

Full summary of submissions

The University of Auckland *Campus development proposals: summary of feedback received*

September 2008

Overview

Staff, students and other members of The University of Auckland's community were invited to provide feedback on a draft set of proposals for the development of the University's Campus. Submissions were invited by email between 28 July and 1 September 2008.

Submissions received were analysed under each of the principles and proposals contained within the Vice-Chancellor's presentations (held during July and August) and accompanying PowerPoint slides. These slides were made available on the University's website and Staff Intranet during the consultation period.

A total of 134 emailed submissions were received. Just over half (54% or 72 submissions) came from staff members, 20% (27 submissions) were received from students, and 16% (21 submissions) from academic and administrative units of the University. Submissions were also received from two student organisations and seven individuals or groups in the wider community. A further five submissions did not indicate their association with the University.

Of the 119 submissions received from staff and students indicating an affiliation within the University, roughly half (61 submissions or 51%) came from the Faculty of Education. A total of 21 submissions were received from the Faculty of Science, 11 from the National Institute of Creative Arts and Industries (NICA), eight from the Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, six from the Faculty of Arts and three from the Faculty of Engineering. Nine submissions were received from administrative units of the University. No submissions were received from staff or students of the Faculty of Law, the Faculty of Business and Economics, or the School of Theology.

The majority of submissions received focused on only one aspect of the proposals – generally that area in which the respondent was employed or currently studying. However a number of submissions covered more than one proposal and/or the underlying draft principles. The following summary focuses on the major strands of support and concern as expressed by respondents.

A complete list of responding individuals and organisations is included at the conclusion of this document.

*Prepared by Heather Kirkwood
Office of the Vice-Chancellor*

September 2008

PRINCIPLES

Principle 1

A key principle is that, as far as possible, teaching and research activities should be concentrated on the City/Grafton campus in order to:

- **Maximise opportunities for interdisciplinary programmes**
- **Make most efficient use of infrastructure and support facilities**
- **Subject staff and students to the minimum of inter-campus travel**¹

Responses: Relatively few submissions provided specific feedback on Principle 1 with most simply stating their views on the consequential relocation of an individual department, programme or Faculty.

Several submissions, while supportive of the overall objectives, noted a tension between the principle that teaching and research activities be concentrated on the City/Grafton campus, and the principle that opportunities for interdisciplinary programmes be maximised. It was suggested that there needs to be a balance with regard to co-locating units according to faculty boundaries, and the creation of genuine opportunities for interdisciplinary research and teaching programmes.

It was suggested that the word efficient should be replaced by effective in bullet point 2 (i.e. 'make most effective use of infrastructure and support facilities'), with the submission noting that effectiveness measures should take into account actual usage patterns.

Principle 2

- **University strategy should drive faculty and campus plans**

Responses: A total of ten submissions responded specifically to Principle 2, with the general view that it was a positive development for the University to engage in long-term planning of this nature and that the University's strategy was the appropriate driver for faculty and campus plans.

However, several submissions pointed out that, in their view, the proposals may not be consistent with the achievement of the University's goals and objectives as contained within the current Strategic Plan. Particular areas of concern identified by respondents:

- Postgraduate numbers in Education may be reduced as a result of the proposed relocation to the City Campus. Respondents expressed concern that postgraduates and professional development students, in particular, would be unwilling to attend classes on the City Campus if there are perceived or actual problems with parking and traffic congestion.
- Similarly, postgraduate numbers for schools and departments located on the Tamaki Campus may be compromised by a reduced emphasis on undergraduate teaching on this campus.
- The focus on single faculty buildings and areas on the City Campus may reduce inter-faculty research and impede the achievement of the Strategic Plan's targets for research performance income.

¹ The sections of this report in bold typeface are drawn directly from the Campus Plan presentation.

- Objective 18 of the Strategic Plan articulates a goal to ‘Provide an infrastructure that supports teaching, learning, research, community engagement of the highest quality’ with standards ‘guided by appropriate benchmarks of the nature and extent of physical infrastructure provided by peer international universities...’. It was suggested by one academic organisation/unit that these proposals do not provide evidence that this international benchmarking exercise has occurred.

Principle 3

- **It is desirable to:**
 - 1. Co-locate units according to today’s faculty boundaries**
 - 2. Locate a department’s undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, and its research, together**

Responses: Again, few submissions referred specifically to Principle 3, with the majority focusing only on the co-location of one area of the University. Among those submissions that did specifically refer to this principle, an emphasis on the co-location of research with teaching space was well received. Those that were supportive of their particular faculty or department becoming less fragmented also spoke positively about the benefits for undergraduate students, postgraduate students and staff in terms of social cohesiveness, a sense of belonging, and reduced academic isolation.

Others were supportive of the general principle of co-location, but thought this need not be applied indiscriminately with strong cases made for the retention of certain teaching and research activities at Tamaki.

Several submissions expressed some disappointment that the University was not taking the opportunity to break down the traditional faculty structure. This, respondents suggested, would greatly assist in the development of interdisciplinary activities, as well as reduce an unnecessary administration at the faculty level. It was suggested by one respondent that further entrenching the existing faculty structure within a physical campus may reduce the University’s ability to make broad changes to the undergraduate degree structure in the future (for example, to follow the interdisciplinary degree structure recently introduced by The University of Melbourne).

Principle 4

- **A campus should have:**
 - 1. A stable and sustainable level of academic activity**
 - 2. Facilities and an environment that support quality teaching, learning and research**
 - 3. An appropriate level and mix of support services**

Responses: Several submissions were received supporting the importance of an appropriate level and mix of support services. In particular four viewpoints were expressed:

1. That Tamaki presently doesn’t have an appropriate mix or level of services, and these appear likely to decline further under these proposals.
2. That Epsom has a preferential level and mix of support services which might be reduced if the Faculty was relocated to the City Campus

3. That an increased concentration of students on the City Campus will demand further services not evident in these proposals.
4. That the Grafton Campus' student support services are in need of further attention

Many other submissions spoke of the need to ensure that a *high quality* teaching, learning and research environment remained at the forefront of the University's campus developments, particularly for those students and staff relocating from other sites.

Principle 5

- **Highest priorities for centrally located campus space are:**
 1. **Teaching and learning**
 2. **Support functions for students**

Responses: There was no specific feedback on Principle 5.

PROPOSALS

Proposals – Law

- **Tenure over 9, 15 and 17-19 Eden Crescent secure until 2020**
- **Joint study being undertaken with Department of Courts on a 'law precinct' involving the High Court, High Court Library, Law School and possible base for Supreme Court**
- **This could lead to better collaboration between the Law School and Courts (but distinct entities)**

Responses: Only one submission was received relating to the proposals for Law. The submission expressed regret that there were no plans to move the Faculty of Law closer to the central area of the City Campus, and suggested that 'similar arguments for and against moving Education could be applied to relocating Law closer to the main City Campus'. If, however, there were no plans to shift Law closer to other City Campus buildings and facilities, the submission strongly supported refurbishing, upgrading and enhancing the existing buildings and facilities.

Proposals - Arts

- **Consolidate in present (200) sector**
- **Relocate DALSL, Philosophy from Fisher Bldg**
- **Relocate Art History, Asian Studies from 58 Symonds St**
- **Classics and History to vacate current premises to allow site development but remain in 200 sector**
- **SGGES and Psychology to exit Human Sciences Building**

Responses: The consolidation of Arts in the present (200) sector attracted little comment, although the possibility of Education coming into this sector caused one respondent to note the 'already serious overcrowding in the Arts sector of the City Campus'. The relocation of DASL, Philosophy, Art History and Asian Studies from the Fisher Building and 58 Symonds Street attracted only one comment, with the respondent supporting the move to draw these 'isolated' departments back into the

Arts Faculty environment. The proposed relocation of Classics and History within the 200 sector attracted no comment.

SGGES

The proposal to relocate SGGES from HSB to the Science sector attracted six responses, five of which were from academic staff who expressed concerns about the proposed move. The respondents spoke of the dual academic heritage of SGGES within both Arts and Science, and the continued need for visibility amongst the large numbers of arts students who undertake SGGES courses. It was noted that many SGGES staff (particularly those in Human Geography) have strong collaborative research and teaching programmes with departments within the Faculty of Arts, such as Development Studies, Anthropology, Sociology and Māori Studies. These submissions suggested that if the proposal to relocate SGGES did proceed, that special consideration should be given to exactly where that might be. It was suggested that it should be placed alongside disciplines within Science that SGGES would be most likely to collaborate with and that it should ideally be found a new location that both highlights and strengthens its multi-disciplinary teaching and research links. Concerns were also raised about the need to mitigate the impact on Māori and Pacific students, given the School's relationship with the Faculty of Arts Tuakana Programme team and the current proximity to the Marae and Fale Pasifika.

Psychology

The proposals for Psychology attracted 11 submissions, with divided opinion as to the Department's optimal location. Four submissions were supportive of a proposal to bring all of Psychology together in one location on the City Campus, citing difficulties with travel between the City and Tamaki campuses, and the arbitrary nature of the distinction between clinical psychology and the rest of the department. These respondents were very clear as to the need for new facilities on the City Campus to accommodate all staff, with one respondent expressing concern that the new facilities be up to a suitable standard, and not simply unwanted or unsuitable space in sector 300 or 400N. It was also suggested that current study space for Māori and Pacific students in Psychology was inadequate, and should be addressed in any plans for new premises for the department.

Another five submissions expressed strong opposition to bringing Psychology together on the City Campus with respondents seeing no need to relocate staff or programmes from the Tamaki Campus. It was stressed that the current arrangement was effective and entirely appropriate. Several respondents did, however, note that the current distribution of Psychology across four buildings on the Tamaki Campus was far from ideal.

Proposals - Business and Economics

- **Owen G. Glenn Building**

Responses: Two submissions made reference to the Owen G. Glenn Building. The first (from a student organisation) was generally supportive and had no specific comment to make, other than to note that the success of the OGG Building in meeting the needs of students now presented a challenge to the University to ensure that students were aware of what was occurring on the City Campus outside of the OGG Building. The submission cautioned that an emphasis on further separate 'nodes' of activity on the City Campus could hinder the interactions between different

types of students that these proposals seek to encourage through co-location and concentration.

The second submission related to the sustainability of building practices.

Proposals - Engineering, Auckland Bioengineering Institute

- **Main location for Engineering to be refurbished current buildings**
- **Current (and possibly further) space-intensive activities to occupy Ray Meyer Centre**
- **Research and student expansion space available in adjacent developments (IT Centre site/Conference Centre site, Grafton Rd South site)**
- **Permanent home for Bioengineering to be identified**

Responses: Three submissions were received on the proposed developments for Engineering and the Auckland Bioengineering Institute. All three were supportive of the proposals and were pleased the University was planning ahead to accommodate anticipated growth in student numbers and in research.

The Faculty of Engineering expressed a strong desire to see the concentration of all its departments on site 400N. This would require both the Department of Engineering Science and the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering being relocated back to the 400N sector. They also stressed the importance of the Auckland Bioengineering Institute being located alongside the Department of Engineering Science in the 400N sector (but in its own building). A student respondent described the need for more computer laboratories and group study areas in Engineering.

While not commenting on the Engineering proposals specifically, a number of other submissions made reference to traffic management and student and staff safety in the areas surrounding the Engineering buildings, the Information Commons, the new Business School, and between sectors 300 and 400, especially Symonds Street.

The Faculty of Engineering was of the opinion that any further development of these proposals must acknowledge the strong research and teaching links between the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Science. This includes allowances for the safe and efficient flow of students and staff from one building to the other, across a busy road.

Proposals - NICA

- **Architecture and Planning to remain in current sector**
- **Elam to relocate to new premises to be constructed adjacent to Architecture and Planning**
- **Music to remain in Music School, with some space nearby for relocation of current outposts**

Responses: Fourteen submissions were received on the NICA proposals, with the majority of these concerned primarily with the space and facilities of the School of Music.

Only one response was received on the proposal for Architecture and Planning to remain in its current sector. The National Institute of Creative Arts and Industries was

supportive of this proposal, along with the 'ideas already floated' for a full refurbishment of the current Architecture and Planning building.

The proposal to relocate Elam to new premises (to be constructed adjacent to Architecture and Planning) attracted three submissions – all supportive. The National Institute of Creative Arts and Industries was highly supportive of this proposal and saw it as a very positive step towards unifying the Faculty and providing best practice facilities for Fine Arts. One staff member pointed out the need to consider carefully how the faculty's research processes might best be integrated into new premises, so as to maximise the opportunities for engagement between the teaching environment and research. Another submission urged that the transition for Elam to new premises be managed carefully to ensure minimal disruption to students and staff.

A total of nine submissions were received concerning the School of Music. All expressed dissatisfaction with the current accommodation arrangements and disappointment that the proposals for NICA I did not appear to recognise nor remedy the problem of insufficient and inappropriate space for teaching, research and office. These respondents stressed an urgent need for need for adequate and appropriate space in a centralised location. The National Institute of Creative Arts and Industries rejected the proposal that Music should remain on its current site, and maintained that the successful integration of NICA I as a faculty was highly dependent on the integration of all departments, including Music, into the new premises proposed for sector 400N. NICA I recommended that as planning of Sector 400N proceeds, full consideration should be given to the inclusion of quality acoustically designed teaching studios, practice rooms, chamber music rooms and staff offices. It also recommended that the studio needs for Dance Studies be addressed within the new premises in 400N.

Other concerns expressed by respondents to the NICA I proposals:

- The current proposal does not mention nor map the Kenneth Myers Centre at 74 Shortland Street (currently a central facility for Music). NICA I believe that this facility is entirely inappropriate and that the future of Music and Dance Studies are hampered by their continued occupation of this building. NICA I would see consolidation in 400N being more desirable than a School of Music spread over several locations including the Kenneth Myers Centre.
- Public performance space provision has not been addressed in the current proposal. NICA I pointed out that Auckland is currently devoid of a recital hall of the 500-700 seat capacity, and that the creation of such a facility on the University's campus could assist to position the University as a cultural hub for Auckland.
- One respondent queried the Campus Map used in the presentations, suggesting that there was an error, stating that Building 207 was shown as jointly occupied by Arts and NICA I when there are in fact no NICA I departments located within Arts 2. Conversely, the Kenneth Myers Centre (Building 820) is shown as being purely NICA I space, when it is actually jointly with NICA I and Arts (FTVMS have office and editing space there).

Proposals - Science

- **Most of the Faculty to remain in current locations:**
 - **Physical and mathematical sciences (301-303)**
 - **Optometry (Grafton)**
 - **Biological Sciences (Thomas Building, possible extension)**
 - **Sport and Exercise Science (Tamaki)**
 - **Leigh Marine Laboratory**
- **SGGES and Psychology to relocate from HSB and Tamaki to 300 or possibly 400N sectors**
- **Further space for research and postgraduate expansion available in 300 and possibly 400N sectors, to be considered alongside Engineering and NICAI**

Responses: The Science proposals attracted relatively little comment outside of the proposed relocation of SGGES and Psychology. [For reactions to the proposals for SGGES and Psychology, see responses under Proposals for the Arts Faculty].

There were no responses to the proposal that physical and mathematical sciences, Optometry, Sport and Exercise Science, and the Leigh Marine Laboratory remain in their current locations.

Three submissions noted that the proposals did not mention the presence of School of Biological Sciences (SBS) staff and the Centre for Biodiversity and Biosecurity at Tamaki Campus. The submissions argued that the key principles of consolidation should not be applied indiscriminately and that the Tamaki-based staff of SBS should explicitly be excluded from any consolidation onto the City Campus. The Centre's strong and successful research and teaching linkages with Landcare Research were mentioned, including the new postgraduate programme launched in March 2008. Confirmation was sought that Tamaki-based staff of SBS would remain on the Tamaki Campus.

Eleven staff members from the School of Biological Sciences wrote a submission seeking reassurance that their views would be accommodated during the redevelopment of the atrium space as part of the extension of the Thomas Building. Specifically, they were concerned that staff and students have input into the redevelopment to ensure that it justifies the creation of new space, does not compromise irreparably the functionality of existing space, and preserves the architectural merit of the existing Reynolds' design.

Three submissions were received on the Department of Computer Science. Two expressed concern that a move to consolidate the department (as implied by the draft Principles) would have a serious and detrimental effect on collaborative research relationships and current and planned research projects on the Tamaki Campus. The third submission suggested that if parts of the Department were to be relocated from the Tamaki Campus to the City Campus, then Applied Computing should be moved from the City Campus to Tamaki to create an Applied Computing Cluster (integrating multimedia imaging).

Proposals - Medical and Health Sciences, Liggins

- **FMHS to remain on the Grafton Campus, except for:**
 - **School of Population Health, to remain at Tamaki**
 - **Clinical facilities at Auckland, Mercy, Middlemore & Waikato hospitals**
- **Faculty Administration and Nursing to return to the Grafton Campus**

- **Refurbishment of research laboratories on most floors of existing buildings 501-504**
- **Construction of a new space for non-laboratory facilities, clinics and administration**
- **Liggins may move to purpose-built space west of existing FMHS buildings in long term**

Responses: No specific feedback was received about the refurbishment of the Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences' research laboratories, or the possible relocation of the Liggins Institute.

Four submissions were received expressing support for the construction of a Clinical Research Centre on the Grafton Campus. These submissions (all from academic units and committees within the Faculty) stated that the facilities currently available to support, maintain and grow clinical research at the University are inadequate, and that the provision of adequate facilities in which to conduct clinical research would improve research income, academic staff performance, recruitment, retention and outcomes for the health of the population. One of these submissions also urged that the development of Clinical Research Space on the Grafton Campus include appropriate facilities for child subjects (as required to undertake paediatric clinical research).

A more general comment was received from a student organisation about the need to ensure that student facilities are growing in line with the growth in student numbers on the Grafton Campus. They expressed concern that space constraints on this site are already negatively affecting undergraduate library, computer facilities and study space for students, and these may be compromised further if medical student numbers continue to grow.

One respondent perceived a possible threat to service provision on the Grafton site, stressing the need for the Student Learning Centre and Student Health and Counselling to maintain a physical presence at Grafton. The submission also pointed out that student feedback suggests the need for ongoing enhancement of student learning spaces such as library and learning common facilities, wireless access and group study spaces.

Four submissions were received related to the location of the School of Population Health. [See also responses under the underlying Principles and also the Tamaki proposals for further feedback related to the location of this School]. The major concern expressed in three of these submissions was that the draft principles and proposals represent a major threat to the academic growth of the School of Population Health, and the academic experience of students enrolled within this School.

The submission from the School of Population Health supported its current location on the Tamaki Campus, providing examples of the successful collaborative teaching and research programmes underway. The School pointed out that its future, including its ability to attract research funding, and meet PhD and research masters completion targets, is dependent upon a strong mix of undergraduate teaching, postgraduate enrolments and research. The focus on the City and Grafton campus, and the implication that facilities for students will be further retracted (or at a minimum not expanded) on the Tamaki Campus was seen by all three respondents as putting at risk the School's undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. It was also viewed as inconsistent with the School of Population Health's current growth targets through

the BHS, BHS Hons and PhD – growth that appears to be at odds with the designation of Tamaki as a base for space intensive research.

The difficulties associated with the current split between Tamaki and Grafton campuses were noted by all four respondents, particularly for BHS and conjoint students.

The Faculty of Medical and Health Science's Education Committee expressed concern about the impact on students and the barrier to interprofessional education caused by the split of the Faculty between the Tamaki and Grafton sites. The Committee stressed that excellent transport options are needed to minimise this dislocation.

The suggestion was made by the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor at Tamaki that, although inconsistent with the principle that 'as far as possible teaching and research activities should be mainly concentrated on the City/Grafton campus', students may benefit from the consolidation of undergraduate teaching programmes like the Bachelor of Health Science on the Tamaki Campus (instead of being split between two campuses as it is at present).

The School of Population Health's submission provided examples of the facilities that it believes are necessary to sustain the School's teaching activities on the Tamaki Campus:

- New accommodation for a Library and Information Commons that is attractive, comfortable and houses a well resourced and staffed information hub;
- Student Health, incorporating adequate medical and counseling service;
- Childcare facilities;
- Tamaki has a high concentration of graduate students but the Graduate Centre has no presence at all on the campus – this should be addressed;
- Accommodation for students near the campus, or, better still, accommodation on campus with conference facilities available as part of the complex. This could provide a home for international students, distance students on campus for 2-3 day teaching blocks, and accommodation for small conference groups;
- Communications network linking all Tamaki lecture theatres and to the city and Grafton campuses to enable simulcasting and video conferencing;
- Transport services to the City and to Grafton (the latter is not currently available).

This submission was also supported by the FMHS Education Committee.

A further submission was received encouraging the University to position the School of Medicine as a distinct and leading entity in the health sciences quarter – "the jewel in the crown of health sciences".

Proposals - Education (1)

- **Relocation to City Campus to allow:**
 - **Academic gains through:**
 - **Closer integration of Education with the rest of the University**
 - **Student access to conjoins and courses taught in other faculties (and vice versa)**

- **Access to better Library/Information Commons facilities**
- **Efficiency and effectiveness gains through:**
 - **Occupation of purpose-built, modern facilities**
 - **Use of shared pool teaching and other facilities**
 - **Elimination of duplicated facilities**

Responses – overview: The Education proposals attracted the majority of feedback received, with a total of 81 submissions (60% of all submissions) commenting on some aspect of the proposals for the Faculty of Education. A total of 44% of these (36 submissions) came from individual staff members, 32% (26 submissions) were from students, seven submissions were from staff organisations or units, two from student organisations and six were received from individuals and organisations outside of the University.

There were strong opinions expressed but no consensus on the optimal location for the Faculty of Education. Twenty-eight percent strongly supported the proposed move for the Faculty. Another 9% were in favour of the move for pre-service teacher education only. These submissions suggested the University retain a presence on the Epsom campus for activities such as in-service teacher education, Team Solutions and the Teachers Resource Centre.

Half (51%) of the submissions received were strongly opposed to a move from the Epsom site to the City Campus. A further 13% could see both advantages and disadvantages in the proposals and were unable to reach a conclusion without further information or consultation.

Responses – by stakeholder type: Current students were the least likely to support the proposals. A total of 85% of students who submitted on the Education proposals were opposed to relocation to the City Campus and just 15% were in favour of the proposed move.

Individual staff members were more supportive of a move to the City Campus, with 36% in favour of the proposals for the Faculty of Education, and a further 17% supportive of a move for pre-service education teaching. Thirty-one percent did not support the proposals and 17% were undecided pending further information.

The seven staff organisations/units that provided feedback also grappled with the relative merits of the Epsom site versus the City Campus, with three opposed to the proposals, two undecided, one in favour of the proposals and one in favour of moving pre-service teaching only. Six external stakeholders (comprised of four principals, a principals' organisation, and a local kindergarten) provided feedback on the Education proposals. Three strongly supported the proposals, two opposed relocation to the City Campus, and one was undecided.

Responses – in support of the proposals: Those in favour of moving Education to the City Campus spoke enthusiastically about the opportunities for greater interaction between Faculty of Education staff and students and those from other disciplines. They were positive about the likely benefits for interdisciplinary research, and the opportunities for staff and students through further engagement with academic and social life on the City Campus.

A number of submissions spoke of the how the proposals would enable the Faculty of Education to be more firmly established as part of the University, shaking off the label of the 'former College of Education'. Several submissions spoke positively

about how a move to the City Campus would enable more Education students to undertake papers from other faculties, conjoint degrees and to explore postgraduate options.

Many were also enthusiastic about the possibility of new purpose-built buildings and facilities, with a number commenting that the current Epsom Campus was run-down, cold, poorly designed and not particularly user-friendly.

Responses – with concerns or opposition to the proposals:

Concerns with the Education proposals fell into four main categories:

1. The special nature of a Faculty of Education
2. The location (including parking and transportation)
3. The history and cultural aspects of the Epsom site
4. The feel or atmosphere of the current location

1. The special nature of a Faculty of Education

Many of the respondents held a view that a Faculty of Education requires a very unique set of facilities and that there was some likelihood that the full range of facilities and resources might not be available should it relocate to the City Campus. This included specialised facilities (such as the swimming pool, gymnasium, tennis courts, dance studios, drama theatres, the Marae, and the Music Auditorium). It was pointed out that the Faculty of Education's timetables are atypical, complex and irregular (largely to accommodate Teachers Council and other regulatory bodies' practicum requirements), which means that the sharing of facilities via semesterised schedules is likely to be difficult. There was also a level of concern about what would happen to the facilities at Epsom, including the Sylvia Ashton Warner Library which was very highly regarded and seen as unlikely to be replicated to the same level. Several submissions wished to ensure that the identity and expertise of the Sylvia Ashton Warner library not be subsumed into the General Library.

Childcare was raised as a serious issue for many students and staff. Several submissions noted that a review of childhood facilities is currently underway, but were concerned that current levels on the City Campus would not accommodate the requirements of Faculty of Education with its particularly high numbers of part-time and mature students with small children. There was a specific concern that there may not be sufficient numbers to run a second kohanga reo facility in the city, meaning children currently attending the kohanga reo at Epsom may not be able to get a place on the City Campus.

Several submissions expressed a concern about how a move to the City Campus may impact on the pedagogical model undertaken within the Faculty, specifically a desire to see that the emphasis on small group teaching not be lost in an effort to create a building consistent with larger scale teaching facilities elsewhere on the City Campus. Two external stakeholders shared concerns that an emphasis on academic theory outside of teacher training could impact on the number of trained teachers that ultimately graduate.

There were concerns from the staff of one academic department about the possibility of duplication or assumptions about shared facilities should the Faculty of Education relocate to the City Campus into a new building. In particular, the possibility of duplication between specialist facilities required for teaching dance, drama, music and the visual arts in education, and those already held by NICAI, and/or the

possibility of inadequate provision of facilities on an assumption of sharing (which may not be possible given differences in the form of delivery and timetabling).

2. Location (including access to parking and transportation)

There was a view among many respondents that teacher training needs to take place in a very different kind of setting – one which Epsom currently provides. In addition to the specialised facilities indicated above, the proximity to local schools (including a number of normal schools) was seen by many students, staff and external respondents as particularly important. Many felt the close relationships and partnerships with these schools could suffer as a result. The ability for students to undertake ‘micro-teaching experiences’ (i.e. where students go into a school to teach only one lesson) was also seen as important and regarded as probably unfeasible from the City Campus location.

Co-location with a number of units and related business units was seen by some respondents as essential, including Te Puna Kohungahunga (Kohunga Reo) and the ECE Centre, Team Solutions, the Kohia Teachers’ Centre (including its retail outlet), Starpath, National Principals’ Centre, and Teacher Support Services. However, there were other respondents who felt that the pre-service element of teaching training could be separated and moved to the City Campus, leaving aspects like Team Solutions at Epsom (largely to preserve their relationships with the local communities and to reduce transportation and parking issues for staff and visitors).

A constant theme in submissions was parking, traffic and transportation between campuses and around the City Campus in particular. The free parking currently available on the Epsom Campus was clearly an important factor for many students and staff, and many believed that this or similar arrangements would need to be replicated on the City Campus to make this proposal palatable to current and prospective students, staff and frequent visitors to the Faculty. A number of submissions made reference to the likely impact of reduced parking availability and heightened traffic congestion on part-time and mature students, particularly those with children or located further out in the Auckland region, or those attending professional development around existing teaching commitments. Several submissions suggested that if the move did go ahead, Team Solutions and other aspects of the Faculty would need dedicated staff and visitor parking to enable its activities to continue.

Concern about this aspect was such that a number of submissions were pessimistic about the likely consequence of a shift to the City Campus on future student numbers. Several submissions expressed real concern that other teacher education providers in the region would be quick to fill the gap left behind on the Epsom site.

It was felt that postgraduate students, in particular, would be less willing to commute to the City Campus – something that would undermine one of the key goals in the University’s Strategic Plan. Several submissions did, however, note the relative paucity of public transport links to the Epsom site (relative to the City Campus) and suggested that the parking available in Epsom was also currently inadequate.

3. Historical and cultural aspects

Tied in with its current location, many submissions commented on the long history of a teachers college in Epsom, identifying family members who had attended and the special connection to the past that exists on the current site.

The special history and place of the Marae and Te Puna Kohungahunga – a bilingual and bicultural Early Childhood Education Centre was the focus of several submissions. The Marae Committee of the Wananga requested that no decisions on this Proposal be made until further consultation is undertaken with staff and students at Te Puna Wananga, the iwi and hapu of the Rankin whanau, and local iwi. Related, there was a concern about losing the history and the mana of the Sonny Riini scholarships if the Faculty was to move away from the Epsom site.

4. Feel or atmosphere of the current location

A number of submissions, particularly those from students, expressed concerns about the feel or atmosphere of the City Campus compared with that experienced at the Epsom Campus. Several respondents described the City Campus as cold, noisy and unfriendly, contrasting that with their experience of a small and close-knit Faculty of Education and the greenery of the Epsom Campus. Several submissions commented that the City Campus appeared to be already overpopulated and were uncertain about how the relocation of how the Faculty of Education would do anything other than stretch resources and facilities even further. Already limited access to computers and study space in the Information Commons were also highlighted as a potential issue by several respondents.

Proposals - Education (2)

- **Teaching and research activities to relocate to the 200 sector**
- **Team Solutions to be located near the Faculty's teaching and research facilities**
- **Physical Education may fit better at Tamaki with Sport and Exercise Science**
- **A key question is what to do with the Epsom Campus**
- **Tai Tokerau campus not affected by this proposal**

Responses: There was little comment on the actual proposed location of Education's teaching and research activities *within* the City Campus, with most respondents interested only in whether it would stay at Epsom or move to the City. However, one submission suggested that the "most unsatisfactory and impractical part of the current plan is the construction of a new building in the Arts sector to house Education. There is no way, the respondent suggested, that a single building can adequately contain the range of activities currently provided on the Epsom campus. It would massively increase the already serious overcrowding in the Arts sector of the city campus, and put great strain on public transport and parking services."

Another submission suggested that more thought needs to go into how the different 'nodes' of activity on the City Campus (including Education in the 200 sector) will interact and whether there is adequate space and opportunities for movement and socialisation between all of the individual 'nodes'.

There was, however, a very strong (and overwhelmingly negative) reaction to the suggestion that Physical Education might fit better at Tamaki with Sport and Exercise Science. All fifteen submissions received on the proposals for Physical Education were of the opinion that Physical Education is an educational practice with strong and vital connections to the rest of the Faculty. The consensus was that Physical Education must remain with the rest of the Faculty of Education (wherever that might be – several of these respondents conceded that it need not be Epsom). This was shown to be consistent with national and international benchmarks for physical

education study. Again, there was also a high level of concern that the very specialised and expensive facilities currently available at Epsom would not be replicated on a space constrained City Campus.

A number of submissions suggested that the University would be better to upgrade the facilities and current buildings on the Epsom Campus rather than relocate the Faculty to the City Campus.

Faculty of Education - other concerns:

- There was a concern that upgrading and maintenance work on the Epsom site might stall if there is the possibility that the faculty might relocate some time in the future.
- One submission queried whether there would be any consequential changes to the B Ed teaching programme at the Manukau Institute of Technology.
- One submission queried where the School of Counselling, Human Services and Social Work would be located on the City Campus with the rest of the Faculty or whether it would move to Tamaki under these proposals. Two submissions were highly supportive of this School moving to the City Campus, regardless of the location of the rest of the Faculty of Education.

Epsom – alternative suggestions:

Seven submissions identified an alternative option of moving pre-service teacher education to the City Campus (and could see merit in doing so), but recommended leaving aspects such as in-service teacher education, Team Solutions, Te Puna Wananga and the Teachers Resource Centre. It was felt that this compromise would allow undergraduate students to benefit from the move to the City Campus while preserving a presence on the Epsom Campus, continuing the relationship with schools in the area, removing the problem of parking and transport for students attending classes around existing teaching commitments, as well as negate the need to rebuild all facilities currently present in Epsom.

One submission suggested that while most staff and students could be relocated to the City Campus, the Epsom Campus could then be transformed into a 'Park of Educational Excellence'. This Park would be a community-based centre with a primary focus on the practice of teaching and learning in school environments, with Team Solutions, Teachers Resource Centre and Health and Physical Education-related courses retained on the Epsom Campus.

Another submission suggested that the option of moving Education to Tamaki should be reconsidered, noting the boost this would provide to the undergraduate population on the Tamaki Campus as well as the linkages that exist and could be furthered between Education, the School of Population Health, MAPAS and the Office of the Tumuaki at Tamaki.

Two submissions suggested the University move other departments and facilities to the Epsom Campus to join the Faculty of Education. Several submissions suggested that a vacated Epsom campus would make a highly suitable student accommodation village, particularly for mature students and those with young families.

Proposals - Student Accommodation

- **Capacity for a 'student village' occupying 400S sector (currently includes Elam)**
- **Staged development would be necessary**

- **Will need to consider options for third party involvement to reduce funding pressures on University**
- **Strategy for student accommodation is being prepared**

Responses: The proposals for student accommodation attracted little comment. One submission (from a student organisation) strongly supported the proposals, pointing out that having a student population that lives within or near to its campus makes a difference to student life.

As identified above, several respondents suggested that the Epsom campus would make a highly suitable student accommodation village, particularly for mature students and those with young families.

One submission made a number of observations about the student accommodation currently on offer, suggesting that it was viewed by some as convenient but expensive. This respondent agreed with the Proposal that engaging with private operators may well be a lower risk solution. It was suggested that more shared rooms may be attractive to students coming from countries where this is common and a lower cost solution.

Proposals - Tamaki Campus

Tamaki becomes the location for:

- **Space-intensive research activities**
 - **Current Ray Meyer Centre occupants**
 - **Other space-intensive activities to be considered for relocation from City Campus**
- **Population Health**
- **Sport and Exercise Science (and possibly Physical Education)**
- **Sports facilities**
- **Support facilities appropriate to settled campus population (≈ 1000 EFTS)**
- **Auckland Innovation Centre (subject to funding)**

Responses: The proposals for the Tamaki Campus attracted a total of 36 submissions. Approximately half of these submissions were mainly concerned about the possible relocation of Physical Education from the Epsom Campus [See the Education proposals for a summary of views on this item].

There was a level of support for the identification of Tamaki as a research-orientated campus. Support for this aspect of the proposals came from a variety of stakeholders, including one external organisation that has co-located to the Tamaki Campus specifically to realise benefits from direct interaction with staff and students on site.

However, most of the respondents about Tamaki (excluding those about Physical Education) held the view that this proposal did not represent a positive strategy for Tamaki's future. Many respondents also saw a level of contradiction between this proposal and the principle that 'as far as possible, teaching and research activities should be concentrated on the City/Grafton campus'. It was felt that these two aspects of the Plan could not be reconciled and the focus on space-intensive research would not excite nor ease concerns of staff and students on the campus. The emphasis on space-intensive research was also seen to be largely unrelated to the activities of the Tamaki-based School of Population

Health. The view of the School of Population Health was that the School might survive if it was the only substantial, intact academic body on the Tamaki campus, but it would be greatly weakened. There was also a concern about the further marginalisation of teaching staff on the Tamaki campus if teaching activities were to be pulled back further to the City Campus.

Several submissions commented that the 'settled campus population' of approximately 1,000 EFTS was lower than the current student numbers. They expressed concern that the student facilities on this campus – already deemed inadequate by several respondents – would fall further behind that of the City and Grafton campuses. Additionally, the lack of critical mass amongst the undergraduate student population, in particular, was viewed as having a negative impact on student experience and on the ability to recruit postgraduate students on the campus. It was noted by several respondents that the Campus' ability to contribute to the University's Strategic Plan (as well as that of the individual schools and departments represented on the Campus) would be significantly compromised by an inability to grow undergraduate and postgraduate numbers. It was suggested that rather than an implied reduction in student numbers, that it might better be phrased as 'a stable and sustainable campus'.

Instead, it was suggested that Tamaki should be viewed as a positive opportunity for the University to grow without the constraints of the City Campus in a way that was technology-intensive, at the heart of educational innovation, leading the way for the university with a community focus, and home to a variety of disciplines, styles of research and levels of teaching. Creating Tamaki as the home of practitioner programmes was suggested by the School of Population Health, with optometry, nursing, social work and physical education nominated to join health promotion, mental health, audiology, palliative care, clinical psychology, health psychology, speech and language therapy, and educational counseling.

One respondent expressed concerns about the safety of the area surrounding the Tamaki Campus – a factor they considered to be relevant not only to current and potential students and staff, but also potential business and research partners. It was suggested that the University work closely with potential partners to identify which areas might be most likely to align well with the facilities and research at Tamaki, and consider joint ventures with other tertiary institutions in the Auckland area for other areas that were not necessarily suitable for a Tamaki-led project. Submissions from the Centre for Biodiversity and BioSecurity were very much in support of their continued presence on this Campus.

One submission suggested that possibilities should be explored to see how the Tamaki Campus could be better used by City students, for example recreational and car parking facilities.

Other matters – consultation and the planning process

Several submissions were received suggesting the University needs to undertake additional consultation with clients and stakeholders before advancing these proposals, particularly with regard to the Epsom Marae complex. One submission (from a student organisation) recommended that the University look to engage students and staff in a creative way throughout the planning process, including involving students by holding student design and planning competitions. It was also suggested that staff and students of NICAI and other relevant departments could be utilised to a greater extent in the planning process. Another submission

suggested that the University needs to place the campus plan within an international context, and could create an open competition for innovative ideas within the university and among major external and international stakeholders.

Other matters – various

A number of other related matters were raised by respondents:

- Parking – a total of 34% of the respondents commented on parking, transportation and traffic, between campuses and as a particular problem for staff, students and visitors to the City Campus.
- Urban design framework – several submissions commented on the need to ensure development occurs within an urban design framework addressing such matters as aesthetics, pedestrian mobility, informal spaces in and around buildings, and connectivity between buildings (including sheltered pedestrian walkways).
- Safety - many submissions talked about student and staff safety in around the Symonds Street area of the City Campus, and the intersection Alfred Street. The need for safe walking options was stressed, including at night.
- Two submissions commented (critically) on the current layout and signage on the Tamaki campus layout and expressed concern about disabled access on the Campus.
- Childcare – several submissions noted the significant demand for this service and expressed concern that the University ensure that the services expand to reflect additional student numbers on the City Campus as a result of the proposals.
- Sector 100 - Two submissions queried the omission of sector 100 from the proposals. It was suggested that this sector contains important historic buildings, the future of which should be integral to the planning process for the whole campus. Government House, Old Choral Hall, the Clock Tower and Alfred Nathan House were identified as key buildings which should feature in this Plan. There was also no mention of the site currently occupied by the Maidment Theatre.
- Cycling – there was disappointment that the proposals contained no mention of cycling facilities, specifically cycle lanes and cycle storage.
- Heritage – several submissions suggested the University’s proposals needed to address issues and opportunities associated with heritage buildings on campus, including a number of modern heritage sites.
- Sustainability - three submissions expressed concern that sustainability of design and construction did not feature as a principle for the planned development of the University.
- Examinations facilities - two submissions highlighted the need for a permanent Examinations Centre on the City Campus following the eventual removal of Commerce A and B prefab buildings and projected growth on the City Campus.
- Timetabling – one submission observed that it would be interesting to see if the new timetabling system (under development) would change the amount of new space required through reductions in inefficiency and wastage.
- Other desirable facilities on campus - One submission expressed disappointment that the proposals did not make reference to a current deficit of such facilities as a “Great Hall”, a performing arts centre, a swimming pool, and other desirable amenities. It was suggested that without full consideration and prioritisation of these and many other

options, the potential for the provision of amenities for the richest possible student experience is ignored.

- Staff development and research support - One submission noted that a world-class campus also requires motivated staff, equipment and facilities (recreation, transport, etc), and that staff development and research support currently need improvement.
- Storage and special collections - one submission observed that the University will need additional storage for special collections and library collections, and that this is not currently apparent in the campus planning documentation.
- Food at Epsom - the quality and cost of food on the Epsom campus attracted several (critical) comments.