

GRADUATING YEAR REVIEW PROCEDURES

Section	Academic
Contact	Academic Policy and Regulations Unit
Last Review	February 2014
Next Review	February 2016
Approval	AC14/02/21 – February 2014

Contents:

	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Process Overview	2
3. Qualifications Requiring and Not Requiring a Graduating Year Review	2
3.1 Graduating Year Review Required	2
3.2 Graduating Year Review Not Required	2
3.3 Graduating Year Reviews Unable to be Completed	2
4. Process Details	3
4.1. Schedule	3
4.2. Data	3
4.3. Self-Review	3
4.4. Student Feedback	4
4.5. Consultation	5
4.6. Review Panels	5
4.6.1 Review Panel Membership	5
4.6.2 Review Panel Meeting	5
4.6.3 Review Panel Documentation	5
4.6.4 Review Panel Considerations	5
4.6.5 Review Panel Report	6
4.7. Graduating Year Review Report	6
4.8. Peer Review	7
4.9. Deferrals	7
4.10. General	7
5. Appendices	
A Graduating Year Review Template	9
B Committee on University Academic Programmes Graduating Year Review Requirements & Information	16
C Review Panel Guide for Reports	19
D Massey University Graduating Year Review Internal Peer Review Guide	20
E Sample Graduating Year Review Deferral Request	21
F. Timeline	22

1. Introduction:

Graduating Year Review (GYR) is the name of the moderation process directed by the Committee for University Academic Programmes (CUAP). All New Zealand universities are required to conduct a formal review of new qualifications generally within three years of the first cohort of students graduating. Failure to submit a GYR may result in the withdrawal of approval of the qualification with no new students being allowed to enrol. (Source: CUAP Handbook 2013-2014)

A GYR is not expected to be a congratulatory document. It should critically analyse the qualification / specialisation against the specified CUAP criteria and provide honest answers. If there is room for improvement this should be noted and wherever possible actions to take to correct the identified problems should be noted. CUAP want to know if the qualification / specialisation is achieving the goals stated in the original proposal and if it is meeting the needs of students and industry. If not, what has been, or is being done, to address this.

These Procedures outline the process to follow to conduct a GYR in order to meet CUAP requirements.

2. Process Overview:

- The qualification / specialisation coordinator (or equivalent) conducts a self-review critically analysing the qualification / specialisation in relation to the original CUAP proposal and GYR requirements.
- A GYR Panel, comprising of experts external to the qualification / specialisation, is appointed and conducts the GYR using the self-review document, the original CUAP proposal, student enrolment and completion numbers, reports of any other reviews on the qualification / specialisation, the aggregated results of any applicable student surveys and any other relevant documentation.
- The GYR Panel writes the GYR report using the self-review report as the base and adding any appropriate comments and /or recommendations.
- The GYR report is peer reviewed within Massey University through College Committees and Academic Committee prior to being sent to CUAP. Colleges may add other peer review steps as appropriate
- The GYR report is scrutinised by two other universities and discussed at the November CUAP meeting. Outcomes of the scrutiny process and CUAP meeting may include acceptance of the GYR report, revision and re-submission, the establishment of a CUAP review panel to report on specified issues or withdrawal of approval of the qualification / specialisation.

3. Qualifications Requiring and Not Requiring a Graduating Year Review

3.1 Graduating Year Review Required

A qualification / specialisation that is (a) open to enrolments, (b) has received enrolments and (c) has had at least one completion requires a GYR.

3.2 Graduating Year Review Not Required

A qualification / specialisation that has been closed to new enrolments or that has been deleted through the CUAP process does not require a GYR.

3.3 Graduating Year Reviews Unable to be Completed

Qualifications / specialisations that are (a) open to enrolments, but have received no enrolments or have had no completions or (b) have not yet been offered, cannot undergo a GYR and an application for deferral should be requested. See section 4.11 on Deferrals.

4. Process Details:

4.1 Schedule:

The Schedule of GYRs for the following year is sent to Academic Committee and Colleges in October/November by the Accreditation Consultant. All qualifications / specialisations listed on the Schedule will, unless granted a deferral, or involve a closed qualification, have a GYR report lodged with Academic Committee not later than the September meeting. Any changes to the Schedule due to deferrals or a qualification / specialisation being closed are communicated to CUAP who confirm the Schedule in February/March.

4.2 Data:

The Academic Policy & Regulations Unit (APRU) collates the following data for all GYRs:

- Student headcount numbers
- EFTS
- Completion numbers
- Strategic Priority Group headcount numbers
- Student Tracking Data (transfers, withdrawals, completions)

This data are sent to Colleges in January/February and is used by the qualification / specialisation coordinator as part of the self-review and by the GYR panel in their review. The student headcount numbers, EFTS data and completion numbers are also included in the final GYR report that goes to CUAP. The Strategic Priority Group headcount numbers and student tracking data are for University information only and are removed before being sent to CUAP.

4.3 Self-Review:

The purpose of the self-review is to critically analyse the qualification / specialisation in relation to the original CUAP proposal and GYR requirements. The self-review is conducted by the qualification / specialisation coordinator and may include other staff if necessary. The GYR template (attached as Appendix A) should be used for the self-review. The following areas form the basis of the review (source: CUAP *Handbook 2013-2014*): The full CUAP GYR requirements and information section from the CUAP *Handbook 2013 – 2014* booklet is attached as Appendix B.

Programme Statement

Description

Provide a brief description of the programme as approved by CUAP and how it has been introduced and consolidated.

Achievement

Set out the stated goals in the original proposal and provide a brief statement on the extent to which these have been achieved.

Changes

Mention any significant changes that have been made to the programme since approval, including specification of any changes to regulations.

Review Processes

Provide a brief overview of programme review processes as they are applied in the university. If more than one GYR is being submitted, this overview may be provided as a covering statement. Provide a brief account of the GYR processes that have been applied to this specific programme, including student feedback and references to available documentation. Include comment on the establishment of the evaluation team, including names and positions held.

Note that a GYR process should involve a formally constituted review panel with at least one member from a disciplinary area other than any involved in the delivery of the programme.

(As part of the final GYR report comment on the establishment of the GYR Panel is included and contains names and positions held. Composition of the panel is detailed below under the Review Panel section. An overview of the GYR process is compiled by APRU and provided to CUAP)

Review Outcomes

Acceptability

Provide a statement of the ongoing acceptability of the programme to the relevant academic, industrial and professional communities. Provide evidence that the graduate profile is being achieved.

(Massey University only requirement: Include Maori and Pasifika professional organisations and communities, with evidence of ongoing consultation with relevant reference groups. Where appropriate, highlight the programme's contribution to local, national, Pacific and global developments.)

Assessment procedures and student performance

Provide a statement on the ongoing appropriateness of methods of assessment including procedures for external assessment.

Data

Provide summary information on the numbers actually enrolling and completing. This should be provided in an easily interpreted format with a commentary. [*Please note APRU provides this data and the self-review coordinator adds the commentary*]

(*Massey University additional requirement*) If enrolments fell below the targets provide an explanation for this. While CUAP requires the inclusion of raw data there is also a need for analytic interpretation and this should be incorporated. Data on strategic priority groups comprising Maori students, Pasifika students, distance learning students and under 25 year olds will be included in an appendix to the GYR report. Comment should be made on whether or not numbers of enrolments and completions in these groups are appropriate and if not, what has, or is being done to address this. This appendix will be removed before the report is sent to CUAP.

Programme evaluation

If the programme has been subject to any external reviews eg by professional or accreditation bodies include, where relevant, a statement of intention, or revisions, to address any shortfall identified in an external review.

Continuation or discontinuation

A statement indicating whether it is the university's intention to continue or discontinue the qualification / subject. Where numbers of students enrolling and completing are low and where the university is continuing the qualification / specialisation, a summary of other actions to be taken to support that continuation must be included.

Once the coordinator has completed the self-review, the Director Teaching and Learning (or equivalent) should assess the report against the CUAP requirements. Colleges may add any additional approval / assessment pathways for the self-review report they think necessary. The final self-review report is then made available to the Review Panel.

4.4 Student Feedback

CUAP require student feedback on the qualification / specialisation being reviewed. The University currently conducts or takes part in the following surveys that can be used for the GYRs: Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE) and the Graduate Destination Survey. Where these surveys have been carried out for the qualification / specialisation under review a narrative and/or comments will be made available to both the Self-review Coordinator and the Review Panel. Individual student responses will not be provided. APRU will obtain the survey information

from the Student Survey and Evaluation Unit. Where an appropriate survey has not been conducted, or where the results are insufficient, APRU, in consultation with the SSEU, will conduct a survey specifically designed for the GYR.

4.5 Consultation:

Consultation with relevant units should be initiated during the self-review stage. Where another unit is directly involved with teaching the qualification / specialisation, formal consultation and sign off is required. Where a qualification / specialisation is jointly offered by two Colleges, one College will be the lead College for the GYR and timeframes need to be considered to allow the final report to be approved through each College's Committee process.

4.6 Review Panels:

4.6.1 Review Panel Membership

The GYR process *must* include a review of the qualification / specialisation by a review panel. The panel will consist of three members, one of whom will be appointed convenor. Larger panels may be used. Panel membership will always include at least one member external to the College and wherever possible external to the University. The panel should not contain, as a full member, staff teaching in the qualification and should avoid containing staff within the teaching unit. However, a subject matter expert may be consulted by the panel and participate in panel meetings if required. The GYR panel is similar in concept to that of a Qualification Review with the expectation that people with appropriate expertise / knowledge external to the qualification / specialisation look at it from an outside perspective and base their report on the evidence available. Subject matter experts should provide clarification and answers to panel queries. It is acceptable to use one panel to conduct more than one GYR if panel members contain suitable expertise / knowledge to cover each GYR.

Colleges will nominate panel members and these will be approved by the Pro Vice-Chancellor. Confirmed panel membership should be sent to the Accreditation Consultant by 31 March in order to meet GYR process timelines and will be included in the April Academic Committee report.

4.6.2 Review Panel Meeting

Once panel membership has been confirmed the School/College organises the panel meeting. Enough time should be allowed when inviting the panel in case first choice members are unavailable and alternatives need to be sought. The Review Panel may meet together in one location or make use of technology to conduct the review remotely if appropriate.

4.6.3 Review Panel Documentation

The panel is charged with reviewing the qualification / specialisation using available data and information. This will include: the self-review report, the original CUAP proposal, student enrolment and completion numbers, reports of any other reviews on the qualification / specialisation, the aggregated results of the student survey and any other applicable documentation. The panel may also, if they wish, interview staff, students and stakeholders.

4.6.4 Review Panel Considerations

The panel will consider and assesses the qualification / specialisation against the CUAP requirements where possible. These are as follows:

In assessing Graduating Year Review reports, the committee [CUAP] will use the criteria for programme approval set out in section 3 [CUAP *Handbook*]. Particular attention will be paid in this peer review process to criteria 2, 3, 4 and 5 (see section 3).

Therefore the committee will be concerned mainly to verify that:

- (a) It has on its files a full and up-to-date statement of the institution's own review, monitoring and evaluation procedures.

- (b) Appropriate institutional review processes have been followed to an acceptable standard.
- (c) Criteria 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been met satisfactorily, namely:
 - i. The adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole course.
 - ii. The adequacy and appropriateness of delivery and learning methods, for all modes of delivery, given the stated learning outcomes.
 - iii. The acceptability of the course to the relevant academic, industrial, professional and other committees in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure.
 - iv. The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations that specify requirements for admissions, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning. Course length and structure, integration of practical/work-based components, assessment procedures, and normal progression within a programme.
- (d) The targets stated in the original CUAP proposal have been met and, if not, the university states the actions to be taken.
- (e) Any concerns raised by CUAP at the point of approval, and any required changes, have been adequately addressed.

The Review Panel should not consider themselves confined to the above CUAP criteria but may address any aspect of the qualification / specialisation. A Review Panel Guide for Reports including these considerations is attached as Appendix C.

4.6.5 Review Panel Report

The Review Panel will produce the GYR report. A Review Panel Guide for Reports is attached as Appendix C. This Appendix includes a series of questions for the Review Panel to consider which look at the overall completeness of the self-review report and the findings contained within it. The Review Panel should include in the report relevant recommendations and commendations if pertinent.

4.7 Graduating Year Review Report:

The Review Panel is responsible for writing the GYR report in conjunction with staff as required, including the Director Teaching and Learning (or equivalent). The GYR report should use the self-review report as the basis. The Review Panel report should include any recommendations they make and, if appropriate, selected quotes. Once the Review Panel has finished the report it is sent to the Self-review Coordinator (or equivalent) for comment on how the College intends to action the review panel recommendations or how it plans to look into these further. The final report may also include other recommendations or suggestions made by the College. It may also be helpful for the qualification / specialisation coordinator to consider the criteria that CUAP uses for assessing the GYR reports as detailed in the Review Panel Report section above. The full CUAP GYR requirements and information section from the CUAP *Handbook 2013 – 2014* booklet is attached as Appendix B.

The final GYR report is submitted through College Committees and forwarded to the Accreditation Consultant in time for the September meeting of Academic Committee.

4.8 Peer Review

The final GYR report is peer reviewed through College Committees and Academic Committee before being sent to CUAP. Colleges may also put the report through additional peer review depending on College preference and time constraints.

A guide for this additional peer review is included as Appendix D but Colleges do not need to limit themselves to the issues listed in this guide.

4.9 Deferrals:

Massey University is required to lodge requests for deferrals of GYRs to CUAP. Requests for deferrals should be sent to the Accreditation Consultant by 28 February in time for the March Academic Committee meeting. Deferrals are not automatically granted by CUAP.

A sample deferral request is attached as Appendix E. Late requests are not permitted.

Deferrals will be considered on the following grounds:

- i. The programme either has not yet been offered or was first offered at a later date than first envisaged.
- ii. All or most enrolments are part-time and there have been no completions by the time the report is due.
- iii. The due date for the GYR precedes or coincides with a scheduled departmental or programme review.

Deferrals will be granted for a maximum of two years from the first due date of a Graduating Year Review.

If a programme has not been offered, or has attracted no enrolments, in the five years following its introduction, it should be re-submitted to CUAP (as in Section 5.1) for re-evaluation or formally deleted (as in section 5.2). (source: CUAP *Handbook 2013-2014*)

There is no minimum number of graduates required for a GYR. Requests for deferral on the basis of low numbers of graduates will not be accepted. Qualifications with low numbers of graduates need to consider the reason for the low number in the GYR and, where appropriate, report on actions to be taken to improve graduate numbers.

4.10 General:

A timeline is attached as Appendix F.

Examples of previous GYRs and advanced schedules of GYR due dates are available from the Accreditation Consultant upon request.

If a Qualification Review (QR) has occurred within one year of the due date for a GYR, another panel does not need to be constituted to conduct the GYR provided that all the information required by a GYR has been addressed in the QR. In these cases the qualification / specialisation coordinator and the Director Teaching & Learning (or equivalent) will prepare the GYR report based on the findings of the QR. The GYR report should include details of the QR panel and process they followed. If a QR is due within a year of a GYR a deferral of the GYR may be requested (as per iii. in the Deferrals section above) in order that both are conducted simultaneously. If a QR is due the same year as a GYR these may use the same Review Panel but two separate reports must be prepared. If a QR and GYR are to be combined these must be conducted in the first half of the year in order for the GYR report to proceed through the committee process before being submitted to CUAP.

Any costs associated with conducting a GYR are to be met within College budgets.

The qualification / specialisation coordinator should begin gathering information and documents from the first year of offering of a new qualification / specialisation. This could include, but is not limited to, any reviews of the qualification

/ specialisation, changes made or recommendations for changes and the reasons for these, student / industry feedback, and external accreditations. In this way by the time the GYR is due information should be readily available and up-to-date showing progression of the qualification / specialisation.

Audience:

All staff conducting a Graduating Year Review

Related procedures / documents:

Qualification Lifecycle Strategy (currently being written)
Qualification Review Policy
Qualification Review Procedures (currently under review)

Document Management Control:

Prepared by: Academic Policy & Regulations Unit
Authorised by: AVC (Research, Academic & Enterprise)
Approved by: Academic Committee (AC)
Date issued: April 2012
Last review: February 2014
Next review: February 2016

Graduating Year Review Template



MASSEY UNIVERSITY

GRADUATING YEAR REVIEW

Current year	
Name of programme	
Identifier for the original proposal	(eg MU11 – BBS/2)
Name of self-review coordinator and position held	

1. Programme Statement

(a) Description

(Provide a brief description of the programme as approved by CUAP and how it has been introduced and consolidated)

(b) Achievement

(Set out the stated goals in the original proposal and provide a brief statement on the extent to which these have been achieved).

(c) Changes

(Mention any significant changes that have been made to the programme since approval, including specification of any changes to regulations).

2. Review Processes

(Provide a brief overview of programme review processes as they are applied in the university. If more than one GYR is being submitted, this overview may be provided as a covering statement. Provide a brief account of the GYR processes that have been applied to this specific programme, including student feedback and references to available documentation. Include comment on the establishment of the evaluation team, including names and positions held. Note that a GYR process should involve a formally constituted review panel with at least one member from a disciplinary area other than any involved in the delivery of the programme).

3. Review Outcomes

(Summarise the outcomes of the review processes under the following headings)

(a) Acceptability

(Provide a statement of the ongoing acceptability of the programme to the relevant academic, industrial and professional communities. Provide evidence that the graduate profile is being achieved. Include Maori and Pasifika

professional organisations and communities, with evidence of ongoing consultation with relevant reference groups. Where appropriate, highlight the programme's contribution to local, national, Pacific and global developments.)

(b) Assessment procedures and student performance

(Provide a statement on the ongoing appropriateness of methods of assessment including any procedures for external assessment.)

(c) Data

(Provide information on student number actually enrolling and completing. This should be provided in an easily interpreted format with a commentary. If enrolments fell below the targets provide an explanation for this. Please also include in Appendix A this analysis information on strategic priority groups including Maori students, Pasifika students, distance learning students and under 25 year olds.)

Summary information on numbers enrolling and completing

(The following data is provided by APRU)

Years (from and including the first)	Actual numbers enrolled	New to Programme	Full-time	Part-time	EFTS	Numbers completed

Extend table as required. If more than one qualification, create appropriate sections.

(d) Programme evaluation

(If the programme has been subject to any external reviews eg by professional or accreditation bodies include, where relevant, a statement of intention, or revisions, to address any shortfall identified in an external review.)

(e) Continuation or discontinuation

(A statement indicating whether it is the university's intention to continue or discontinue the qualification/subject. Where numbers of students enrolling and completing the qualification do not meet the original targets and where the university is continuing the qualification/subject, a summary of other actions to be taken to support that continuation must be included.)

This report should be no more than four pages long. All italicised notes should be deleted before submission.

Graduating Year Review Template – (*GYR Template Appendix A*)

Strategic Priority Groups Data

This appendix contains data on distance and internal students, ethnicities, over and under 25s and full-time and part-time study to allow comparisons on the strategic priority groups - Maori students, Pasifika students, distance learning students and under 25 year olds.

Comment should be made on whether or not numbers of enrolments and completions in the strategic priority groups are appropriate and if not, what has, or is being done to address this.

This appendix is included for University purposes only and will be removed before the GYR report is submitted to CUAP.

(The following data is provided by APRU)

Distance Students

Primary Ethnicity	Full/Part Time	Age	2010	Cmpltns	2011	Cmpltns	2012	Cmpltns
Asian	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Asian Total								
Maori	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Maori Total								
Other	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Other Total								
Pacific Peoples	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Pacific Peoples Total								
Pakeha/European	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Pakeha/European Total								
Unspecified	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Unspecified Total								

Internal Students

Primary Ethnicity	Full/Part Time	Age	2010	Cmpltns	2011	Cmpltns	2012	Cmpltns
Asian	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Asian Total								
Maori	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Maori Total								
Other	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Other Total								
Pacific Peoples	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Pacific Peoples Total								
Pakeha/European	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Pakeha/European Total								
Unspecified	F	24 & under 25 & over						
	F Total							
	P	24 & under 25 & over						
	P Total							
Unspecified Total								

Graduating Year Review Template – (GYR Template Appendix B)

Student Tracking Data

This appendix is included for University purposes only and will be removed before the GYR report is submitted to CUAP.

(The following data is provided by APRU)

Totals			
Individual Commencements (from the 1st year of offer – current year)			
Active in 2014 (includes new in current year)			
Total Conclusions (from the 1st year of offer – year immediately prior to current year):			
2014 Enrolments			
Returning in current year from previous year/s study			
New to Programme in current year			
Conclusions Prior to current year			
Successful Completion			
Not Carried On			
Transferred Out			
Percentages			
Successful Completions	% from total commencements		
	% from conclusions only		
Exits without qualification	% from total commencements		
	% from conclusions only		
Conclusions (from the 1st year of offer - year immediately prior to current year) as a percentage of Commencements from the 1st year of offer – current year)	% of commencements		

Notes:

The current year figures are as at February and will be updated prior to the final report being presented to Academic Committee in September.

Conclusions include successful completions, transfers and students who have not carried on studying.

The actual years will be added according to when the qualification was approved.

Graduating Year Review Template – (*GYR Template Appendix C*)

Staff Profiles

This appendix is included for University purposes only and will be removed before the GYR report is submitted to CUAP.

Please provide appropriate information on staff teaching into the qualification / specialisation. This should include position, supervision and teaching, research projects, expertise and outputs, and qualifications.

This information is to allow a critical review of the staffing environment with reference to the original proposal and environment in which success is articulated.

Committee on University Academic Programmes Graduating Year Review Requirements and Information

CUAP has given the name Graduating Year Review to its moderation process.

The committee requires a follow-up review of all successful proposals involving the introduction of new qualifications and major subjects and endorsements comprising 40% or more of a qualification. (Higher doctorates are exempted from this process, and reviews are not required for minor subjects or for endorsements when they comprise less than 40% of the qualification.) Reviews should be conducted formally, involving an appointed convener and also at least one panel member from another disciplinary area. Reviews might be part of regular institutional reviews but the report to CUAP should stand alone and cover the topics outlined in the “Format for reports” following. The review is intended to assure the committee that programmes are meeting their original course objectives and an acceptable standard of delivery.

The reports should be summary statements only and no more than four pages long. Members of CUAP will be entitled to call for copies of all documentation referred to in the reports. Following the response to such a request, where any member retains reservations about a programme, the university offering the programme may be asked to respond to these reservations at a subsequent meeting of CUAP.

The Graduating Year Review reports will normally be required to be submitted within three years of the graduation of the first cohort of students, and in time for the November meeting of CUAP, i.e. by 1 November. For a three-year bachelor’s degree this will mean Year 6, while for a one-year diploma it will mean Year 4. Universities will be provided with approximately one year’s notice of their requirement to submit a review report.

If a university fails to provide a Graduating Year Review report when requested, the committee may suspend approval pending receipt of the report. The effect of such a decision would be that no new students could be enrolled in the programme until the committee lifted the approval suspension on receipt of the report.

Criteria for Assessing Graduating Year Review Reports

In assessing Graduating Year Review reports, the committee will use the criteria for programme approval set out in section 3. Particular attention will be paid in this peer review process to criteria 2, 3, 4 and 5 (see section 3).

Therefore the committee will be concerned mainly to verify that:

- a. It has on its files a full and up-to-date statement of the institution’s own review, monitoring and evaluation procedures
- b. Appropriate institutional review processes have been followed to an acceptable standard
- c. Criteria 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been met satisfactorily, namely:
 - i. The adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole course.
 - ii. The adequacy and appropriateness of delivery and learning methods, for all modes of delivery, given the stated learning outcomes.
 - iii. The acceptability of the course to the relevant academic, industrial, professional and other committees in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure.

- iv. The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations that specify requirements for admissions, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning. Course length and structure, integration of practical/work-based components, assessment procedures, and normal progression within a programme.
- d. The targets stated in the original CUAP proposal have been met and, if not, the university states the actions to be taken.
- e. Any concerns raised by CUAP at the point of approval, and any required changes, have been adequately addressed.

Deferral or Programme Not Offered

Universities may request deferral of a Graduating Year Review on the following grounds:

- i. The programme either has not yet been offered or was first offered at a later date than first envisaged
- ii. All or most enrolments are part-time and there have been no completions by the time the report is due
- iii. The due date for the Graduating Year Review precedes or coincides with a scheduled departmental or programme review

Deferrals will be granted for a maximum of two years from the first due date of a Graduating Year Review.

If a programme has not been offered, or has attracted no enrolments, in the five years following its introduction, it should be re-submitted to CUAP (as in Section 5.1) for re-evaluation or formally deleted (as in Section 5.2). (See section 5.9).

Process for Consideration of the Reports

- a. Each set of reports submitted by a university will be initially considered by two CUAP members acting as scrutineers who will provide a summary report to the CUAP meeting on:
 - i. The acceptability and rigour of the review processes utilised by the university
 - ii. The general quality of the reports from the university, and the extent to which they meet the requirements of the GYR process
 - iii. Any specific issues relating to individual programmes that are of interest to the Committee
 - iv. Any general issues emerging from the university's submissions.

In considering the Graduating Year Reviews the scrutineers may seek clarification of any matter from the originating university.

- b. The scrutineers' reports will be considered by the full committee in order to:
 - i. Make specific recommendations on individual programmes
 - ii. Make recommendations on improvements to the processes undertaken by individual universities, or proposals for improvement to the CUAP process
 - iii. Identify any general issues of interest to all universities.

Outcomes

CUAP may,

1. a. Accept the review report.
b. Accept the report, with specified changes (which would normally be actioned through a Round One or Round Two proposal) or other comment.

The programme would subsequently be subject to normal external academic audit and institutional self-review processes.

2. Require one further report after a specified time in response to concerns about the programme specified by the committee.
3. Establish a review panel to report to the committee on specified issues. The processes on review panels set out in section 5.7.4 of this booklet would be followed.
4. Withdraw approval where there are reasonable grounds for doing so after considering reports generated during either outcome 2 or outcome 3 above. The offering university would be given an opportunity to comment further prior to withdrawal of approval, and Universities New Zealand would be consulted in advance. The effect of such a decision would be that no new students could be enrolled for the qualification. The university concerned and the committee would negotiate agreed transition arrangements to protect the interests of students already enrolled. The qualification could be reinstated only through successful completion of a fresh Round One or Round Two proposal.'

Source: CUAP *Handbook 2013 – 2014*. The full booklet is available at:
<http://www.universitiesnz.ac.nz/aboutus/sc/cuap>

Review Panel Guide for Reports

The Review Panel should use this guide for their report but should not be limited by it.

Information / Documentation:

Has enough information/documentation been provided to the Review Panel? If not, please contact either the Accreditation Consultant or the Self-review Coordinator.

Does the panel wish to meet with any staff and/or students?

Considerations:

Are the following adequate and appropriate?

- qualification title
- aims
- stated learning outcomes
- coherence of the whole qualification
- delivery and learning methods given the stated learning outcomes

Is the qualification acceptable to relevant academic, industrial, professional and/or other communities in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure?

Has due comment been included on any changes made to the qualification?

Have the achievements as stated in the original CUAP proposal been met according to the self-review?

Are the findings in the self-review clear and logical?

Does the self-review appear to have been conducted rigorously?

What does the data tell you? Is there an appropriate commentary to accompany and, if necessary, explain the data?

What is your evaluation of the programme?

Recommendations / Commendations:

Does the Review Panel agree with any recommendations made in the self-review?

What additional recommendations does the Review Panel have to make?

What commendations does the Review Panel have to make?

Do you recommend continuation or discontinuation? If discontinuation, please provide reasons for this.

GYR Procedures Appendix D

Massey University Graduating Year Review Internal Peer Review Guide

The following are taken from the CUAP GYR criteria. These may be used as a guide but peer reviewers should not be limited by these:

1. *The adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole course*
2. *The adequacy and appropriateness of delivery and learning methods, for all modes of delivery, given the stated learning outcomes*
3. *The acceptability of the course to the relevant academic, industrial, professional and other committees in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure*
4. *The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations that specify requirements for admissions, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning. Course length and structure, integration of practical/work-based components, assessment procedures, and normal progression within a programme*
5. *The targets stated in the original CUAP proposal have been met and, if not, the university states the actions to be taken.*

Comment on other issues:

1. *The acceptability and rigour of the review processes utilised.*
2. *The general quality of the reports, and the extent to which they meet the requirements of the GYR process.*
3. *Any general issues.*

Sample Graduating Year Review Deferral Request



MASSEY UNIVERSITY

To: Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic & International)
From: College of XX
Date: 1 June 2012
Subject: **Request to Defer Graduating Year Review for the Bachelor of University Studies**

The College of XX requests a deferral of the following Graduating Year Review:

Bachelor of University Studies

Period of deferral: 1 year

Reason: The Bachelor of University Studies was approved for delivery commencing in 2005. However, due to the part-time nature of the qualification there have been no completions at this time.

OR

Reason: The Bachelor of University Studies was approved for delivery commencing in 2005. However, due to unforeseen circumstances it was not first offered until 2009.

OR

Reason: The Department of University Studies is currently undergoing a departmental-wide academic review. The Bachelor of University Studies is part of this review.

GYR Timeline

This timeline allows for the final GYR report to reach Academic Committee in September.

Date	Item	Details	Deadline	Notes
January / February	Data	Colleges are sent data for GYRs scheduled for review.	15 Feb	The data provided will be specific to the qualification/specialisation being reviewed.
January / February	Procedures	The Procedures are sent to Colleges along with the data	15 Feb	The Procedures are updated yearly to include changes required by CUAP.
February	Deferrals	Send deferral requests to the Accreditation Consultant	28 Feb	Deferrals must be received at the March Academic Committee. A deferral template is available as an appendix in the GYR Procedures. Deferral requests based on low enrolment or completion numbers are not accepted by CUAP.
Feb / March	Self-Review	Qualification / Specialisation co-ordinators conduct the self-review	31 March	Co-ordinators conduct a self-review of the qualification / specialisation. The GYR Procedures outline CUAP and Massey requirements. The finished Self-review is sent to the Accreditation Consultant.
	Panel Appointment	A panel is appointed to undertake the GYR	31 March	Panel members are selected by Colleges in accordance with the panel composition requirements as set out in the GYR Procedures.
March	Self-Review	College check on Self-review		This step is optional and allows for Colleges to check the content of the self-review prior to the Panel receiving it.
March	Panel	Panel membership is notified to Accreditation Consultant	31 March	Colleges advise who panel members for each GYR are. These are included in the April Academic Committee report.
April	Update	A progress report is sent to Academic Committee	1 April	This report summarises action so far and reports any problems or delays.
April / May	Panel Review	The panel conducts the GYR and writes up the GYR Report	31 May	The panel undertakes the GYR using the self-review document, original CUAP proposal, GYR Procedures, student survey and feedback material and any additional information available. The panel may also interview staff, students and stakeholders. The Review Panel is responsible for writing the GYR report and uses the Self-review document as the basis for the final report. The GYR Report is sent to the Accreditation Consultant.
June	GYR Reports	The Self-review Coordinator responds to the Review Panel recommendations.	30 June	If appropriate, comment should be made on how the College intends to action the recommendations in the Report.

June / July	College Peer Review	An appropriate person in the College peer reviews the GYR Report	31 July	This could be the Director, Academic Programmes, or Teaching & Learning. This step is optional.
July	Update	A progress report is sent to AC	1 July	This report summarises action so far and reports any problems or delays. Delays at this stage can have serious consequences.
July / August	GYR Reports	Reports are sent to College Boards for peer review	31 Aug	Colleges may also wish to send the reports through sub-committees of College Board.
September	GYR Reports	Completed GYR reports are sent to the Accreditation Consultant	1 Sep	All GYR reports must be received no later than the September AC meeting. If amendments are required the revised report is re-submitted to the October AC meeting.
October	GYR Reports	Amendments to GYR reports as a result of September AC	1 Oct	Only revised reports are sent to the October Academic Committee meeting.
October	GYR Reports	Reports are sent to CUAP	24 Oct	2014 Reports are due to CUAP no later than 24 October. Late reports are not accepted.
October	GYR Scrutiny	Receive GYR reports from two other Universities	27 Oct	As part of the CUAP process GYR reports are peer reviewed by other Universities. Each University is paired up to scrutinise two other Universities' reports.
November	GYR Scrutiny	Complete scrutiny of GYRs	Approx. 3 Nov	Subject matter experts are sent GYRs reports from the two Universities assigned to Massey. The scrutiny comments are sent to the Accreditation Consultant for amalgamating into one report with Massey's partner University.
November	GYR Scrutiny	Massey receives the comments from the scrutiny of our GYRs	Approx. 5 Nov	Any questions raised need to be addressed prior to the CUAP meeting held in November.
November	Schedule	The following year's schedule and process overview are sent to AC and Colleges	1 Nov	
December	GYR Scrutiny	The results of the discussion of Massey's GYR reports are received after the CUAP meeting.	early Dec	Colleges are sent any comments made or questions raised at the CUAP meeting. Any rejected proposal is required to be revised in light of the comments and re-submitted to the March CUAP meeting.
December	Year's Summary	A report on the round just concluded is sent to AC	Dec	This may be an oral report.