**Annual Programme Report
For the Year 2021**

Programme Code and Title: BASc Bachelor of Arts and Science

Programme/Department/School/Division: Divisions of Humanities & Sciences

Year of Introduction: 2017

1. Description

(a) Provide a brief description of the programme structure, levels, and papers as approved by CUAP. Include paper titles, points, and NZQF Level. Describe succinctly, but in sufficient detail so that the programme structure may be understood without reference to the original proposal, the Calendar or websites, and write for a non-specialist audience. The description should be no more than around 200 words so that it can easily form part of the GYR, and it should generally not include a schedule or table.

The BASc programme offers students the chance to complete a degree majoring in *both* a Science subject *and* an Arts subject and to do so in a shorter period of time than would be required to complete a double degree. The degree can be completed in 3.5 years, but normally requires 4 years' study.

The degree is made up of papers (normally 27) worth 480 points, which fulfil the requirements of both a BA major and a BSc major. The 480 points must include 216 points (normally 12 papers) from Science Schedule C and 216 points (normally 12 papers) from Arts Schedule C. Students may also choose to do a minor, in an Arts, Science, or Commerce subject.

The programme was introduced in 2017 and has grown steadily since then, although the growth figures for the last two years have shown a slowed rate of increase.

(b) If any concerns were raised or changes requested by CUAP at the time of approval, indicate how they have been addressed. If the programme has had a delayed start, say so and explain why.

No concerns were raised or changes requested.

---

2. Changes Made to the Programme since Introduction

(a) Mention and explain any significant changes (from the original proposal) that have been made to the programme since its introduction, such as: deletion of papers; introduction of new papers; regulation changes; changes to the Graduate Profile; changes to the assessment regime.

(b) If any changes were reported in a previous Annual Programme Report, comment on their ongoing adequacy and appropriateness.

No changes have been made to the programme since its introduction.

3. Student Enrolment and Completion Trends

(a) Provide information on student numbers enrolling and completing over the period the programme has been offered with respect to the following. (*Please refer to the datasets provided by the Strategy, Analytics and Reporting Office, which have been attached to the email initiating this report. You are welcome to simply copy and paste the enrolment data into this report, or you can provide your own data if you believe they offer more clarity. If you are providing your own data, explain why.*)

Table 1

Year	Predicted Numbers	Total Headcount	Full-time	Part-time	With-drawn	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5+	Comple-tions	EFTS
2017	45	89	87	2	0	89	0	0	0	-	3	75.0
2018	90	204	195	8	1	150	54	0	0	-	16	181.1
2019	135	291	276	11	4	170	87	34	0	-	28	262.0
2020	180	319	307	10	2	170	80	53	16	-	42	297.9

(b) Discuss the data and comment on any anomalies such as disparity between the predicted student numbers (in the original proposal) and actual numbers. (*Please take care to ensure that no student can be identified in the Report. All information should be anonymised so that individuals are not identifiable.*)

Last year's APR spoke of what appeared to be a high attrition rate, so this year the Board followed up on this observation by meeting with staff from the Strategy, Analytics and Reporting Office. Their helpful report included the following facts.

The overall attrition rate for students enrolled between 2017 and 2020 was 42%. While this may seem high, it is only slightly more than the BA (40%), BSc (40%) and BCom (38%) and lower than some other degrees such as the BAppSc (55%).

What is notable is that the attrition rate for the BASc after the first year of enrolment (43%) is significantly higher than for other degrees: 36% for the BA, 35% for the BCom, and 27% for the BSc. It is, however, lower than the rate for the BAppSc (55%).

Of those who leave the BASc programme, 86% switch to either a BA (43%) or a BSc (43%). This suggests that after the first year, a good number of students are deciding that the combined (interdivisional) degree is not for them.

Why is this happening? Such students may have discovered that their interests lie on just one side of the Arts and Sciences divide or that they can take both their

intended majors within a BA or BSc. (Some subjects, such as psychology, are majors for both qualifications.) A further motivation may be the desire to complete a degree more quickly. We hope that discussion with student representatives will help clarify this.

Completion rates, however, remain high for those who remain: 81% of students in the fourth year of the degree in 2020 completed their qualification.

(c) If the programme has not yet been offered, or has attracted no enrolments, explain why not and outline the intended future of the programme. (*Please note that when a programme has not been offered or has attracted no enrolments in the five years following its introduction, its approval lapses. The programme should either be resubmitted to CUAP for re-evaluation or formally deleted. This report should outline the intended course of action. If the decision is made to delete the programme, a Form 5 should be submitted.)*

N/A

4. Monitoring Programme Quality

(a) What processes are in place to monitor programme quality? (These will have been identified in the original proposal.)

The Board meets three times a year, to review enrolment numbers, graduation data, and any other matters that have arisen.

It does not consider its task to include the monitoring of the quality of the papers and programmes that make up the degree. This would duplicate quality assurance processes already in place for the BA and BSc and would be impracticable, given that there are approximately 657 individual courses involved.

(b) Summarise the evidence that has been generated by those monitoring mechanisms during the year under review by answering as many of the following questions as possible. If you can't answer a question, explain how you will gather evidence to answer it next year. Depending on the length of the programme, some of these questions may be more challenging to answer in the first year or two.

i. To what degree are the goals of the programme as stated in the original proposal being achieved?

This is information we are currently trying to gather.

The Convenor of the Board of Studies met (on May 26th) with Romain Mirosa from the Quality Advancement Unit. Romain compiled and forwarded to us information from the most recent Graduate Opinion Survey, which we will be tabling at our next Board meeting.

Members of the Board of Studies also met (on June 17th) with Louise Lawrence from the Alumni Office to discuss the creation of survey early next year in preparation for the Graduating Year Review of the BASc.

ii. How well are the Graduate Attributes being met?

Our goal in tracking recent graduates is to see what they are doing after completing the degree (employment or further study) and to gather

information about how well the degree has prepared them for this activity. (See our answer to question [iv].)

iii. How strongly does the evidence indicate appropriate content, delivery and assessment in the component papers?

As noted earlier, it would be impracticable and inappropriate for the Board to try to oversee the content, delivery, and assessment procedures of component papers. This work is already being done within the programmes that contribute to the BASc.

iv. How confident are you that students are satisfied with the programme?

In addition to the surveys mentioned in our answer to question (i), we are creating a focus group for interdivisional degree students, made up of individuals who volunteered to be representatives during the preliminary lectures this year. This should help us to receive some informal feedback.

We already have a student representative from OUSA on the Board. But with the approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), we are extending student representation so as to have a representative from each of the degrees for which we are responsible (BASc, BACom, BComSc). This should assist us in identifying any difficulties students are experiencing.

v. What evidence do you have of industry acceptance, particularly in graduate employability?

We have already collected responses from two employers, writing in support of interdivisional degrees. We hope to collect further information from employers of BASc graduates in due course. (See the answer to question [i].)

vi. If there is external moderation, what does this reveal about the quality and consistency of the assessment procedures?

See the answer to question (iii). The Board does not regard itself as having responsibility for assessment procedures.

5. Highlights and Issues

(a) Comment on what is going well and identify any examples of good practice – such as learning and assessment activities, employer involvement or special projects –that may be helpful to other programmes or boards of studies.

At the beginning of this year, the Board of Studies organized a preliminary lecture, to make contact with students who were beginning these qualifications. The lectures (there were two sessions) were well attended. They included a brief presentation from an existing BASc student, Dante Fouché, which was well received.

By way of Jenna Anderson, the Marketing Advisor for Commerce, we have also received some very positive feedback from a couple of employers, which we have been able to use when speaking about the degrees.

(b) Comment on any particular issues that have arisen and what is being done to respond to and improve upon them.

There are no issues beyond those already discussed.

6. Response to Previous Annual Programme Report (if applicable)

State how you have responded to any Divisional Board or other feedback arising from the previous year's Annual Programme Report.

The Board of Undergraduate Studies urged us to address the degree to which graduates met the demands of the graduate profile, which (as noted) we are attempting to do by way of contact with the Alumni Office and Quality Advancement Unit.

It also urged us to pay attention to student feedback and representation. As mentioned earlier, we are doing this by creating a focus group of interdivisional degree students and by extending student representation on the Board.