outcomes Directorate.

The new Business Solutions Directorate (page 16) includes a new role – Manager of Business partnerships. TEU members see little value in creating this management role which has a very limited number of reports. We also recommend moving Specialist Procurement, Business Partners and Manager of Investments to the Corporate Accountant reporting line.

#### **Outcomes Directorate - proposed team structure (pages 35-39)**

We support the weaving of bicultural practice through principles, their application, and any final structure and practice. This will require collective vigilance to ensure that bicultural practice is properly implemented and regularly evaluated. We have witnessed many organisational reviews where proposals purport to integrate and embed biculturalism, but which have then resulted in ‘whitestreaming’<sup>2</sup> and loss of mana Māori motuhake within the organisation.

We support the consultative intentions outlined on page 35: *These outcomes would be developed in consultation with key stakeholders such as employers, iwi and local councils and be cognisant of such things as regional economic, iwi and business development plans.* We urge this same process to occur *prior* to any current proposals and decisions around cutting programmes, rather than the assumption that this consultative vision can only occur after this review.

#### **Outcomes Directorate - Academic Leadership (page 35-37)**

The change proposal document recommends creating a large number of manager positions, and at the same time proclaims (page 36) that “leadership is seen to be in all of our hands and not just those of a few”. In principle, TEU members support the notion of leadership in the manner described, but consider that is unlikely to occur, if leadership comes within the confines of being managed from above, and is not duly recognised or given authority.

The proposals on page 36 divest academic leadership from Programme Leaders to academic staff more generally. Again in principle, within an organisation which has a culture of

---

<sup>2</sup> Whitestreaming describes the practice of Māori specialist positions being reconfigured as generalist positions where the Māori focus of such roles has changed to that of working with all students. (Potter and Cooper 2016:9)

respect and trust, this will flourish. In that sense, the proposal is aspirational and we would support it, with the usual caveats around workload and work-life balance and proper remuneration for academic staff taking up additional responsibilities. In reality, we believe NorthTec is not at this point in terms of its organisational culture. At present, this proposal sets academic staff up to fail, by allocating leadership tasks and using managers to performance manage the leaders, whose jobs involve carrying responsibility without authority. However, if and when a different organisational culture is embedded, we would support this proposal.

If the proposal goes ahead, it must adhere to the Academic Staff Collective Agreement, which is clear on duties, categories of duties, and overall workload as captured in workload planners. Where leadership includes responsibilities which fall outside those defined in the Collective Agreement, then staff would need to be remunerated accordingly and workloads adjusted in line with the additional duties.

One of the responsibilities identified is to “in conjunction with colleagues undertake tutorial observations”. We note that many months ago a proposal for tutor observations was put up for consultation, and NorthTec has not at any point responded to or engaged with TEU members over their submission to that proposal. This again highlights the very real problems NorthTec senior management must address with regard to communication and engagement with staff.

#### **Outcomes Directorate - Group managers (pages 35-36)**

The change proposal document asserts that there are fewer managers in the proposed new structure than currently. However for most academic staff, an additional layer of management was inserted earlier this year with the creation of Group Managers (Outcomes).

There is clearly a need for the Group Manager (Regions); this has been supported over time by staff in the regions where there has been a lack of attention, cohesion and strategic planning. This position should retain all of its current regional campuses as part of its scope, rather than halving it by closing Rāwene and Kerikeri.

There is also support for the Group Manager Student Support and Success, who is responsible for student success (academic/learning, student finance, career advice, pastoral and kaitakawaenga roles), health centre, library and student voice. (Note that we do not believe this is a new position as stated on page 39, but an extension in scope of the current Group Manager Student Services position).

The Group Manager Student Support and Success has a 0.5 FTE Support Officer attached to it. That is a reduced FTE from the current 0.8 FTE position supporting Student Services. There is no logic to that reduction, as the Group Manager role is proposed to be bigger than the current Group Manager Student Success, indicating a need for more support, not less. It is important to note that this position supports not only the manager but the wider student success function, and should not be seen as linked simply as a support function to the Group Manager. We note further that it is not open to NorthTec to initiate compulsory *partial* severance.

TEU members report that, contrary to the Group Managers Regional Outcomes and Student Success, there is little understanding as to the purpose, functions and relevance of the Group Manager (Outcomes) positions. Previously academic staff reported to their Programme Leader, who reported (predominantly) to a Director (some reported to a Deputy Director). The proposal for change sees the core work of teaching students further removed from decision-making with the earlier addition of Group Managers (Outcomes). When this is considered against issues for the institution regarding staff engagement (because of lack of vision and leadership, accountability and poor communication) and the view amongst many staff that a culture of top-down communication and compliance/performance management dominates at Northtec, it does not bode well for improvements in student achievement and staff satisfaction.

NorthTec reports a staff of 416 (headcount). If proposals are confirmed, there will be (conservatively) 380 staff, 40 of whom are managers. This is a ratio of manager: worker of about 1:8.5. This is indulgent in a situation in which the institution reports impending financial crisis and educational risk. Of the 40 managers, there are 11 whose functions are

directly related to student achievement and outcomes (12 if we include the Director Māori and Capability directing oversight of embedding Te Āo Māori) – 1 (2) at tier 2; 4 at tier 3; and 6 at tier 4. The other 29 managers are in corporate or associated services. This focus appears to be out of alignment with the organisation’s vision to put the student at the heart of everything. Rather the impression is of an increasingly corporatised organisation that is fast losing sight of its core purpose as set out in the Education Act and in its own strategic documents.

### **Outcomes Directorate - Programme Leaders, Pathway Managers (pages 35-36)**

During Phase One of the organisational restructuring (leading to the creation of Group Managers), we submitted that undertaking that restructure without including Programme Leaders placed these roles at risk. This was because Phase One would inevitably have impacts on them at Phase Two, at a point of no return, due to decisions from Phase One being cemented into the organisational structure. Our prediction has been borne out.

We agree that Programme Leader positions have become problematic, because the reality of these jobs has grown in some instances beyond the initial purpose. TEU members have commented that the roles have morphed into the previous Programme Manager positions which it had replaced. The positions have also become inconsistent in size, for example: with line management and academic responsibilities for different numbers of staff over different numbers of locations, some with multiple programmes. We welcome proposals to align the size of these positions or their replacement positions.

Generally speaking, TEU members have been and continue to be supportive of the Programme Leader positions. They are the critical interface between academic staff and management representatives, as well as the direct line manager.

We note the following points with regard to the proposed Pathway Manager positions:

- Due to the insertion of an additional layer of management (Group Managers – Outcomes), the Pathway Manager is at a lower tier of management than the current Programme Leader position;

- It is entirely (yet another) management position, as the vital academic leadership component of the current Programme Leader position is shed;
- This creates risk to the organisation: staff see the value in the current programme leader positions as representing an academic and management nexus. If academic leadership is shed, over time Pathway Managers will lose connection and understanding of teaching/academic roles. Instead they will be governed exclusively by KPI imperatives which are driven from above and in the current environment have a micromanaging performance management foundation rather than a holistic academic foundation. This creates organisational risk in terms of planning and vision, and in perpetuating the current top-down management model;
- We also have concerns about loss of career progression for academic staff; Programme Leader was a direct career progression for academic staff, but the new positions make this less possible;
- We note and support the *Degree Monitoring Report for the NorthTec Bachelor of Nursing* dated 25 October 2017. On pages 6-7, it raises concerns as to how the New Zealand Nursing Council's requirements will be met if there is a separation between academic and management functions. More generally, and more broadly than nursing, we endorse the concerns about separation of academic leadership and day-to-day management functions, and do not think that such a model will improve academic quality.

If NorthTec does go ahead with the proposed Pathway Manager positions, the following should be noted regarding the position description and processes to fill those positions:

- The remuneration should be as proposed, *at a minimum*. TEU members note with interest that some other proposed positions (e.g. Organisational Development Specialist) are proposed to be paid higher, and note also that NorthTec has strategically and consistently ignored TEU attempts to remunerate Programme

Leaders in accordance with the size and skills set of the job. It is disappointing that the institution would wait until it strips out academic functions, and takes the position out of the TEU collective agreement, before proposing to remunerate more reasonably.

- See comments in our submission about the process for redeployment. However, it is important to note here that current Programme Leaders undertake all aspects of the key responsibilities listed in the Pathway Manager position description; it is simply the breadth of covered disciplines which will change for some Programme Leaders. As such there would be no ability to turn down applications for redeployment, unless there is internal contestability between two Programme Leaders for a Pathway Manager position;
- In the proposed position description it states under Education the need for a degree level qualification in Education, Business Management or similar. Not having such a qualification cannot be a reason to turn down a Programme Leader for redeployment, given that they have already been undertaking the key responsibilities. Rather, they should be supported and resourced to obtain a qualification if it is deemed appropriate and necessary;
- On page 43 under 'proposed changes and HR process', it states that appointment criteria to be used are the skills, experience, past performance and qualifications required for the position. Please see above in terms of qualification. Past performance cannot be used because this is a redeployment process; not a performance management process.
- On page 44, competitive selection may only be used if current Programme Leaders do not first fill the Pathway Manager positions (unless there is a competitive process between Programme Leader incumbents). We recommend a three-stage process:
  - filling these positions internally from among the Programme Leader incumbents who express interest in them;

- If not filled, opening to internal competitive selection among other affected staff;
- External competitive selection.

### **Outcomes Directorate – an alternative proposal**

In light of the very real concerns posed by the proposal of separating management and academic leadership functions, an alternative model would be to further analyse the Programme Leader position. It is currently largely supported by academic staff and could be kept in place in a way which retains the academic leadership/management mix but ensures the size of each Programme Leader job is realistic, duties are evenly allocated and fair remuneration is assured. This would entail the need for more than six positions – this takes us back to concerns that the phase one review has inevitably but unnecessarily created a resource squeeze at this level.

### **Māori and Capability Directorate – proposed team structure (pages 80-81)**

The focus and direction for the Māori and Capability Directorate, particularly the emphasis on better responding to Māori learner need and whānau, hapū, iwi aspirations is welcomed. How the overarching goals of this directorate will be achieved and implemented day-to-day will be crucial. As we have previously noted in this submission, NorthTec has much work to do in terms of shifting organisational culture and practice from a top-down management model to a more genuinely inclusive and democratic model. The Māori and Capability Directorate will have an important role to play in this transformation, as is acknowledged in the whakataukī “Ka ora ai te iwi” which speaks to the importance of ensuring wellbeing for all within the organisation in order for it to flourish. It is also important to note that whilst NorthTec may have a desire over time to lift the percentage of Māori staff in the institution (which we support), they have a responsibility to ensure that current staff are provided with genuine opportunities for skill and knowledge development that support Māori learner achievement and foster the bicultural aspirations of the institution.

### **Māori and Capability Directorate – proposed structure chart (page 82)**

We recommend that the new position Manager Culture and Capability be deleted, with the Specialist 21st Century Teaching and Learning position being moved to the Flexible Learning

Team with a re-established Moodle Administrator and Multimedia Designer also retained in this team. There should also be a direct report for the Kaitiaki Tikanga, Kaitiaki Marae and Pou Manaaki to the Director Māori and Capability as the Marae is the heart of NorthTec and this Director has limited reports. The Specialist Organisational Development should also direct report to the Director to maximise organisational cultural change. It should also be noted that the Moodle Administrator and two Specialists are academic roles.

### **Māori and Capability Directorate - disestablishment of Flexible Learning Team (page 83)**

We support the submission made by the Flexible Learning Team. In particular we see value in preserving a well-functioning team that is already working to implement the identified priority '21st century learning and teaching methods' as the core part of their daily work and purpose as a team.

We note further that the proposed position *Specialist – 21st Century Teaching and Learning* sits within academic coverage. We support the remuneration and look forward to it being extended to all academic staff.

## **6. Staffing implications**

As we have stated earlier in this submission, we contest a number of the statements made with regard to staffing numbers, as well as the arguments (or lack of) provided to justify the closure of a range of programmes currently offered at NorthTec. Our comments in this section seek to ensure that if redundancies do occur as a result of the review, proper process within the terms of the TEU academic collective agreement and TEU members' individual allied agreements is followed. As advised during the course of consultation and clearly signalled in this submission, we reserve the right to challenge any outcomes for members where the obligations under the Employment Relations Act and its supporting case law have not been met. These include providing all the information relevant to the continuation of their employment and the ability to comment on this information.

We support the proposal, outlined in the Academic Staff Collective Agreement, that other options as identified in clause 10.5 are pursued, to avoid compulsory severance and to

minimise the consequences of loss of employment. TEU members are also pleased that this will be applied uniformly irrespective of the type of employment agreement.

### **Voluntary redundancy for directly affected staff**

We acknowledge that acceptance of offers of voluntary redundancy for directly affected staff are at the employer's discretion, but propose a single principle for accepting such offers. That principle should be that the organisation's need for specific skills and numbers of staff are met, and that the departure of the individual who has accepted voluntary redundancy will not create a vacancy that then has to be advertised and filled. We also note that some of the proposed principles (page 99) may be open to organisational risk – for example political and cultural benefits, and no foreseeable drop in quality and quantity of outcomes. These principles largely fall outside the control of staff and should not form the basis of voluntary redundancy processes.

We acknowledge the response to feedback which led to a changed date for volunteer requests to 8 December 2017.

We recommend that selection criteria are established to facilitate a situation in which there is an 'oversupply' of volunteers for the numbers required.

### **Voluntary Retirement/Resignation for staff not significantly impacted**

The TEU opposes this proposal. It allows for restructuring through the back door, without the employer having to demonstrate to staff and their unions that there is a need for a reduction in staffing levels or the ability to continue delivery with fewer staff. This proposal puts remaining staff at risk with regard to increased workloads and stress. It also prevents staff from having a proper voice in any consultation over staffing needs in their area.

TEU members are also concerned at the Eurocentric and ageist proposal to allow staff over the age of 62 years to apply for voluntary retirement or resignation. The proposal is in direct contradiction to NorthTec's aspirations to become a bicultural organisation. The proposal also presents organisational risk if some offers are accepted and others not – NorthTec would need to be very clear and without any identity prejudices, as to why an offer is not

accepted. Furthermore it is an irresponsible use of taxpayer funds to apply this proposal, especially at a time when NorthTec is advising staff that a key driver for change is financial concerns. TEU members support affirmative action recruitment processes in filling future staff vacancies, but achieving a younger staffing profile by virtue of offering staff that are 62 years and over an incentive to depart cannot be supported.

### **Redeployment**

We acknowledge and support the use of redeployment as a key mechanism to reduce or avert job loss. Redeployment should be utilised not only for positions which 'have similar employment terms and conditions' but where capability allows redeployment to occur. This would be the case, for example, in several administrative positions, and redeployment from Programme Leader into the Pathway Manager positions. The work entailed in the Pathway Manager position is already undertaken in whole by Programme Leaders – the proposal is simply to take away the academic leadership component of the Programme Leader position and broaden the line manager responsibility part of the position by encompassing a greater area of discipline.

TEU members are concerned about the qualifying brackets in the opening paragraph page 102 – if an outcome of this process is to identify someone as impacted who has not been advised of such, then organisational change provisions need to ensue.

We acknowledge the response to feedback which led to a changed date for redeployment requests to 8 December 2017.

**Requests for Consideration:** We propose that 2(b) is changed to read 'the title of the position they wish to be *redeployed* in to'. The redeployment option is not a job interview/job application process, although we acknowledge there may be competitive selection in situations where there are multiple affected staff and fewer redeployment positions available.

## Redeployment Selection Process

TEU members support the following selection criteria identified in point 4 (page 102): length of service, relevant knowledge (role and institutional), experience (which repeats the first two criteria), and skills.

We do not support: values, competencies and behaviours – these are subjective and open to challenge. We also do not support the use of past performance: this is also subjective and open to challenge. This is a redeployment process which is an entirely separate matter to performance. It is not open to an employer to use performance as a reason not to redeploy somebody into a position. It is the employer's responsibility to manage performance rather than use an organisational change process to choose 'good' and 'bad' performers.

We strongly disagree with point 5 (page 102) "in the event only one person is considered for a redeployment option for one role, an abridged selection process may be used to assess their suitability for the position". Redeployment is not a job application process - the one person available for the role simply needs to be redeployed.

Point 6 (page 103) opens NorthTec to risk of challenge due to non-transparency of the process (*Massey University v Wrigley Kelly*). A transparent selection criterion enables selection to occur without the need for formal interviews. Again we reiterate – this is a redeployment process; not a job application/interview process.

We strongly oppose psychometric and competency testing and would challenge any disadvantage to a TEU member from their use. These processes have been proven to have a Eurocentric bias and as such using them would undermine NorthTec's aspirations to become a bicultural institution.

We note that on page 110 (Appendix 1: FAQ) the question "I want to apply for a new role – what are the selection criteria?" has an answer that is inconsistent with principles or case law around redeployment. It is unlikely that someone suitable for redeployment will meet all the minimum requirements of the role as noted in the job description or the preferred qualifications, experience, skills, or cultural competencies. These are actually a 'wish list' for

a new employee, and it would be unreasonable for NorthTec to apply the same rules in redeployment situations. In addition, 'demonstrating organisational fit', 'demonstrating cultural contributions over and above those required of a role', and 'demonstrating performance and achievement of KPIs in previous role' are not reasonable applications in a redeployment situation, and would be open to challenge. We are concerned that this level of requirement is set up to deliberately preclude some staff from reasonable redeployment options.

### **Retraining**

We acknowledge the inclusion of retraining as part of the options available to affected staff.

### **Compulsory Redundancy**

We acknowledge and appreciate NorthTec's stance in the footnote page 103, stipulating that if there is a need for competitive compulsory severance, a set of selection criteria will be developed and consulted on once decisions are finalised and other options are exhausted.

## **7. Conclusion**

Given all the other issues relating to funding for our regional ITPs and the tertiary education sector overall, TEU members strongly recommend that NorthTec halt plans to close programmes and campuses to allow time to discuss the funding needs of the sector in depth with the new government. The TEU nationally and at NorthTec branch is committed to continuing lobbying for change for the sector, and we look forward to continuing to work with you to put pressure on government to make the changes needed for the continued success of NorthTec and its communities.

## References

Grey, S and Scott, J. February 2012. *“When the government steers the market: implications for the New Zealand's tertiary education system.”* A working paper for NTEU's Future of Higher Education Conference, 22-23 February 2012, University of Sydney. New Zealand Tertiary Education Union.

Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. July 2017. *“Future demand for construction workers: projections from the national construction occupations model.”* Wellington <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/publications-research/research/construction-sector-productivity/future-demand-for-construction-workers-2017.pdf>

Neilson, B. June 2016. *“Information communication technologies and tertiary education.”* Prepared for the Tertiary Education Union Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa

Potter, H. and Cooper, L. March 2016. *“Project Whitestreaming: A report on the generalising of Māori specialist staff positions in the tertiary education sector.”* Prepared for the Tertiary Education Union Te Hautū Kahurangi o Aotearoa.

Statistics New Zealand. 2017. *“Subnational population estimates (DHB, DHB constituency) by age and sex at 30 June 2006-20017 (2017 boundaries.”* <http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/index.aspx>

Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan Advisory Group. February 2016. *“Tai Tokerau Northland Economic Action Plan”*

Seutter, S. 2015. *“Socioeconomic Profile of the Whangarei District.”* Prepared for the Whangarei District Council.