

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO**

#### **Introduction**

Initially established as a branch college of the University of Auckland in 1960, the University of Waikato became New Zealand's seventh university after the University of Waikato Act was passed in 1964. Located within what is regarded as the tribal heartland of Maoridom, the University was able to bring into its catchment area a large, diverse group of Maori tribes. From its base within the tribal lands of Waikato, the University of Waikato Maori catchment area included, by 1997, some 19 tribal groups who made up the membership of Te Roopu Manukura, the Maori advisory body to the University of Waikato (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997).

The establishment of the University of Waikato took place at the time that public acknowledgement of the underachievement of Maori in education, health, housing, and other areas, occurred. The Hunn Report (1960) and the Currie Report (1962) identified the lack of progress Maori had made, and the issues raised within these reports focused public and political attention after years of inertia. The fact that the University was situated within the Waikato and surrounded by a number of Maori tribes gave it the opportunity to establish itself as an institution in tune to the needs of the Maori people. It was a challenge that, at times, the University has struggled to meet.

Since the late 1980s, the University of Waikato has experienced a growth in the numbers of Maori students enrolling for university study. As stated in the introductory chapter, Davies & Nicholl (1993:74) identified that the University of Waikato, "through programmes actively geared at improving Maori participation in

education,” had a “significant impact on increasing the participation of Maori in university study overall.” What effect, however, have these programmes had for Maori?

The large numbers of Maori students who have enrolled at the University of Waikato over the years, and the diversity of the tribal groups that fall within its catchment area, give rise to a number of questions. Firstly, did the large numbers of Maori who chose to enrol at the University of Waikato do so because of the empathy that the University had for Maori? Were the courses that the University of Waikato offered responsive to and reflective of Maori needs? Were there ways in which the University of Waikato went out on a limb to encourage these Maori students where other universities had failed? Or was it not the academic environment that attracted such numbers of Maori students at all? Due to the geographic location of the University, was it that the University of Waikato created an environment of convenience and closer proximity to home? Equally, was the size of Hamilton (much smaller than the cosmopolitan and sprawling city of Auckland) more conducive to Maori needs and wants? These questions form the basis of this chapter on the University of Waikato.

The first part of the chapter overviews the establishment of the University and the role of Maori during this period. Then, the developments of the University over the last three decades – 1970s, 1980s and 1990s – are examined, paying particular attention to the role of Maori within its growth. Finally, with a specific focus on the developments during the 1990s and up to 1997, the chapter will look at three significant policy documents produced for, by and about the University of Waikato. The University of Waikato Charter, developed in 1991, and the Strategic Plan, “Paetawhiti,” developed by Dr Norman Kingsbury for the University in 1993, were attempts to address and reflect (in parts) what it anticipated were the ways in which Maori could, and should, be incorporated into the university community. The New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit report into the academic quality assurance procedures, conducted in 1997, critiqued (among other things) the University’s

approach to and handling of Maori issues. This chapter, therefore, is a critical evaluation of the University of Waikato's attempts to address Maori needs and aspirations in higher education, and how effective the institution has been in recognising and adapting to its Maori population.

It should be made clear that the intent of this chapter has not been to overview the entire history of the University, nor detail every single Maori-focussed programme that has been established since the opening of the University. Rather, the intention of this chapter is to place focus on the three policy documents, as discussed earlier. These are the documents which, in my opinion, would have had the greatest impact (if at all) on the graduates' experiences while at the University, and which are being examined in Chapter Six. Furthermore, data and information about the University, and in particular, about Maori participation or involvement in University activities since its establishment is not well documented in either histories of the University or in University documents, such as council minutes, reports and so forth. As a result, the chapter, in its treatment of and reference to University material in relation to Maori may appear sparse and incomplete. However, the intention is to provide a focussed examination of the three policy documents outlined.

### **The Establishment of the University of Waikato – A Brief Overview**

Day (1984)<sup>1</sup> has written a comprehensive account of the development of the University of Waikato since its inception. Providing one of the few glimpses into the short history of the University of Waikato, Day recalls that the original concept of the University was to be a medical school. Led by two Hamiltonians, Dr Anthony Rogers and Mr Douglas Seymour, this idea was rejected by the authoritative body, the University Senate of New Zealand. Undeterred, Seymour and Rogers rethought their

---

<sup>1</sup> Day provides a comprehensive record of the establishment of the University of Waikato from which much of the information for this chapter has been drawn.

positions and became fixed on the idea that Hamilton needed a university of its own and more importantly, that the university needed to be controlled by the local community and not dominated by Auckland. A collective group, known as the University of South Auckland Society was formed, a case was prepared and the process of getting the university established began.

The case was presented before the University Senate of New Zealand in 1957. Parton (1979:214) states that the main factor put forward to justify a new university in Hamilton was “population density.” The University of Auckland, the major stumbling block for the establishment of a new university in Hamilton, realised the fears of the Society through its unanimous rejection of the Hamilton university proposal. The setback was anticipated but the constant, unrelenting opposition that spouted forth from the University of Auckland Council was not, especially as instruction had come from the Senate that consultation in relation to the proposal needed to occur between the two factions - the University of Auckland, and the University of South Auckland Society. The University of Auckland put forward an alternative proposal, which did not foresee a university in Hamilton. This was rejected by the Senate, which approved “in principle the establishment of a university in the Waikato” (Parton 1979:215). Vice-Chancellor Currie, from the University of New Zealand, envisaged that a university in the Waikato region would be established “within the next fifteen years” (Parton 1979:215).

The Hughes-Parry Committee, which was set up in 1959 to investigate the state of university education in New Zealand, was invited to comment on the proposed establishment of a university in Hamilton (Parton 1979). Parton (1979:233) states that the Committee, mindful that the decision to establish a new institution had already been made, “doubted whether sufficient exploration of alternative solutions had been made.” However, it recommended “the continuation of Auckland’s limited commitment...for five years” (Parton 1979:233).

A visit by members of the Hughes-Parry Committee to the proposed site for the new university proved educational for the Hamilton-based Society. Firstly, they learned that the Commission members were not at all interested in using the population increases as a justification for the establishment of a university. Secondly, the view of Commission members relating to the standard of elementary school teachers was such that teachers required a higher standard of learning. Thirdly, the location of the proposed university site in relation to current research facilities such as the Ruakura Research Station, the Meat Research Laboratories and the Soil Research Centre impressed upon the Commission members the need for Hamilton to become the focal point for the teaching of science education at university level. The outcomes of the visit laid the foundations for the way the University of Waikato was to function once it was operational.

At the beginning of 1960 two major milestones were achieved - the new Hamilton Teachers' College opened, followed one month later with the opening of the Waikato Branch of the University of Auckland. Both institutions were based together in a suburb away from the site planned for the University proper although developments were underway for the purchase and construction of buildings at the new proposed site. While external events hampered the progress for the new university (the release of the Hughes-Parry Report on university education the year before resulted in inaction while everyone awaited reaction from the government), classes extended to the second stage and enrolments continued to increase. One significant event in the early life of the Waikato Branch of the University of Auckland, related to the production of the play *Othello* in which, as Day (1984:30) recalls, "history was made through the first portrayal of the title role by a Maori."

According to Parton (1979:216), the establishment of the Waikato Branch, along with the Palmerston North University College, was among "the final acts of the University of New Zealand, and their birth, like that of their parent institution, was attended with controversy."

During this whole period the two factions, the University of Auckland Council - who were still opposed to the establishment of the University of Waikato as its own entity, and who were consistently undermining efforts towards its establishment, and the University of South Auckland Society, the Hamilton-based collective pushing for its opening, continued to spar with one another, scoring points along the way. Another significant factor in this period, which the University of South Auckland Society could claim as a victory, included the initiating of the University of Waikato Halls of Residence Appeal, overtly designed to include the community in efforts to fundraise for residential accommodation for anticipated students in the yet-to-be-built university as well as to further negate the University of Auckland Council's claims that a university in Hamilton was a redundant idea.

In spite of the continuing erratic and unsupportive atmosphere emanating from the University of Auckland, the University of South Auckland Society were given the green light to set up an Advisory Committee, form a Council and recommend to the government how the University of Waikato might operate as an autonomous and separate facility from the University of Auckland. In 1963, site preparations began and drafts were being formulated for the anticipated University of Waikato Act, which was finally passed by the government on August 22 of that year. Events following included the appointment of the first Vice-Chancellor, Professor D. R. Llewellyn - Special Assistant to the Vice-Chancellor and Professor of Chemistry at the University of Auckland; initial meetings of the Professorial Board and the University Council, and the appointments of Dr Denis Rogers as Chancellor, Mr J. B. McKenzie as Pro-Chancellor and Mr J.R. Day as Secretary of the Finance Committee (Day 1984:42-44).

The Governor-General of New Zealand, Sir Bernard Fergusson, opened the University of Waikato amid much pomp and ceremony on Friday February 26, 1965. The dream that was sowed almost ten years earlier became planted in the soils of the

Hillcrest site and the University of Waikato, as the youngest university, was able to move forward as an institution in its own right.

### **The Early Years**

The apron strings, which the University of South Auckland Society so desperately wanted to sever, were still tied firmly in place around the vast expanse that was the University of Auckland. This underlined the continued reliance of the fledgling university on its older and wiser counterpart. Indeed, the academic programme of the university in its early days reflected this reliance, where the subjects offered (English, French, Geography, History, New Zealand History and Pure Mathematics) were those “generally in accordance with the prescriptions of the University of Auckland” (University of Waikato 1964:1). This was the very essence of the traditional English-based university education offered by the University of Auckland and other universities around New Zealand. This was also a clear indication that the University of Waikato, while proclaiming autonomy of sorts, still did not have the resources (either monetary or otherwise) to develop more innovative research agendas.

### Maori Issues and Advocates

During these early years of the University of Waikato, little reference was made to Maori, little consultation was undertaken as to how Maori felt about the proposed establishment of a new university, and no Maori were invited onto the University of South Auckland Society to support this new initiative. While these issues may appear irrelevant, they do have some significance, as it highlights not only the view from society in general (that Maori had little place in education, let alone higher education), but also the view amongst academia that perhaps Maori were still only worthy as subjects of study. At the opening of the University of Waikato however, Sir Bernard Fergusson, the Governor-General of New Zealand, surprised the gathering with the following statement: “Waikato is the first of the New Zealand universities to

be planted right in the heart of the traditionally Maori community. I would like to see high among its ambitions a resolve to establish a Maori faculty.” (Day 1984:60). According to Day (1984:60), “a seed had been sown by the Governor-General’s stirring words which was to grow into something unique, and precious in the university’s structure.”

The appointment of Professor James Ritchie as one of the founding professors proved advantageous for Maori as he tested the academic waters by introducing the idea of Maori Studies into the overall plan of the University of Waikato in his inaugural address (Day 1984:67). At the time, Professor Ritchie was seen as having connections with the Maori community through his research work, most notably with the Rakau study (1958). While the response by academic colleagues to the idea of a Maori Studies department could best be described as lukewarm, Professor Ritchie persevered and continued to push for the idea in public and not so public forums, until the University Council in June of 1965 approved in principle the concept of a Maori research centre. Also agreed during this period was the establishment of a School of Management Studies, a School of Biological Sciences, a School of Earth Sciences and a School of Physical Sciences (University of Waikato 1965:2).

The idea of establishing Maori Studies as a subject worthy of academic study proved intensely interesting for the wider public. Day (1984:67-68) describes articles that appeared in the local papers, and the topic became the focus of discussion for the Maori community, who had been “enthusiastic...at their impromptu hui after the opening ceremony.” The Graduates Association, as a result of the interest and publicity generated by the call to establish Maori Studies as a subject, convened a panel “to discuss the whole question of how more Maori people could be brought into higher education and what form Maori Studies should take” (Day 1984:68). The discussion was highly persuasive and opened the eyes of those who attended.

Further to the interest generated from the original concept of including Maori Studies at the University of Waikato, the Maori community became more proactive in pushing for a Maori member to be appointed to the University Council. The Court of Convocation elected Dr Henry Bennett some eight months after the original request was submitted to the University Council.

Other significant events for Maori during 1965 included a pledge by the Maori community to raise “a total of \$60,000 towards the Halls of Residence Appeal” (Day 1984:68), and an invitation to the University Council and academic staff to attend the annual coronation celebrations of the leader of the Maori King movement, King Koroki. Although Koroki was not present that day due to illness, his successor, Princess Piki (now Te Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikaahu), watched over as kaumatua presented a \$2,000 donation on behalf of the Waikato people for the Halls of Residence Appeal fund (Day 1984:68).

While early documentation to the Minister of Education and the University Grants Committee revealed little of the activity occurring at the University of Waikato relating to the establishment of a Maori Studies centre, Day (1984:66-71) writes of the constant push spearheaded by Professor Ritchie to ensure the focus was paramount. Professor Ritchie was supported by Vice-Chancellor Llewellyn who was keenly determined to follow through the establishment of a Centre for Maori Studies and Research and was also interested in ensuring an avenue in which the “revival and resuscitation of the Maori language” could be facilitated (Day 1984:71).

### Comment

The concept for the University’s establishment was realised with its opening in 1964. There has been little evidence in the documents available that suggest Maori were involved in any depth during the initial stages of the University’s development. This lack of substantial involvement by Maori in the development of the University

characterised the early years, leaving the Maori community to question the University's commitment to advancing Maori issues.

These initial years leading up to and following the establishment of the University of Waikato highlight two important points. The first point relates to the role played by the Maori community during these initial phases. The second point relates to the University and the University community's acknowledgement of this role, and its acknowledgement and advancement of Maori issues and ideals during this period.

As indicated, the Maori community rallied behind the idea of establishing the University, despite what was later discovered to be a lack of consultation on many key issues, including use of the name "Waikato," and the location. Kaumatua recall at a hui held in 1990, nearly 30 years after the University's establishment, how these issues were still left unresolved in their eyes (University of Waikato 1990:23). The fact that the Maori community provided financial support, through assisting in the fundraising for the Halls of Residence appeal is also striking, given the identification in the Hunn and Currie Commission reports of the poor socio-economic, education and health position occupied by Maori at that time. Indeed, it is interesting that Maori, despite their financial position, were eager to support the initiative of the University, seeing this as a positive initiative that might assist their people in moving forward. The statement of the Governor-General at the opening of the University would have reinforced these feelings. This raises the question as to how seriously the University viewed the contribution of Maori to its establishment, and more importantly, how the University viewed its own contribution back to the Maori community. At this point, I would suggest that the University displayed the patronising attitude similar of other institutions at that time, missing the very opportunity that the Governor-General urged it to take. Further, the University reflected the general attitudes of the time, where government inaction was also evident, in spite of the changes urged by the Hunn and Currie Commission reports.

### **The First Decades: The University of Waikato in the 1960s and 1970s**

The idea of a Maori Studies centre had been sown, thus it appeared that the University could not entirely escape the issue. Once floated, it seemed that the notion of a Maori Studies centre moved beyond musings ‘if’ it would be established and began to be discussed in terms of ‘when’ it would be established. Representations towards the government by both the University of Waikato and interested groups within the community regarding the establishment of Maori Studies at the University did not prove successful during the latter part of the 1960s. The quinquennial grants (the five-yearly funding rounds by the government to universities in New Zealand), which were allocated toward the end of 1969, did not provide for the establishment of a Centre for Maori Studies and Research, although assurances were received that the government was prepared to “consider again the application for a special grant for this important project” (University of Waikato 1969:2).

The University of Waikato was still trying to establish initial programmes at that time and vented its frustration at those “people not directly involved” and thus who did “not readily” appreciate the time, effort and funding required (University of Waikato 1969:2). Local efforts to secure a position for the Centre for Maori Studies and Research included a mass meeting at which 200 students protested at the continual deferment and where a “Maori Centre Action Committee” was formed (Day 1984:117). Panel discussions, recommendations, newspaper publicity and articles that further reinforced community support for the initiative did little from the government’s perspective, which continually beat back an increasingly disconcerted University of Waikato.

The issue of the establishment of the Centre for Maori Studies and Research was debated intensely, not only amongst the local community and in the media, but also within the ranks of academia. According to Day (1984:123), Professor Biggs (Professor in Anthropology at the University of Auckland) strongly contested the

“impression” being given by the University of Waikato that “Maori Studies did not exist anywhere in the universities.” In fact, Maori Studies courses were being taught up to the Masters’ level at the University of Auckland as well as the University of Victoria, Wellington. The argument, however, concerning the establishment of a Centre for Maori Studies and Research at the University of Waikato was not on replacing or reproducing those courses taught at other universities. Instead, the argument for the Centre for Maori Studies and Research focused on the area of “current Maori life - in all areas where problems existed - with a view to discovering ways of improving the lot of the Maori people, and also to recovering and ascertaining elements of their cultural heritage which the twentieth century was obliterating” (Day 1984:123). This was a recurrent theme in the argument regarding the Centre’s establishment.

#### The Introduction of Maori Language

In 1970, five years after classes officially began at the University of Waikato, Part I Maori language courses were offered for the first time. It is interesting to note that the University of Waikato also offered Part I Japanese courses in the same year (University of Waikato 1970:1). The introduction of Part I Maori at the same time as Part I Japanese courses was largely due to the efforts of a Mr Peter Wells. Mr Wells, a lecturer in French at the University of Waikato looked for further challenges once a Professorial appointment had been made within the French Department (Day 1984:123). Mr Wells, aside from his expertise in French, was also one of the first in New Zealand to teach Japanese as well as being a “vigorous proponent of the relevance of Maori to all New Zealand citizens” (Day 1984:124). His proposed Language Studies Department, which incorporated the first year courses of Maori and Japanese, was accepted by the University Council hence their simultaneous introduction at the University of Waikato in 1970.

With a student population of 1,034 in 1970, the focus of the University of Waikato in terms of courses offered could clearly be seen in the sciences, with courses available

in Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Earth Sciences and Physics (University of Waikato 1970:1). The following year, the establishment of the School of Management Studies was capped with the appointment of its first Dean, with classes scheduled to begin in 1972. While there was significant opposition from the newly established School of Science, the argument put forward for establishing the School of Management Studies at that point in time was sufficient to convince the University Council of its support. Day (1984:147) states however, that the ease with which the School of Management Studies was established was not to be carried over into the establishment of the much argued and debated Centre for Maori Studies and Research.

#### The Opening of the Centre for Maori Studies and Research

A significant breakthrough came about from a grant by the D.V. Bryant Trust. The Trust, which was a charitable trust based in Hamilton and founded by a well-known Hamilton family, “resolved to make a donation of \$10,000 a year for a period of three years...provided the University was able to obtain official funds to make the Centre a viable proposition” (University of Waikato 1971:1). It is ironic that since the establishment of the University of Waikato, Maori had had to rely on the generosity of others in order to realise their ambitions in relation to the higher education field. Day (1984) states that there was opposition within some sectors of the community, which suggests that the advancement of Maori issues, despite the call by the Governor-General at the opening of the University, had yet to take effect. This point is also more important when considered in light of the publication of the Hunn and Currie Commission reports some ten years earlier, and highlights the inability of a higher education institution that had thus far failed to take a proactive stance in providing a venue from which Maori development could be advanced.

After pressure from supporters of the Centre for Maori Studies and Research the University of Waikato finally brought to fruition the establishment of the Centre, with the appointment of Mr Robert Te Kotahi Mahuta as Director (University of Waikato

1972:1). Mr Mahuta, a member of the kahui ariki (direct descendants of the first Maori King, Potatau Te Wherowhero), is described by Day as “the epitome of local Maori sensibilities” who also held a Master’s degree from the University of Auckland (1984:178). A more visible presence for Maori at the University of Waikato had finally been provided.

The Centre for Maori Studies and Research was also to have an Advisory Committee “made up of representatives of the University, of the Maori community, the Departments of Maori and Island Affairs and of Education, and some other concerned organisations” (University of Waikato 1971:1). These advisors were drawn from nominees of the Maori Queen (as leader of the Maori King movement), a nominee from the Director-General of Education, representatives from the D.V. Bryant Trust (which established the initial funding source) as well as representatives drawn from the Maori Centre Trust, the Maori Women’s Welfare League and the New Zealand Maori Council (University of Waikato 1972:1).

#### Other Developments

According to the University of Waikato report to the Minister of Education and University Grants Committee, 1973 was seen as a year of consolidation. In particular for Maori, things were happening at the University of Waikato. The year began with the election of Dr Henry Bennett as Chancellor, a post that was to be held for three years (University of Waikato 1973:2). From a distinguished Te Arawa family (from the Bay of Plenty in the central North Island of New Zealand), the installation of Dr. Bennett as Chancellor was a major step forward in the progression of Maori interests at the University of Waikato. Prior to the establishment of the University of Waikato, Dr Bennett had been actively involved in ensuring the institution became a reality through discussions and debates.

Academically, Maori language courses, which had been introduced two years earlier, were expanded and the Centre for Maori Studies and Research had begun research

projects focusing on pre-school education and community development. A University Extension programme, which had been initiated earlier, completed its planning for a Certificate of Maori Studies which was to begin the following year. The Certificate of Maori Studies required the student to undertake six courses in Maori Studies over a minimum three-year period (University of Waikato 1973:2). The Extension programme was available to students from within the University catchment area, drawing students from as far away as Gisborne and Whakatane (on the east coast of the North Island) to the King Country (on the west coast of the North Island), as well as catering for students within the immediate Hamilton surrounds.

According to Karetu (1989:73), who was the inaugural Senior Lecturer of the Department of Maori, the Maori programmes offered by the University at that time “had to prove their viability, their academic worth and their desirability in an environment that was often hostile, suspicious and uninformed.” While able to proceed largely due to the demand for the programmes (to the point where Maori was offered as a major for undergraduate degree programmes), this hostility resurfaced in 1977 during discussions for the introduction of a Master of Arts degree in Maori. Pointing out the perceived lack of literary sources within Maori to substantiate study at an advanced level, Karetu (1989:73) responded in 1988 at a graduation ceremony “that the bards of Maoridom were equal to Milton and Shakespeare, the philosophers equal to those the world has known and still celebrates.” It was, however, an insight into the political battleground that characterised academic life during that time.

The rest of the 1970s saw a more cohesive approach as Maori Studies developed in the different academic sectors across campus. The University Extension programme was renamed the Centre for Continuing Education. The first students enrolled in the Certificate of Maori Studies graduated in 1976. Maori language, not introduced as a subject until 1972, rapidly moved through to the Master’s level of study and the Centre for Maori Studies and Research made considerable progress in its research activities. The Maori Department, the Centre for Maori Studies and Research and the

Centre for Continuing Education were all housed in the same building. In 1979, the University of Waikato conferred an honorary doctorate upon the leader of the Maori King movement, Te Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikaahu (University of Waikato 1979:3).

### Comment

A number of points emerge when reflecting on the early years of the University of Waikato. In relation to the advancement of Maori issues, however, these points are not positive. The initial rejection of the Centre proposal during the quinquennial funding round reflects a point made earlier regarding government inertia over Maori issues and government's inability to find proactive (if not bold) ways of addressing them. Another point to consider regarding the establishment of the Centre revolves around the issue on the reliance on external funding, which effectively set in motion the process by which the Centre was eventually established. The fact that the Centre's establishment was effected because of external funding points to the dichotomous relationship between Maori and the academy again reinforcing the impression of inertia by the University to become bold advocates for Maori advancement during this period.

Equally interesting is the sensitivity displayed by other academic members during the debate about the Centre for Maori Studies and Research establishment. The fact that Day (1984) highlights the point made by Professor Biggs regarding the status of Maori Studies within New Zealand universities during this time raises the question that perhaps there may have been the fear of competition, given Auckland University's close proximity to Waikato. I would suggest, however, that the fear was perhaps more indicative of the protective world of academia, which did not see the Centre's proposed approach as 'fitting' the mould, where research was 'on' Maori, and not 'by', 'for', and 'with' Maori. Again, this would seem to highlight the traditions maintained by higher education, and reinforced the maintenance of a 'status quo' approach to academic activity concerning Maori.

This approach is further reinforced when considering the introduction of Maori language teaching in conjunction with Japanese. The experiences of academic staff, like Karetu, reflect the inability of academic staff at the University to accept Maori as an academic subject, and thus seems to have reinforced a sense of ignorance and a notion of superior arrogance to the advancement of 'others.' In a sense, the University of Waikato chose to maintain a 'status quo' position, seemingly reluctant to forge the path that Sir Bernard Fergusson had urged at its opening.

There were some achievements for Maori during the early years of the University. These included the establishment of the Certificate of Maori Studies, through the Extension programme, which opened up the possibility of accessing higher education for Maori living in remote communities. The appointment of Dr Henry Bennett to the position of Chancellor of the University could also be classed as an achievement, providing a role model for Maori at the highest level of University governance.

Overall however, I suggest that the achievements made during this early period, such as the establishment of the Maori language course and the Centre for Maori Studies and Research, were perhaps more reflective of the persistence of a few members of the University, rather than a planned institutional directive. In essence, constant battles by Maori staff and the Maori community against academic ignorance towards Maori, and the maintenance of cultural superiority, or 'status quo' overshadowed these achievements.

### **The 1980s**

The period of the 1980s in terms of development of new initiatives specifically for Maori did not particularly ring true. In fact, there was very little in the way of new programmes. Day (1984:233) highlights the international exposure the Maori language lecturer, Timoti Karetu, gained when he took his nationally renowned

cultural group, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato overseas. The group also performed at the invitation of many on local marae around the country. Karetu (1989:76) felt that this type of activity enabled the local Maori community to “realise that the University is not beyond their scope and that, for them, it is a very definite possibility.”

In 1982, the School of Social Sciences instituted, in consultation with the Department of Maori Affairs, a management development programme where the emphasis rested on providing opportunities for young Maori (University of Waikato 1982:2-3). Meanwhile the Centre for Maori Studies and Research continued working within the community, hosting overseas scholars and researching issues of relevance to Maori development (University of Waikato 1982:6-7).

The Centre for Continuing Education experienced resource constraints due to the popularity of its courses during this period, especially in the Certificate of Maori Studies. While only a small group of students were coming out with Certificates, according to Day (1984:235), the programme was seen by the Maori community as being “highly-prized,” and as such was being offered in more centres than ever before – Tauranga and Rotorua (the Bay of Plenty), Edgecumbe and Tokomaru Bay (the eastern Bay of Plenty and east coast), and for the first time, Hamilton City. More significantly, the Maori Department offered places in degree classes to certificate students, which were seized upon “with both hands” (Day 1984:236). During the mid-1980s, classes in Maori increased which in turn put pressure on staff (University of Waikato 1984:2). Despite these constraints, Karetu (1989:78) was of the opinion that the popularity of the Certificate of Maori Studies “whetted the academic appetite of people in areas far removed from the physical location of universities,” and credited the University for being “in the vanguard of such thinking.”

In 1983, the Centre for Maori Studies and Research began to focus more on Maori education, with the secondment of a research fellow from the Department of Education who was charged with setting up alternative marae-based education

programmes for the young unemployed (University of Waikato 1984:5). Other schools of studies at the University of Waikato were also involved in research topics which impacted on Maori, namely educational achievement among Maori children, Maori land compensation, and for Waikato Maori in particular, quality issues concerning the Waikato River (University of Waikato 1984:4-5).

A new Vice-Chancellor was appointed in 1985, the first change at that level since the University of Waikato was established thirty years earlier. Dr Wilf Malcolm, formerly Professor of Pure Mathematics and Academic Pro-Vice-Chancellor at Victoria University, Wellington, took over after the retirement of Dr Llewellyn (University of Waikato 1985:1).

#### Comment

It is interesting to note that the 1980s were seen as a decade of development for Maori, characterised by the Hui Taumata held in 1984, which discussed the status of Maori and how it could be advanced. Against this backdrop however, the University of Waikato appears to have continued advancing academic interests, through the development of new schools, new courses and programmes without seeming to take a vested interest in the activities of its wider, Maori constituency.

Perhaps the most positive initiative during this period was the continuing success of the Certificate of Maori Studies, offered by the Centre for Continuing Education, and taught through a number of satellite campuses in remote centres of the University's catchment area. Karetu's comment of how Maori embraced the concept of higher education through this Certificate gives an indication of the need for traditional institutions like universities to move outside of their own structures and become more accessible to people who do not have the means to move to study for a tertiary degree. This was reinforced with Karetu's initiative of taking groups of Maori students on cultural tours, using them as positive role models for higher education to the more isolated Maori communities.

While the University must be lauded for instituting the Certificate programme, Maori themselves still largely conducted much of the University's work in relation to Maori during this period. The notions of institutional support, as described in Chapter Two, appear lacking during this period, where it seems the emphasis was still on maintaining "Euro-Western values" (Wright 1987:11).

### **The New Look Era? The 1990s and the University of Waikato Charter**

The continuing development of the University, as it entered into its third decade of operation, came about during a time of major restructuring in the New Zealand education system. Up until this point, programmes and initiatives developed to assist Maori participation in higher education were relatively small in number. In 1989, the University established Te Timatanga Hou, a bridging programme aimed at Maori school leavers who did not necessarily have the qualifications to enter university directly. The purpose of Te Timatanga Hou was to encourage Maori school leavers into considering university education as an option. The one-year course was designed to tutor small numbers of Maori students in subjects such as English, Maori, maths and science, to give them a breadth of options for studying at the university level. Courses were also given in writing, so as to prepare students for writing essays, appropriate use of language and basic research skills. After graduating from Te Timatanga Hou, graduates were able to enrol for all university courses.

At the time Te Timatanga Hou was introduced at the University of Waikato, major changes to the tertiary education system were being devised. According to Butterworth & Butterworth (1998:163), the release of the government document, *Learning for Life Two*, in 1989, set out the government "decisions on the tertiary sector." These decisions included more accountability by universities to the government. The 1989 Education Act required universities to develop charters. Specifically, the government directive for charters was that they were to be corporate

plans, which set out “objectives and funding requirements” and were to be used as a “basis for negotiating government funding” (Butterworth & Butterworth 1998:164). Envisaged as being public documents, the charters were also intended by the government to contain “a set of specific performance indicators to measure how well the institution was meeting its objectives” (Butterworth & Butterworth 1998:164). The Vice-Chancellors’ Committee was uncomfortable with the government directive, seeing the changes as excessive and failing to “get the right balance between autonomy and accountability” (Butterworth & Butterworth 1998:164).

One key aspect of the charters was the need for institutions to address Treaty of Waitangi issues. Given that universities to date had initiated few proactive measures for Maori student populations, this would have been a challenging task. The political climate at that time ensured that Maori issues were to the fore, and that Maori rights guaranteed under the Treaty were made known. However, the reality was that there existed a greater misunderstanding about the Treaty itself, and in particular, how the Treaty was to be incorporated into business plans for higher education institutions.

In spite of these concerns, the University of Waikato Charter was developed in 1991 in fulfilment of the government directives. The Charter was also developed during the period of direct negotiations between the government and the Waikato tribe, following a successful decision by the Court of Appeal in 1989, which acknowledged the need for the government to consult with Maori regarding the sale of state-owned assets. This section overviews the Charter, paying particular attention to how Maori have been perceived within the corporate plan of the University of Waikato.

### Statements and Objectives

In its statement of distinctive character, purpose and the goals of the University of Waikato, the Charter identified the relationship between the University and Maori, acknowledging its “awareness of and sensitivity to equity issues and its policy to achieve equality of opportunity in education” (University of Waikato 1991:1). The

University Charter also sought to “incorporate into its life and activities the diversity of Maori interests within its region” (University of Waikato 1991:1).

#### Educational Purpose, Values and the Treaty of Waitangi

The Charter also highlighted what could be viewed as standard references to the pursuit of “excellence” within the university environs and the need for the university to be accessible to a “wide range of people” (University of Waikato 1991:1). Under the heading “Educational Purpose and Values,” the Charter outlines a definitive approach to the needs of Maori within university education, ensuring that they are “appropriately catered for outside a formally constituted Whare Wananga; Maori customs and values are expressed in the ordinary life of the University; and the Treaty of Waitangi is clearly acknowledged in the development of programmes and initiatives based on partnership between Maori and other New Zealand people” (University of Waikato 1991:2).

Interesting to note from this section are two points: firstly, its reference to the Treaty of Waitangi and secondly the broad statements referring to the incorporation of Maori life and customs into the normal life of the University itself. With regard to the first point, Benton (1987) had identified some years earlier that there was a clear relationship between the Treaty of Waitangi and education. Indeed, the government appeared to recognise this relationship, and had stipulated that there were certain “non-negotiable elements” that had to be included in the charters of schools, of which the Treaty of Waitangi was listed as one (Butterworth & Butterworth 1998:129). It would seem that tertiary institutions were also following suit.

The broad statements referring to Maori customs and values being expressed within the “ordinary life of the University” appear exactly that – broad. Kingsbury (1984:26) had already identified the need to “encourage the spread of Maori ethos throughout the institutions.” Specifically, Kingsbury (1984:26) appealed that because universities were extensions of the dominant society, there needed to be a concerted effort to have

“more recognition of Maori values and Maori ways of doing things” which would “enrich both the universities themselves and society as a whole.” What Kingsbury had highlighted was something that the Governor-General had raised at the opening of the University of Waikato back in 1965, and something that the University still appeared to have difficulty trying to address. Durie (cited in Bishop & Graham 1996:9) believed that the difficulty experienced by universities during this period related not so much to unwillingness, but rather a confusion as to what was expected from institutions with Treaty requirements. In particular, the confusion stemmed from what Bishop & Graham (1996:9-10) describe as a “focus on a ‘needs’ analysis, rather than any understanding of a contractual arrangement between Iwi and Crown agencies.”

#### Access and Affirmative Action: Fashion Statements or Key Issues?

The issue of access was addressed in the Charter, with the intention of reaching those from “traditional groups without a tradition of regular access to university education” (University of Waikato 1991:3). Other writers have noted that Maori, perhaps more than any other “group,” have less “regular access” to university education (Davies & Nicholl 1993; Pool 1987; New Zealand Government 1987; Boston 1988). In this setting, the University of Waikato had already moved to initiate action in this area, with the establishment of Te Timatanga Hou programme in 1989 (Avery 1989:44-45).

The Charter also stated its intention to implement the “Affirmative Action Policy and the Equal Employment Opportunities Programme,” although it was unclear as to whether these initiatives were for the benefit of Maori or for all those perceived as disadvantaged (University of Waikato 1991:4).

#### The University Council within the Charter

According to the Charter, the constitution of the University Council allowed for direct Maori input into two of the positions. One of these positions was to be

appointed by nomination of the head of the King movement (whose present leader is Te Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikaahu), and the other by nomination of the “Iwi/University Consultative Council” otherwise known as Te Roopu Manukura (University of Waikato 1991:4). It should be noted that these two positions were reserved solely for Maori to determine who should be representative of them on the University Council. However, it did not preclude Maori from being represented on the University Council in any other capacity.

#### Consultation and the Kaumatua Hui

In the development of the Charter document, the university undertook a series of consultations as well as accepting submissions from interested parties. Voicing opinions from a Maori perspective was the Centre for Maori Studies and Research (University of Waikato 1991:6). A Kaumatua Hui was held at Turangawaewae Marae in July 1990 specifically to discuss the development of the Charter and to allow for Maori input into the written document that was produced.

There were two key objectives arising from the Kaumatua Hui: one was to define the area of post-school education and training and how Maori interests could be incorporated within this sector, and two, to define the paramount purpose (from the participants’ point of view) of education for Maori. The outcomes from the hui based on the two objectives resolved firstly, that tikanga Maori (Maori customs) be the guiding force behind the development, construction and dissemination of knowledge and secondly, that the Treaty of Waitangi be acknowledged as the paramount educational purpose from which programmes be developed with an emphasis on the partnership with Maori in such activity (University of Waikato 1990:17).

Other issues discussed at the Kaumatua Hui highlighted a number of points. As discussed, there was little Maori input into the establishment of the University of Waikato, its location, or its name (University of Waikato 1990:23). The University of Waikato has attempted to incorporate the aspects of a Whare Wananga (hence the

name University of Waikato/Te Whare Wananga o Waikato). However, it was pointed out at the Kaumatua Hui that the University needed to be much more committed to developing programmes that clearly showed the realisation of such objectives (University of Waikato 1990:29). Furthermore, it was felt that the University of Waikato/Te Whare Wananga o Waikato as a “joint institution” needed to fully incorporate aspects of both cultures, thus running parallel or in conjunction with each other as opposed to being in competition to, separated from or worse, continuing to promulgate the assimilatory perspectives which have been characteristics of tertiary operations for so long.

### Comment

From the points raised in the preceding discussion, the University of Waikato Charter has emerged as an attempt to address the needs of Maori within what is essentially a corporate plan for a tertiary institution. While it could be argued as to what place Maori concerns have within such documents, it is fair to say that for the University of Waikato anyway, such concerns should be valued and treated as valid, given the Maori student population base (or client base), from which the University draws its economic viability. Closer examination of the Charter itself has highlighted a priority to include the Treaty of Waitangi.

Despite this priority, such inclusions had little impact for Maori interests, as highlighted from the concerns expressed at the Kaumatua Hui. It is argued that the inclusion of the Treaty of Waitangi in the Charter was more to satisfy government requirements, to show that – by including the Treaty – Maori concerns and issues had been addressed by the University. The view therefore, is that the inclusion of Maori within the Charter, while important, was more of a token gesture rather than a genuine desire to include the Treaty in a meaningful, effective way. In effect, then, the apparent unwillingness of the University of Waikato to embrace the power-sharing role that the Treaty of Waitangi had envisaged back in 1840 highlighted the maintenance of its links to the colonial past.

## **Paetawhiti - the Strategic Plan of the University of Waikato**

“Paetawhiti - setting our aspirations on distant horizons and journeying towards them” (Kingsbury 1993:i). The opening statement of the strategic plan formulated for the University of Waikato, outlined the intentions of the document. At face value, the report should be taken as an introduction to the whole strategic planning process undertaken by the University of Waikato, which began with the release of the University of Waikato Charter in 1991. Underpinning the focus of the report was the desire for the University of Waikato to find its niche within the university context, and to determine its unique structure within the wider global institutional setting. Issues of cost in association to research without compromising on quality were raised, as were the areas of efficiency and effective use of funding streams available to the University. The report identified the need for the University to be able to adapt to the changing needs of the various members of its community, which would enable it to juggle the differences between the cultural, social, political and economic climates within which it existed.

Particularly, the report identified the need for the University to acknowledge, understand and move towards addressing the many issues associated with the complexities of running a university, and which specifically include its relationship with government and funding, its relationship with students, staff and the wider community (including Maori), how it intended to manage its research and teaching programmes, and how it was to cope with issues such as technology and the increasing move to globalise education.

### Paetawhiti - An Impetus for Maori?

According to the report, the University had a “long-term commitment to education for Maori,” which allowed it to provide a “very good base for increasing Maori participation,” an on-going goal of the University “for many years” (Kingsbury 1993:3). Acknowledging the unequal participation rates of Maori in education and

thus in economic development, the report urged the University to consider its role in terms of increasing the participation rates of Maori through to graduation, and questioned how it intended to “honour the Treaty of Waitangi” (Kingsbury 1993:4).

The report recognised that the University was located within a region “deeply rooted in its Maori culture, strong in its will to preserve the vitality of the culture and language, and energetically motivated to the development of Maori and the good management of Maori resources” (Kingsbury 1993:11). Accordingly, the University had attempted to understand these concerns, through the development of high quality language-teaching programmes and research centred on Maori development.

An interesting focal point of the Paetawhiti report was the identification of the unequal playing field of Maori in the area of education. The report clearly identified this lack of equal participation and also highlighted the “serious and continuing concern” with which the Treaty of Waitangi was regarded by the University of Waikato (Kingsbury 1993:43). While proclaiming its achievements in the area of Maori education, the report acknowledged the areas that required further development, and it specifically identified the issue of increasing participation by Maori campus-wide. The purpose behind this objective was to allow for more Maori graduates to enter into the workforce suitably qualified, ensuring that there was no saturation of Maori graduates in any one discipline or employment area. Specific mention was also made of the need for Maori to “take employment” especially in the fields “essential to Maori development,” although such fields were not specified (Kingsbury 1993:43).

One main achievement that was listed in the Paetawhiti report in relation to Maori education at the University of Waikato was the development of the proposal for the School of Maori and Pacific Development, which was opened in 1996. The function of the School, as outlined in the report, was to ensure that its activities had a “strong Maori ethos and/or are designed especially to serve the needs of Maori” (Kingsbury

1993:43). The concept of the Tainui endowed college, which is discussed in the next chapter, was also introduced at this point (Kingsbury 1993:43).

### Implications of Paetawhiti

As mentioned, the issue of increasing Maori participation and retention had a real focus within the report and was seen by the University to be one of the main objectives that needed attention. While many of the Schools of Studies had formulated policies specifically to address this, it appears from the Paetawhiti report that the development and establishment of the School of Maori and Pacific Development was to facilitate the increase of Maori participation across all academic disciplines.

The report emphasised the need for the University to be wary of limiting Maori perspectives, values and ways of doing things as being advantageous to Maori only. Specifically, the report stated that the University needed to be aware of the changing societal climate within which graduates were expected to participate and contribute. Therefore, according to the report, the University had to ensure that these graduates understood “things Maori” and were “sensitive to Maori concerns, culture, aspirations and economic development” (Kingsbury 1993:44). Equally, the report encouraged the University itself to be more accepting of alternative knowledge approaches and teaching methods, and encouraged the University to “be supportive of these programmes and, where appropriate, formally acknowledge them as pathways into university education for those who want it” (Kingsbury 1993:45).

In short, the emphasis of the report focused on the need for the University to be more diverse in its approach to research, teaching and learning. Effectively, the report stated that the University needed to become more proactive in ensuring the needs of its customers were being addressed, and that the diversity of its customers was acknowledged and addressed. Specifically for Maori, the report identified the ongoing need for the University to ensure that appropriate links were made with

secondary schools, with iwi authorities and with other tertiary providers to ensure that Maori needs were being satisfactorily met. Equally, the report urged the University to ensure greater participation by Maori across the academic disciplines, as well as ensuring its commitment towards achieving biculturalism (Kingsbury 1993:78).

### A Summary of Paetawhiti

In essence, Paetwahiti could be described as a benchmark for the University of Waikato. Particularly in relation to Maori issues, such as increasing Maori participation and retention, Paetwahiti provided the impetus for the University from which to move forward. The identification of Maori as a key customer base, acknowledging its diversity and unique attributes effectively challenged the University to view Maori in a different light. However, the University, which had been required to introduce the Treaty of Waitangi into its Charter document in 1991, still appeared uneasy with the concept of power-sharing with Maori. Despite the identification of Maori as a key customer base, and the fact that Maori represented nearly 20 percent of the total University of Waikato student population, it would seem that the University did not comprehend the need to cater for Maori needs, beyond the provision of Maori language/culture related programmes. The “Maori ethos” that Kingsbury (1984) argued for still had not permeated through the culture of the University. This point was further reinforced when, in 1997, the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit was invited by the University to “carry out an audit of its academic quality assurance procedures” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:1).

### **The Academic Audit Report**

Comprising six members, one of whom was Maori, the Audit Panel was appointed to carry out the audit on the University of Waikato between August 1996 and June 1997. At the outset, the Audit Panel acknowledged that the University was in a

process of change, where senior management appointments (including that of the Vice-Chancellor) had been made in the last two years preceding the audit. As identified in the Audit Report, the University prior to the audit itself had already implemented comprehensive self-auditing procedures. The Audit Panel found that, through this process of self-auditing, the University had already identified “almost all the matters that the panel subsequently discovered through its investigations” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:2). This section is interested only in the issues which impact directly on Maori, and thus pays most attention to section three of the Audit Report, entitled “The Treaty of Waitangi.”

#### The Audit Report and Maori Access

The audit panel commended the University for its work in ensuring Maori student access to university education, and for maintaining good relations with the Maori community. However, the panel found that “evident goodwill has not always been translated into structures that will ensure an environment that is congenial for Maori students” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:2).

The report found that the Department of Maori within the University of Waikato was “one of the fastest growing” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:9). While it does not seem clear from the report whether this statement refers to the size of the department itself or to the growth in the number of programmes being offered, it is presumed that the growth refers to the types of programmes offered. As Timoti Karetu (1989:75), former head of the Department of Maori, wrote in commemorating 25 years of the University’s existence in 1989, “Waikato has the reputation for being the speakers of the language. It has a reputation from which there should be no veering, for it is what makes the Maori Department of the University of Waikato unique among the country’s universities.”

Aside from the depth shown in the Maori department, the University of Waikato was also praised for the establishment of the School of Maori and Pacific Development,

an initiative that, according to the report “incorporates some long-standing and successful UW activities” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:9).<sup>2</sup> Equally impressive were the figures given for Maori student enrolments at the University of Waikato, although the panel noted that those Maori who made up 22 percent of the student population were “still less than the Maori proportion of the local population (31%)” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:10). Whilst the report found that the enrolment figures were “testimony to UW’s success in providing access,” it also expressed concern that “the retention rate of Maori students” during the final years of study and further on to higher study “is only half that of other students” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:10). The panel subsequently recommended that the University of Waikato “investigate the reasons for this” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:10).

### Te Roopu Manukura

The report stated that 19 iwi authorities were represented on the Maori advisory body to the University Council, Te Roopu Manukura. Theoretically, according to the report, the role of Te Roopu Manukura was to ensure that Maori “concerns, comments and desires from every iwi” were put before the Council (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:9). In practice, however, the report showed quite a different picture. Instead of a body that was able to inform and advise the University Council decisively and with some authority on issues of Maori concern, it was beset with problems due to its large size, and a lack of clarity about its role, and about the actualities of student life and university life in general. While it was attempting to address these issues, the report also indicated mixed response as to the relationship between the University and individual iwi, which may then have impacted on the ability of iwi to see themselves effectively represented in a forum such as Te Roopu Manukura.

---

<sup>2</sup> UW refers to the University of Waikato.

Specifically, these concerns were identified through the high value placed on the University by Tainui, which had “some negative consequences for other tribes’ attitudes” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:9). This issue in particular raises concern regarding the University’s ability to service the needs of its wider Maori constituency. The establishment of the Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi in Whakatane (part of the catchment region of the University), and the Wananga o Aotearoa, with campuses in Te Awamutu, Rotorua and Hamilton (again all part of the catchment region of the University), all have the capability of impacting on Maori student enrolments at the University of Waikato, as well as the University’s ability to maintain its relationships with iwi, as mentioned.

#### Implications of Academic Audit Report for Maori

Briefly, it could be stated that the Academic Audit report highlighted, again, some of the issues that had been present at the University of Waikato for some time. The report indicated that the acceptance and incorporation of Maori values, knowledge and ways of doing things, as recommended by Kingsbury in 1984 and 1993, were not yet clearly understood across the University, and some felt that the University was “essentially monocultural, with some polarisation on bicultural issues” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:12). In short, it highlighted the gap between the good intentions of the University, as indicated in the Charter and strategic plan, and the reality.

For Maori, the issues are complex. The development of Maori programmes and initiatives was identified as a positive by the report, although it cautioned of the stress created for Maori staff with multiple functions to fulfil. The report also identified that Maori issues and the provision of advice and support on things Maori should not be the sole responsibility of the School of Maori and Pacific Development. Instead, such responsibilities should be spread campus-wide. The reality of this initiative being implemented, however, in my opinion, would be slim. There appears to be little

recognition within the university community of the obligations of Maori academics, despite increasing literature on the issue (see for example, Irwin 1991; Smith 1993).

The effectiveness of Te Roopu Manukura, and its defined purpose and objectives, was also questionable, particularly in light of the reports findings. If, as the report identified, there was little clarity or understanding among the members of Te Roopu Manukura, then attention should have been paid to the iwi authorities that were representatives. Maori students, I am sure, would have been most dismayed that such a group had not been as effective as it had the potential to be. It may have been proactive of these iwi authorities to spend time with their tribal members enrolled as students at the University of Waikato, to find out what their needs were and how best they may have wanted to be represented. Equally, pressure should have been maintained on the University to ensure that Te Roopu Manukura was not merely a vehicle for boxing Maori interests together with little or no intention of listening to Maori concerns or advice. Clearer parameters as to what Te Roopu Manukura stood for and what it represented had yet to be clearly defined by all parties concerned – the University, iwi authorities and Maori students. It would also have been useful if the University took heed of the 1997 audit report’s recommendation to ensure a periodic “updated comparison of any disparities between vision and reality” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:4).

### **A cautionary note – there is change and there is CHANGE**

At a glance, it would be questionable as to the level of commitment and amount of progress that the University of Waikato has made regarding issues concerning Maori. However, the reports and policy documents just described need to be viewed in context with the events that were shaping the national direction for higher education. In particular, the mid-1980s to 1990s was a period of major policy reform, which, according to Peters & Roberts (1999:27), produced “momentous” changes to the

economic, social and educational life of the country. Peters & Roberts (1999:14-16) describe such changes as having been “premised on a set of neo-liberal philosophical assumptions,” where the “primacy of the market” became the sole focus and priority of progress, and where education became a “commodity,” which was for “private rather than public good.” Butterworth & Butterworth (1998) on the other hand, describe these changes as being mere reflections on what the education system was originally supposed to be and how it was to be implemented. According to them, “the founders of the New Zealand system explicitly distrusted the state as an agency of education” (Butterworth & Butterworth 1998:21). The intention was to move the control out to the areas and provinces, with only a small number of services being handled centrally. This was to avoid the problem associated with having “universal state funding” that tended to make “the system focus on the centre, and to become dependent on it” (Butterworth & Butterworth 1998:23).

Despite these oppositional views the fact remains that the education system has, as a result of the policy reforms, become more in tune (with much vociferous opposition) with the neo-liberal, ‘New Right’, forces. Peters & Roberts (1999:19) describe the opening up (and subsequent ‘bleeding’) of the tertiary education system in New Zealand as a result of these reforms, which has meant that universities are no longer the sole degree-awarding institution. Butterworth & Butterworth (1998) have regarded this period where the issues of accountability, equality and equity, and more importantly – who pays? – were paramount in policy development and implementation (1998:25). This emphasis on who pays, or who should pay (the individual versus the state), has led towards more competitiveness between and among institutions (university, polytechnic and the like), creating a “pressure-cooker situation” of stretched resources, increased workloads and lower staff morale (Peters & Roberts 1999:19).

More importantly, however, the reforms served to unleash a new debate about the ‘elitism’ of university – couched in the guise of protecting high quality academic

standards – and the need to become more ‘entrepreneurial’ – more in pursuit of student dollars and external revenue generation than reliance on government (and taxpayer) funding. Peters & Roberts (1999:25) claim that if such an approach should continue, “traditional canons of scholarly rigour could be placed under increasing threat, not just because standards will have been lowered in an environment where any organisation can set itself up as a university, but also because they will no longer matter for many people.”

For Maori, the upholding of principles like quality, equality and accountability seem to have become less important as a result of these reforms, although the neo-liberal argument would argue otherwise. In effect, the reforms have seen changes in how principles like quality, equality and accountability have been defined. The new thinking regards accountability in a way where institutions must justify their ‘taking’ of public money; where equality is defined as being available to all who can afford (with loans for those who cannot), and quality based on the idea that competition will inevitably breed better quality.

No institution escaped unscathed by the changes introduced during this major reform period. While the growth of the University of Waikato was staggering over the decade of the 1990s, especially for Maori, the measuring of outputs and effectiveness of initiatives and programmes must be viewed in light of the system over which the University itself has had little or no control. Indeed, while there is an acknowledgement that effective change must be implemented from ‘top-down’, it must be remembered that the top of the university tree does not finish at the council level. In short, then, change must be instituted higher up, at the government level.

### **A summary: Thirty-odd years and three documents – What has it meant for Maori?**

The University of Waikato was established in the early 1960s with pomp and ceremony. In 1965, the Governor-General put forward the challenge to the University of Waikato to make full use of its location within the heart of Maori and the strength of their tribal traditions. Over the years, the University of Waikato can (and does) claim to have a high-quality Maori language programme, initiatives to attract Maori students (such as Te Timatanga Hou), and quality bilingual and immersion teaching programmes, plus high quality Maori research. However, has the University of Waikato met the challenge laid down by the Governor-General during its foundation year?

This thesis gives particular attention to the years 1992 to 1997. During this period, the University of Waikato was involved in three significant documents, all of which had impact on Maori. The Charter, a government requirement, was produced in 1991 to provide a corporate plan for the University, which would make it accountable for the public funds it received while also maintaining some degree of autonomy. The commissioning of the strategic plan, Paetawhiti, in 1993 was an attempt by the University to move on from the Charter and to chart some way forward, identifying key constituents, key issues and putting forward recommendations for action and implementation. Finally, the invitation to the Academic Audit Unit to conduct an audit and report its findings in 1997 was an initiative of the University in order to assess its progress regarding its academic quality procedures. All of these documents consistently placed a high emphasis on the needs of Maori. But have they been met?

Having read the three documents, I am drawn to one statement time and time again. To me it is descriptive of the University of Waikato's action (or inaction) regarding Maori issues since its establishment: "the panel found that the evident goodwill has not always been translated into structures that will ensure an environment that is

congenial for Maori students” (New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit 1997:2). Historically, this was shown through the length of time taken in establishing the Centre for Maori Studies and Research, the Maori Department and the School of Maori and Pacific Development. While external influences can be partially blamed for much of the early inaction, the University of Waikato must look at itself and assess the true extent of its willingness to contribute to the advancement and development of Maori through their access to and participation in Maori society. Indeed, as Karetu (1989:73) described, “there is much about the academic world that is unattractive: its pettiness, its vindictiveness and its constant striving for one-upmanship.” In essence, this statement reflects the University’s position as a derivative of its colonial past, where power imbalances, through members of the academy, have maintained their hold on determining what counts as knowledge, and therefore have maintained the status quo of western domination in an institutional setting.

Overseas literature has identified that increasing minority student retention has to be reflected at all levels of an institution rather than being isolated to particular schools, disciplines or alternative programmes (American Council on Education 1993:32). In the context of the Paetawhiti report, the University of Waikato needed to ensure an institutional commitment to Maori that was reflected, accepted and incorporated in all aspects of the University and how it operated.

If one traces the history of the University of Waikato, which has been provided briefly within this chapter, one can see that treatment of and reference to Maori has been due to the persistence of key Maori and non-Maori figures. There have been repeated calls for the University, since its establishment, to take advantage of its unique positioning within the heart of very strong Maori tribal traditions. Despite the positive initiatives established by the University, the implications of the 1997 Academic Audit Unit report were that, by and large the University consistently missed opportunities to stamp its authority in university education as the premier

institution for Maori to study. It did not appear to heed the calls of Kingsbury to ensure that a Maori ethos was present throughout campus, nor has it been evident that the University has been receptive to the alternative, or Maori ways, of knowing.

While it is acknowledged that government constraints (such as the University Grants Committee) and reforms (such as those in the 1980s and 1990s) have gradually and effectively changed the ways universities cater for their indigenous population, it still seems apparent that the University has not managed over time to entrench its position as the “Maori university,” as described by Karetu (1989).

Effectively, the progress of the University up to 1997 appears to have slowed in its momentum. The only way of measuring such progress would be to ensure that key policy documents such as the Charter, Paetawhiti and the 1997 audit reporting processes, remain as benchmarks. In this way, a clearer picture of the University’s response to increasing the participation and retention of Maori students through to graduation will emerge.

The thesis now turns to examine how a Maori organisation has tried to effect change for its tribal members in the area of higher education.