THE UNIVERSITY
OF AUCKLAND

NEW ZEALAND

Te Whare Wānanga o Tāmaki Makaurau

The University of Auckland

Guidelines for Programme Reviews

Approved by Senate 25 August 2008

CONTENTS

PART A: INTRODUCTION

The University of Auckland's mission statement includes a commitment to excellence in teaching and learning, research, creative work and administration. The regular review of academic units and academic programmes assists in assuring the University and its communities that this mission is being carried out effectively.

Academic units are reviewed on a seven to ten-year cycle under a process detailed in the Guidelines for Departmental Reviews. These Guidelines set out the processes for a cyclical review of academic programmes.

1   Definitions and scope

Definitions
1.1   A 'programme' is a generic term for a group of courses or other work which on satisfactory completion leads to the award of a qualification (a degree, diploma or certificate). A 'programme review' is a review of the overall academic quality of the programme, its purpose, structure, curriculum, teaching and learning, student outcomes and management.

Scope of these Guidelines
1.2   Programmes eligible for review under these guidelines are established programmes with a taught component, other than those that are subject to accreditation, a professional external review or which are reviewed in the course of a Departmental Review. New programmes are first reviewed under the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) Graduating Year Review (GYR) process and thereafter are scheduled for review under one of the categories of programme outlined in these Guidelines.

1.3   Qualifications are, in many cases, made up of majors, specialisations and minors focussing on one subject area or a combination of subject areas or interdisciplinary courses. The quality of these components of programmes is primarily monitored by schools, departments and faculties but may also be reviewed under these Guidelines if a faculty or the University so determines.

2   Categories of programme review

2.1   All programmes should be subject to periodic review. The University reviews its academic programmes in different ways.

2.2   **New academic programme review:** Evaluation of 'new' academic programmes at The University of Auckland is conducted through the following process. Within three years of the first cohort of students graduating a Graduating Year Review is conducted under CUAP Guidelines. In the case of this University, the GYR consists of
   - A University Review, consisting of a guided self-review and a review by an external panel

- The preparation of a Graduating Year Review Report based on the University Review and its submission to CUAP
- CUAP evaluation of the programme based on the University's review and self reporting (refer to *CUAP Functions and Procedures*)

2.3 **Professional programme accreditation:** A number of programmes have regular reviews carried out by external bodies. In such cases the faculty, school or department prepares a portfolio based on the requirements of the accreditation or professional body, a site visit takes place and the review is reported to the University. Professional programmes which undergo accreditation reviews are not required to be reviewed under these Guidelines.

2.4 **Programmes reviewed in the course of Departmental Reviews:** In some faculties programmes are co-terminous with a Department. In such cases, the academic programmes of the Department are reviewed in the course of the Departmental Review.

2.5 **Established programme review:** All other established programmes will be reviewed on a regular basis in a way that is appropriate to the importance, strategic relevance and size of the programme. Accordingly these Guidelines outline different levels of review according to two categories of programme:
- A: programmes with large enrolments and/or of strategic importance;
- B: programmes with limited enrolments and of limited scope.

Programmes that are not reviewed under these Guidelines are listed in a third category (C). Table 1 below summarises these review procedures.

Table 1: Review formats for established programmes

Category	Description	Review process
A	Programmes with large enrolments and/or of strategic importance. In the case of staircased qualifications, eg, postgraduate certificates and diplomas that staircase into a masters degree, and qualifications that draw on the same set of courses, qualifications are reviewed at the same time	Formal review at least once every ten years, conducted by external review panel. Ongoing monitoring by programme managers / co-ordinators (eg, Board of Studies)
B	Degrees, graduate and postgraduate diplomas, postgraduate certificates, certificates and diplomas with limited enrolments and scope	Internal review every five years commissioned by the Dean and reported to the University through Education Committee
C	Programmes leading to professional qualifications where there is an accreditation external review	Reviewed in the course of accreditation or professional reviews
	Conjoint degrees	Reviewed in the course of reviews of component programmes
	Programmes co-terminous with a Department	Reviewed in the course of the Departmental Review
	PhD and higher doctorates	Not reviewed

Annex 1 lists all current programmes by category, A-C.

3   Guiding principles for reviews of established programmes

3.1   A programme review focuses on an assessment and enhancement of programme quality. A programme review should not be used to determine the viability of a programme. Before any programme is reviewed, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (DVC (Academic)) and the Dean should discuss the programme viability and determine whether or not a programme review should proceed.

3.2   In the case of programmes that are not viable in terms of student numbers and resources, a decision should be made through the appropriate University processes as to the continuation or withdrawal of the programme. Grounds for continuing a programme that has a low number of students or that is financially unviable might be that the programme meets important disciplinary, strategic or student needs. If a decision is made to continue the programme, a quality review might then proceed.

3.3   The review process asks if the programme is:
- achieving its intended objectives and learning outcomes, at the required standard
- meeting the needs of students, employers, the professions and the community
- based on a strong, well-organised and coherent curriculum
- supported by appropriate regulations
- monitoring its performance effectively
- anticipating future challenges and making improvements as required.

3.4   The results of programme reviews can be used to:
- provide an assurance of quality for students, staff, faculties, the wider university community and external stakeholders
- provide feedback to faculties, schools and departments to assist them in identifying and making programme improvements.

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 5 of 29

PART B: REVIEWS OF MAJOR QUALIFICATIONS

Part B describes the process to be used for cyclical reviews of major qualifications, ie, Category A programmes.

4   The review cycle

4.1   A major qualification will normally be reviewed at least once during a ten-year cycle. The DVC (Academic), in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor, prepares a five-year rolling plan for these reviews. Faculties comment as requested prior to approval of the review schedule by Education Committee and Senate.

4.2   The five-year rolling plan may be adjusted annually by the DVC (Academic) to take account of significant changes in, for example, enrolment trends, strategic importance and/or the external environment of the programme. This may result in additions or deletions of programmes on the review list.

4.3   Other programmes may be nominated for inclusion on the review list, eg, upon Faculty request, or by the DVC (Academic) as a result of issues identified in ongoing quality assurance monitoring.

4.4   The formal cyclical review of a Category A programme complements, but does not replace, ongoing or periodic assessments of the programme by its managers and the process of continuous improvement. A cyclical programme review will draw upon these assessments.

5   Size, composition and responsibilities of the review panel

5.1   Category A reviews will be conducted by a Review Panel, normally comprising six members:
*   a Chair of the Review Panel (a senior academic staff member of the University of Auckland, but outside the programme under review)
*   two academic staff members from the University of Auckland. One will be a teaching staff member in the programme, but without formal programme management responsibilities. The other staff member will be external to the programme
*   two members external to the University of Auckland. Normally this will comprise one senior member of academic staff in a similar or related programme at another New Zealand university or eastern Australian university. The second member may be another academic staff member, or a member of a related professional group, business or significant client group
*   a recent graduate of the programme under review.

5.2   The size of the Panel may be adjusted up or down by the DVC (Academic) to ensure that there is an appropriate alignment of review resources with programme size, complexity, strategic importance etc.

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 6 of 29

5.3   The Deans of Faculties will not be members of Review Panels.

5.4   The Review Panel Chair should be appointed well in advance of the review. The DVC (Academic) will consult with the Vice-Chancellor and the relevant Dean on possible chairs. The Vice-Chancellor will approve the nomination of the Chair. Following this approval, the Chair will be briefed by the DVC (Academic). The relevant Dean and the Chair (where possible) will collaborate to provide a list of possible Panel members to the DVC (Academic). This list should take into account, as far as possible, relevant expertise and experience, appropriate disciplinary, gender and ethnic representation, and seek to include at least one representative from a *Universitas 21* partner. Relevant biographical data on possible Panel members should be included. The Vice-Chancellor in consultation with the DVC (Academic) decides on membership. Before the membership is finalised any reasoned objections which the Dean might have are considered. Prospective members are then asked if they are prepared to undertake the task. When they have agreed, the review is commissioned.

5.5   The Chair is responsible for:
- ensuring that the review is conducted in accordance with its Terms of Reference and the requirements of confidentiality
- chairing meetings of the Review Panel
- acting as the main point of contact between the Review Panel and the DVC(Academic)
- ensuring that effective means of communication (e.g., email, conference calls) are arranged as necessary between Panel members before and after the site visit
- co-ordinating requests for additional information
- preparing the site visit programme in conjunction with the Academic Administrator and the University Secretariat
- overseeing the invitation of staff, students and others to meet with the Review Panel as per the site visit schedule
- co-ordinating the drafting of the Review Panel Report, soliciting comments from the Dean and programme managers, finalising the report and submitting it to the Vice-Chancellor within agreed deadlines.

5.6   The Chair may also request the DVC (Academic) to augment the Panel by co-opting additional members, and may consult with the DVC (Academic) and/or the Vice-Chancellor at any stage in the review process.

5.7   Review Panel members will:
- evaluate the programme portfolio and written submissions
- request, if necessary, additional information through the Chair
- provide input into the site visit programme
- participate, as agreed with the Chair, in writing the final report.

5.8   The Academic Administrator in the Office of the Vice-Chancellor will:
- advise the Academic Head, where requested, on the preparation of the departmental portfolio

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 7 of 29

- manage the request and receipt of submissions
- attend panel meetings and take notes
- action Panel requests for additional information
- assist the Chair, where requested, in finalising the Review Panel Report.

5.9 The University Secretariat will provide secretarial support to assist the Chair, the Academic Administrator and the Review Panel in its work.

6 Confidentiality

6.1 Review Panel members will treat all submissions, written and oral, as confidential. Submissions are destroyed when the review report is finalised.

6.2 The names of staff who appear before the Review Panel may be kept confidential.

6.3 A Review Panel may be exposed to or uncover sensitive material during the course of its work. Panel members will treat material (both written and oral) that is sensitive to the career or reputation of individual staff, or is commercially sensitive, with utmost care.

6.4 Where warranted, the Review Panel should report any findings on individual staff in a separate confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor. Issues that emerge outside of the Terms of Reference for a review may also, at the discretion of the Panel, be reported separately to the Vice-Chancellor. As the Vice-Chancellor is the employer of all staff, he/she will retain the report, and if action follows, may make information from it available to the staff member concerned.

7 Terms of reference

7.1 The generic Terms of Reference (see **Annex 2**) outline the focus of the review. To take account of a special aspect(s) requiring investigation, the Dean may request that the Vice-Chancellor and the DVC (Academic) include additional Terms of Reference. Additional Terms may also be included by the Vice-Chancellor and DVC (Academic). The Review Panel at its discretion may consider any matters presented in submissions that it deems relevant to its Terms of Reference.

7.2 Review Panels will be provided with up-to-date information on resource contexts and resourcing criteria by Faculty Offices, but should only comment on programme resource levels (e.g., staffing, financial, administrative, physical, etc) in so far as they pertain to the Terms of Reference.

8 Compiling information

8.1 In addition to its own expertise, the Review Panel will use the following major sources of information in its work:

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 8 of 29

- the programme self-review portfolio
- solicited written submissions
- interviews during the site visit.

The programme portfolio (self-review document)

8.2   Following agreement on the Terms of Reference for a review, a programme portfolio will be prepared.
- The relevant Dean will designate the staff responsible for co-ordinating preparation of the portfolio, e.g., programme managers or co-ordinators
- Enough copies of the portfolio for each Review Panel member, and one for the Secretariat, will be submitted to the University Secretariat at least **six weeks** prior to the visit of the Review Panel
- To minimise workload and duplication, the portfolio will utilise to the maximum extent possible existing sources of data and information. Some of these data (e.g., from university-wide databases) may need to be processed further by their holders in order to meet the programme-specific and comparative needs of the Review Panel. **See Table 2 below.**
- The Planning and Quality Office will provide its information to the portfolio coordinator(s) at least three weeks before the due date for portfolio submission.

8.3   The portfolio should contain both factual information about the programme and reflection and critical analysis. Among the issues that the portfolio should address are:
- How does the programme relate to the University's Strategic Plan?
- What are the objectives of the programme?
- Are the programme's activities the best means of achieving its objectives?
- What are our current strengths (highlighting good practices, outcomes and impacts) and weaknesses?
- How does the programme attempt to meet the attributes of the University's Graduate Profile?
- What mechanisms and processes do we have to ensure quality (including benchmarking activities) and to report on the effectiveness of the programme?
- What innovations have been made in the programme recently and how well have they worked?
- What strategies and activities, or resource re-profiling, can further improve the performance of the programme?

8.4   A suggested portfolio structure is shown in **Table 2** below. Portfolios should be brief and to the point. Use of diagrams and flow charts is encouraged. Suggested maximum length for the main document (excluding appendices) is 7,500 words. Some of the information included in the self-review portfolio will be relevant under more than one term of reference and may be cross-referenced.

8.5   The portfolio should be presented in two spiral-bound volumes. The first volume will contain reflective comments and analysis under the Terms of

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 9 of 29

Reference (see **Table 2**). The second volume will contain supporting information as appendices to the main volume. Some supporting information may be included on CD-Rom, where appropriate.

Table 2: Self-review portfolio structure

Section	Suggested areas for reflective comment may include: (refer Annex 1)	Supporting information that may be included in the main text or as appendices
Introduction	Overview of the programme including: • significant points in the history of the programme • special characteristics or factors that have influenced development since the last review (where relevant) • current strengths and weaknesses • key matters that are of particular interest or concern • plans for future development • reorganisation or other plans that may affect the programme under review	• copy of the proposal establishing the programme • the previous programme review report • the formal faculty response(s) to the previous review report • a table showing the current status of implementation of the recommendations of the previous review report
Programme purpose and design	• programme purpose and objectives and alignment with faculty and University objectives, including how the programme aligns with the University's graduate profile • tabular summary of expected programme outcomes for students (including, knowledge and understanding, intellectual skills and attributes, and other skills and attributes) • brief description of all contributing subject areas and their contribution to the programme (eg, majors, specializations, minors, core subjects) • description of major changes to the Regulations and schedule of prescriptions in the past five years • composition of the student body and analysis of the capacity of the programme to attract high-quality students	• Faculty Strategic Plan • Faculty Teaching and Learning Plan • Programme Regulations and schedules • tables showing composition of the student body, including where possible enrolments (EFTS and/or head count) and entrance qualifications of students (see 8.6)
Curriculum content and organisation	• coverage and currency of curriculum content, including consideration of areas that should be introduced, expanded or reduced • structure of the pathways through the programme and into postgraduate study • methods used for ensuring the continued relevance of curriculum content • the measures taken to link research and teaching in the programme • the measures taken to integrate national and international perspectives into the curriculum	• schedule of course prescriptions

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 10 of 29

Section	Suggested areas for reflective comment may include: (refer Annex 1)	Supporting information that may be included in the main text or as appendices

Teaching, learning and assessment	*Teaching and learning*
	• analysis of staff/student ratios
	• contribution to teaching by:
	  ○ specific contributing departments/ schools, etc.
	  ○ academic staff level (including tutors and demonstrators)
	• description of teaching methods in general and any specific instances of different methods including innovative or flexible teaching methods and use of teaching technologies
	• initiatives for responding to diversity
	
	Assessment
	• description of assessment methods used and links to programme objectives and outcomes
	• faculty procedures for establishing:
	  ○ student workloads
	  ○ coursework requirements
	  ○ examination requirements
	• faculty procedures for moderation of assessment
	
	Student research
	• the opportunities and provisions for student research in taught programmes
	• a statement of policy, process and practice in approving and monitoring student research (where relevant)
	• incentives for student research provided by the faculty, school or department research supervision practices, including organization and monitoring (where relevant)
		Teaching and learning
		• faculty formulae (financial and human) applied to the programme (eg, norms on staff-student ratios, workload allocation formulae)
		
		Assessment
		• Three examples of an examination paper (one at each teaching level) for the most recent semester
		• documentation for the current year on coursework and examination requirements
		
		Student research
		• relevant information about student research outcomes, eg, lists of thesis and dissertation titles, student publications, awards to undertake higher degrees (where relevant)

Learning resources	• a description of teaching and learning environment and facilities • statement on physical resources for students (e.g., space, library, computing facilities, equipment) and plans for their development	• a statement of the administrative / financial / IT support resources provided for the programme
Student achievement	• an analysis of pass and completion rates • an analysis of retention rates and progression trends • a description of any mechanism for tracking student achievement and identifying 'at risk' students • an analysis of graduate destination and employment trends prizes and scholarships awarded to graduates • EEdO initiatives for students, and their impacts	• Tables showing pass and completion rates, broken down to show gender and ethnicity variables (see 8.6) • Retention rates and progression trends (see 8.6)

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 11 of 29

Section	Suggested areas for reflective comment may include: (refer Annex 1)	Supporting information that may be included in the main text or as appendices
Programme management, quality assurance and enhancement	*Programme management and planning* • brief description of programme processes for enrolment, timetabling, and examinations • programme processes for responding to disciplinary developments, student demand and interest, and the changing characteristics of the student body • teaching links with other faculties, departments or groups within the University and plans to develop these links • relationship with professional or industry organisations and their input into the programme • current and anticipated resource context *Student advice and information* • a description of programme methods for academic advice and information available to students *Quality assurance and enhancement* • the processes for faculty monitoring of teaching evaluation plans for those schools and departments contributing to the programme • processes within the programme for use of student evaluation of courses at the programme management level and how feedback is provided to students • processes for annual monitoring of programme quality (eg, external assessments, professional monitoring or appraisal, departmental and faculty monitoring of course quality etc.) • selection and use of external examiners or assessors • other programme performance indicators, eg, benchmarking data, internal student satisfaction surveys, prizes and scholarships awarded to graduates	*Programme management and planning* • planning documents specific to the programme • projected enrolment numbers for the forthcoming academic year(s), including enrolments across majors or specialisations • student application trends (for limited entry programmes and courses) • membership, mandates/responsibilities and current year reports of meetings of any Boards of Studies (or equivalent programme management body) • examples of employer, professional or industry comment (if available) *Student advice and information* • Current programme prospectuses, faculty or department handbooks, website references • Three examples of a current course guide (one at each teaching level) • copy of the degree planner or similar given to students *Quality assurance and enhancement* • systematically analysed results of student evaluation of courses and over the last three years • reports of external examiners or assessors • evidence of stakeholder input into programme planning, design and content

8.6   Documentation to be included as appendices to the portfolio provided by other units within the University on the request of the faculty:

Planning and Quality Office	(multiple year data, including where available gender, ethnicity and age variables) • Enrolments (EFTS and/or head count) • Entrance qualifications of students • Pass rates and grade distribution for the two most recent examination sessions • Retention rates • Progression trends • Results of any applicable student satisfaction surveys

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 12 of 29

	N.B. The Planning Office will, upon request, provide comparative data on the above measures against other departments within the University. The Planning Office can also be used as a resource by both departments and the Review Panel to identify and assemble appropriate benchmarking data from other universities.
Academic Secretariat	• CUAP *Definitions of Academic Programmes* • The University's *Concurrent Teaching Policy*(Guidelines for the Preparation of Proposals and Amendments) • *Glossary of Terminology* related to programmes (University Calendar)

Written submissions

8.7 The Academic Administrator will post a notice in *Next Week Online* requesting written submissions from interested staff and students. In addition, at their initial meeting, the DVC (Academic), Panel Chair, Dean, and internal panel member can draw up a list of people or groups who could be invited to make submissions. Submissions could be solicited from the following categories:

- Deans
- Academic Heads
- Teaching staff in the programme
- Currently-enrolled undergraduate and postgraduate students
- Pro Vice-Chancellor (Maori)
- Pro Vice-Chancellor (EO)
- Pro Vice-Chancellor (International)
- University Librarian
- Recent graduates
- Employers of graduates
- Other stakeholder organisations, professional or community groups with which the programme has links

8.8 Invited written submissions are called for by the Review Panel Chair, with the administrative support of the Academic Administrator. Requests for submissions should:

- be specific concerning matters about which comment is being sought (those known to have expertise or interest relating to a particular academic or professional facet of the programme should be asked specifically to comment on that facet)
- indicate that the review is not a review of individual staff performance
- enclose a copy of the Terms of Reference
- advise respondents that they may designate part or all of their submission as confidential to the Review Panel
- enclose a brief summary of background data about the programme.

8.9 The Review Panel may request other materials about the programme prior to the site visit**.** The Panel may also request copies of recent reviews of departments that contribute to the programme. A Review Panel may also consider other means of gathering information and may consult with any party they choose.

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 13 of 29

Site visit by the Review Panel

8.10   The site visit is devoted to interviews, further analysis and discussion, and progressing the draft report. Interviews, either with the entire Panel or individual members, are used to validate (confirm, challenge, elaborate) the judgements made in the portfolio, and to collect further opinions and experiences from teaching staff, students, representatives of professional and other external bodies, and others who may interact with the programme.

8.11   Prior to the formal site visit, the Panel Chair and internal members may meet informally with representatives from programme management to discuss the review process and any particular concerns.

8.12   Meetings should take place during the site visit with representatives from:
- programme managers/co-ordinators, including the Board of Study (or equivalent)
- Academic Heads of departments contributing to the programme
- Teaching staff, including tutors and demonstrators
- staff of key support services, e.g. administration, financial, IT, library, laboratory
- current students
- recent graduates
- community and business groups, and other stakeholders

8.13   The Review Panel may also tour facilities and other resources.

8.14   Meetings with current students and recent graduates will occur towards the beginning of the visit, so that their views can be discussed subsequently with staff.

8.15   The Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors (Academic and Research), and Pro Vice-Chancellors (EO, Maori, International and Tamaki) may be invited to meet with the Review Panel.

8.16   Following the panel's deliberations, on the afternoon of the final day of the site visit, the Panel should meet with the Dean and academic and general staff who have major responsibilities for the design, delivery and management of the programme to provide a brief verbal summary of the preliminary review findings. A separate meeting with the Dean may be held if the Panel wishes.

9   Review timetable

9.1   The review timetable would normally be as follows:
- Shortly after the commissioning of the review, a meeting is convened of the DVC (Academic), the Panel Chair, other panel members from the University of Auckland, the relevant Dean and/or programme management representative, and the Academic Administrator. This meeting plans the

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 14 of 29

conduct of the review, including discussing a list of those from whom submissions will be sought together with any specific requests for comment.

- After submissions and the programme portfolio are received, the Chair summarises the key points raised in the submissions and draws up a tentative list of those to be interviewed, together with a proposed schedule for the site visit. These are circulated to the Panel for comment.
- At the discretion of the Chair, there may be a meeting of the full Panel prior to the site visit to decide on the key issues, whether further information is required, who should be interviewed, whether focus groups should be convened, etc.
- About four months after commissioning, the site visit of the Review Panel takes place. It is suggested that this visit last two to three days, with the final day devoted to analysis, formulation of recommendations and report drafting. The Academic Administrator will support and assist the Panel during the site visit.
- Following the site visit, the Chair co-ordinates drafting of the Panel's report. The Academic Administrator will assist. The Chair has the discretion to discuss findings and recommendations with the Dean. The draft Review report should be completed within eight weeks of the site visit.

Table 3 provides a typical timeline for key tasks in the Category A programme review process.

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 15 of 29

Table 3: Indicative timeline for a category 'A' programme review

Week number	Date	Task
-26		Appointment of Chair of Review Panel
-22		Panel member nomination and recruitment
-20		Finalisation of Panel membership and Terms of Reference; commissioning of review
-19		Review plan drafted (Chair and Academic Administrator)
-18		Initial meeting of DVC (Academic), Chair, Dean, programme representative and internal panel member(s); list of invited written submissions discussed
-17		Written submissions requested; notification in *Next Week Online*
-9		Due date for written submissions; data inputs from other units to department for use in portfolio preparations
-6		Submission of programme portfolio to Secretariat
-5		Chair meeting with Academic Administrator: key issues list, proposed site visit schedule and interview list complied and circulated to Panel members for comment
0		**Site visit by Review Panel**
+8		Draft report to Dean
+11		Faculty comments to Panel Chair
+13		Report finalised and submitted to DVC (Academic)
+21		Faculty response, and submission of report/response to Education Committee (Senate/Council)
+34		Implementation Plan tabled at Education Committee
+73		Status report on implementation to Education Committee

10   The review report

10.1   Contents of the Category 'A' Review Report should conform broadly to the Terms of Reference. A suggested format is in **Annex 3**.

11   Finalisation and implementation of the report

11.1   Within **eight weeks** of the site visit the review Panel Chair will send the completed draft report in confidence to the Dean for correction of matters of fact and wording of matters of substance. Comments must be sent back to the Chair within **three weeks**.

11.2   After receiving these comments the Chair will finalise the report, consulting Panel members as necessary, and submit the final report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

11.3   The DVC (Academic) will report on the review to the Vice-Chancellor and refer the report to the Dean for a written Faculty response on any matters raised in the review which s/he believes deserve comment at that stage. Responses are to be received within **eight weeks**, and should address the report's findings and recommendations as they apply to the Terms of Reference. Programme managers and teaching staff should see the report and the Faculty response.

11.4   Both the report and the responses will be submitted to Senate and Council through Education Committee. The Chair of the Panel, the Dean and a representative of programme management will be invited to attend the meeting of Education Committee at which the report is discussed.

11.5   The report is considered confidential until accepted by Council. Prior to that time, copies are distributed on a need-to-know basis.

11.6   After considering the report and the responses, Education Committee will recommend on implementation to Senate and Council. The Faculty will prepare an implementation plan that will prioritise recommendations, cost any resource-related recommendations, and designate responsibility and timelines for implementation.

11.7   This plan will be forwarded for review to the Academic Administrator within **three months** of the report being received by Education Committee. The Academic Administrator will advise Education Committee of the implementation plan's receipt.

11.8   One year after initial consideration of the Review Report by Education Committee, the Faculty will provide a status report to the Committee on progress of implementation of recommendations. The status report will be submitted to the Academic Administrator for review, who will then forward it to Education Committee. A Faculty representative (e.g., programme

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 17 of 29

manager) will be invited to attend Education Committee to present this status report. Education Committee recommends to Senate and Council the approval of implementation actions or calls for a further report if necessary.

11.9   In special circumstances the Vice-Chancellor may vary these procedures and advise Education Committee of the variation and the reasons for it.

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 18 of 29

PART C: OTHER PROGRAMME REVIEWS

12   Category B reviews

12.1   Category B includes qualifications such as stand alone graduate and postgraduate diplomas, postgraduate certificates and other diplomas and degrees where the number of equivalent full time students is limited (usually fewer than 75 EFTS).

12.2   Such qualifications should be reviewed internally every five years. The Dean should commission a review carried out by three academic staff members, one from within the programme, one from within the Faculty but not involved in the programme and one from outside the Faculty.[1] The Faculty provides the secretarial services for the review. The Panel should be guided by these Guidelines, using the Terms of Reference and Report format as is appropriate, and should report through the Dean to Education Committee and Senate.

13   Special reviews

13.1   The DVC (Academic), in consultation with the relevant Dean(s), may commission a special review outside of the normal review cycle or under different terms of reference. A special review might be undertaken under the following circumstances, although this is not an inclusive list:
- When problems have been identified in a programme or in particular parts of it
- To inform the University about the future of a qualification
- If a faculty requests a review for a good reason
- When only a part of a programme requires review, eg, teaching in a particular
- curriculum area of the programme, first year courses and teaching

13.2   In such cases the review would be conducted as a Category A review but it is likely that the review panel would be smaller than a scheduled Category A review panel.

---

[1] The faculty concerned may adjust panel membership as appropriate for smaller programmes.

Annex 1 - Classification of qualifications by review category

Category A: full University review

Faculty	Programme
Faculty of Arts	Bachelor of Arts (including Certificate in Arts)
	Master of Arts/Bachelor of Arts (Honours)/Postgraduate Diploma in Arts
Faculty of Business & Economics	Bachelor of Business and Information Management
	Bachelor of Commerce
	Graduate Diploma in Commerce
	Postgraduate Diploma in Business/Postgraduate Certificate in Business
	Master of Commerce/Bachelor of Commerce (Honours)/Postgraduate Diploma in Commerce
Faculty of Creative Arts & Industries	Bachelor of Performing Arts
	Master of Creative and Performing Arts/Postgraduate Diploma in Creative and Performing Arts
Faculty of Education	Bachelor of Education (Teaching) (Honours)/Postgraduate Diploma in Education (Teaching)
	Master of Education/Postgraduate Diploma in Education
	Doctor of Education
Faculty of Engineering	Master of Engineering
Faculty of Medical & Health Sciences	Bachelor of Health Sciences
	Master of Health Sciences/ Postgraduate Diploma/ Postgraduate Certificate in Health Sciences
	Master of Medical Science/ Postgraduate Diploma/ Postgraduate Certificate in Medical Science
	Master of Public Health/ Postgraduate Diploma/ Postgraduate Certificate in Public Health
Faculty of Science	Bachelor of Science (including the Certificate in Science)
	Master of Science/Bachelor of Science (Honours)/Postgraduate Diploma in Science
School of Theology	Bachelor of Theology/Graduate Diploma in Theology
	Master of Theology/Bachelor of Theology (Honours)/Postgraduate Diploma in Theology
Interfaculty	Bachelor of Technology (Faculties of Engineering, Medical and Health Sciences and Science)

Faculty	Programme
	Tertiary Foundation Certificate (Faculties of Arts and Science)

Category B: faculty review

Faculty	Programme
Faculty of Arts	Diploma in Professional Ethics
	Graduate Diploma in Arts
	Postgraduate Certificate in Advanced Interpreting
	Postgraduate Diploma in Language Teaching
	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Science Research Methods
	Postgraduate Diploma in Translation Studies
	Master of Creative Writing
	Master of Literature
	Master of Public Policy
	Master of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
Faculty of Business & Economics	Master of International Business/Postgraduate Diploma in International Business
	Master of Management
	Master of Property/Bachelor of Property (Honours)/Postgraduate Diploma in Property
	Master of Taxation Studies
Faculty of Creative Arts & Industries	Graduate Diploma in Fine Arts [suspended]
	Master of Urban Design
Faculty of Education	Foundation Certificate Education
	Foundation Certificate Tohu Taupapa Matauranga
	Bachelor of Education (Teaching English in Schools to Speakers of Other Languages)
	Graduate Diploma in Education
	Graduate Diploma in Teaching English in Schools to Speakers of Other Languages
	Graduate Diploma in Special Education

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 21 of 29

Faculty	Programme
	Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Supervision / Postgraduate Certificate in Professional Supervision
Faculty of Engineering	Graduate Diploma in Engineering
	Graduate Diploma in Engineering (Transportation)
	Postgraduate Certificate in Light Metals Reduction Technology
	Postgraduate Certificate in Geothermal Energy Technology
	Master of Engineering Management (with Faculty of Business and Economics)
	Master of Engineering Studies
Faculty of Medical & Health Sciences	Certificate in Health Sciences
	Diploma in Paediatrics
	Graduate Diploma in Health Sciences
	Postgraduate Diploma in Community Emergency Medicine
	Postgraduate Diploma in Geriatric Medicine [suspended]
	Postgraduate Diploma in Health Psychology
	Postgraduate Diploma in Obstetrics and Medical Gynaecology
	Postgraduate Diploma in Sports Medicine
	Bachelor of Human Biology (Honours)
	Master of Audiology
	Master of Clinical Education / Postgraduate Diploma in Clinical Education / Postgraduate Certificate in Clinical Education
	Master of Maori Health/ Postgraduate Diploma/ Postgraduate Certificate in Maori Health
	Doctor of Medicine
	Doctor of Pharmacy
Faculty of Science	Graduate Diploma in Science
	Postgraduate Diploma in Applied Psychology
	Postgraduate Diploma in Clinical Psychology
	Postgraduate Diploma in Forensic Science

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 22 of 29

Faculty	Programme
	Doctor of Clinical Psychology
Interfaculty	Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice
	Master of Bioscience Enterprise/Postgraduate Diploma in Bioscience Enterprise
	Master of Educational Management/Postgraduate Diploma in Educational Management
	Master of Health Management
	Master of Operations Research/Postgraduate Diploma in Operations Research
	Master of Professional Studies
University Programmes	Foundation Certificate in English for Academic Purposes

Category C – Qualifications not covered by this programme review process

Faculty	Accredited and professionally-reviewed qualifications	Programmes co-terminous with a Department and to be reviewed in the course of a Departmental Review
Faculty of Business & Economics	Bachelor of Property	
	Master of Business Administration	
Faculty of Creative Arts & Industries	Bachelor of Architectural Studies	Bachelor of Fine Arts / Bachelor of Fine Arts (Hons)
	Master of Architecture (Professional)	Bachelor of Music
	Bachelor of Planning	Bachelor of Visual Arts
	Master of Planning Practice	Graduate Diploma in Music
		Master of Architecture/Postgraduate Diploma in Architecture
		Master of Fine Arts/Postgraduate Diploma in Fine Arts
		Master of Music/Bachelor of Music (Honours)/Postgraduate Diploma in Music
		Master of Planning

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 23 of 29

Faculty	Accredited and professionally-reviewed qualifications	Programmes co-terminous with a Department and to be reviewed in the course of a Departmental Review
		Doctor of Fine Arts
		Doctor of Music
		Doctor of Musical Arts
Faculty of Education	Diploma in Teaching (Early Childhood Education)	Bachelor of Human Services
	Bachelor of Education (Teaching)	Bachelor of Social Work
	Bachelor of Physical Education	
	Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Early Childhood Education)	
	Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Primary)	
	Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Secondary)	
Faculty of Engineering	Bachelor of Engineering (Hons)	
Faculty of Law		Bachelor of Laws/Bachelor of Laws (Honours)
		Graduate Diploma in Law / Graduate Certificate in Law
		Master of Laws/Postgraduate Certificate in Law
		Master of Legal Studies
Faculty of Medical & Health Sciences	Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery	Master of Nursing/Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)
	Bachelor of Nursing	Master of Pharmacy Practice (including Postgraduate Certificate and Postgraduate Diploma)
	Bachelor of Pharmacy	
Faculty of Science	Bachelor of Optometry	
	Master of Speech Language Therapy Practice	

Doctor of Philosophy

Higher doctorates

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 24 of 29

Doctor of Engineering
Doctor of Literature
Doctor of Laws
Doctor of Science

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 25 of 29

Annex 2 - Terms of Reference for Programme Reviews

The overall purpose of programme reviews is to evaluate their academic quality and to ensure that they meet international standards and the needs of students. Review Panels are asked to focus on the following aspects of the programme:

1   Programme purpose and design

Does the programme have a clear purpose and objectives and is it designed to meet that purpose and those objectives effectively? Is it coherent, balanced, and well structured? Are the regulations governing the programme adequate, appropriate, and clear? Does the programme attract a wide range of students (e.g., ethnicity, gender, age range)?

2   Curriculum content and organisation

Is the curriculum comprehensive (e.g., no significant gaps in subject or course offerings), based on appropriate and up-to-date knowledge, and well-organised (including a clear sense of progression at each level)? Is the curriculum relevant in relation to the current and state of knowledge and academic environment, and how is continued relevance assured? Are there content areas that should be introduced? expanded? reduced? deleted?

3   Teaching, learning and assessment

What is the overall quality of teaching and learning in the programme and how is this supported and improved? Are teaching methods appropriate to the curriculum and course content? Are assessment methods appropriate (e.g., in relation to stated learning outcomes), and how are they moderated? Do teaching methods meet the needs of a diverse student body?

4   Learning resources

Are learning resources appropriate and adequate to maintain the quality of the programme?

5   Student achievement

Is the programme meeting its objectives in terms of achievement indicators such as pass rates and completion rates? Is the stated graduate profile being achieved?

6   Programme management, quality assurance and enhancement

How appropriate and informative are the guidance and advice offered to students concerning the programme (including how to structure a programme of study, course selection, timetabling, credit transfer)? How well are programme processes, eg, enrolment, timetabling, examinations, managed? How are feedback and other inputs from students, employers, advisory groups or standards setting bodies taken into

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 26 of 29

account in curriculum design and improvements? How is quality monitored and assured, and how are changes and improvements planned and implemented?

The Report should also make a global recommendation as to whether the programme should be:
- continued indefinitely
- continued for a stated time period, with improvements required in the interim
- redeveloped within a timeframe
- merged with another programme(s), or discontinued

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 27 of 29

Annex 3 - Suggested format for a programme review report

Cover Page
The cover page should include:
- The University of Auckland
- Report of the Committee established to review the 'xxx' programme
- Name of host/sponsoring Faculty(s)
- Date of the Report
- Confidential (until accepted by Senate and Council)

Table of Contents
Using the generic Terms of Reference, the table of contents of a typical Programme Review Report should resemble the following model:

- Executive Summary
- Summary of Key Findings (text)
- List of Recommendations
- Preamble (This can be prepared by the Academic Administrator for Category A reviews)
- Terms of Reference
- List of Review Panel members
- Process of conduct of the review
- The number of submissions requested and received
- Review panel meetings
- Report drafting, comment and submission dates
- Contextual issues
- Acknowledgements
- Findings and Recommendations for each Term of Reference
- Programme purpose and design
- Curriculum content and organisation
- Teaching, learning and assessment
- Learning Resources
- Programme management, quality assurance and enhancement
- Other term(s) of reference (if applicable)

Length and Format
As a general guideline, the Report including Executive Summary should not exceed 7500 words. In addition, a limited number of appendices may be included. The Executive Summary (comprising a summary of key findings and a list of recommendations) should be no more than four pages in length.

The major headings of the Report should correspond to the Terms of Reference. Reports should be constructive, with both critical and complimentary elements as appropriate. For each Term of Reference, the Report should be structured around integrated findings and recommendations for improvement or change. Where the Panel determines that good or exemplary practices exist, these should be highlighted. Each recommendation should be supported by a brief discussion of a finding(s), and should also identify the appropriate unit(s) that should take action if

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 28 of 29

that recommendation is accepted, e.g., department(s), faculty(s), or a University committee. The Report should also make a global recommendation as to whether the programme should be:

- continued indefinitely
- continued for a stated time period, with improvements required in the interim
- redeveloped within a timeframe
- merged with another programme(s), or discontinued

Appendices

A data appendix will be prepared by the Planning Office from data provided in the Portfolio. This will include:

- EFTS over the last seven years
- EFTS by gender, ethnicity and age
- qualifications of entering students
- overall pass rates per subject per level for past three years
- retention rates from Stage I to Stage II for past three years by subject
- completion numbers for last five years

The Review Panel may include other Appendices as it thinks appropriate.

Prepared by: Vice-Chancellor's Office
Owned by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approved by: Senate
Date last approved: 25 August 2008
Review date: July 2015
Page 29 of 29