

QUALIFICATION LIFECYCLE REVIEW PROCESS PROCEDURES

Section	Academic
Contact	Centre for Education Transformation
Last Review	New
Next Review	August 2028
Approval	AB25/08/132
Effective Date	August 2025

Purpose:

These procedures support the Qualification Lifecycle Review Process Policy by stating detailed requirements and the different categories of review which form Massey University's curriculum quality assurance processes for review of courses and qualifications and should be read alongside that policy.

Procedure:

Course-Level Processes

Course-level processes are:

1. Course Health Check (CHC)
2. Periodic Course Review (PRC)

These regular course reports ensure regular monitoring of courses and support the systematic and evidence-based planning and implementation of course improvements.

Records of these health checks will inform qualification reviews and institutional continuous improvement processes.

Table 1 Course life-cycle processes

Course-level systems	Year 0	New course developed and approved – Colleges, Academic Committee	
	Each offering	Health check	No Action
			Action Plan
			Full periodic course review
	Once each course cycle (3 years)	Periodic course review	'Endorsed' to next periodic review
			Endorsement pending
			Course closure

Course Health Check (CHC)

Purpose: To gather key course 'performance' information to feed into a collaborative conversation with peers. To identify key areas for change and to support academic development through reflection on teaching practice, and the continuous improvement of the student experience. An opportunity for reflection and shared learning with colleagues.

Frequency: Every offering

Who: Course coordinator and teaching team

Process: The CHC may take place in one of two ways:

- Through an existing process already approved by a College Board, OR
- Through a Collaborative Conversation between groups of relevant staff (such as those teaching the different offerings; courses at the same level; or teaching into a major, Associate Deans Māori, student achievement coaches, etc.) as determined by a Programme Committee. (It may be helpful to have the conversation facilitated by an academic colleague from a different discipline, or by a member of the Centre for Education Transformation.)

The following questions should be used as a guide for this conversation but further questions or focus areas may be added by the college:

- How is student success promoted within this course?
- What was the student experience of this course? Consider any identified university or TEC priority groups in particular:
 - Ākonga Māori
 - Pacific students
 - Disabled students
 - International students
- What did students say about the course?
- What feedback was provided to students?
- Was there anything notable with the grade distribution?
- What was the experience of teaching this course?
- Does this course meet all the agreed university compliance requirements?
- What worked well in this course?
- What caused problems in this course?
- What, if any, recommendations for change are you making?

Reporting: On completion of the CHC, course health will be categorised as:

- i. Good – no action required
- ii. Minor issues – action plan required
- iii. Significant issues – Full periodic course review.

Completion of the CHC will be monitored by College Offices. Colleges will submit a high-level summary report to Academic Committee within 6 weeks of the end of the relevant semester.

Periodic Course Review (PCR)

Purpose: The PCR is intended as a deeper review of the course and its place in the curriculum. Trends over time are examined with a view to ensuring the course is current and aligned with the qualification(s) it serves.

Frequency: Every three years, or more frequently if required by college¹

Who: Programme committee or other college nominee.

Process: PCR should occur every three years but may be initiated by a College Office at any time as part of college quality assurance/risk management processes.

Reviewer to check the following:

- Currency of learning outcomes and alignment to qualification graduate profile
- Overall student and staff experience over time (as reported via CHCs)
- Student enrolment, demographics and outcomes over time, including outcomes for Ākonga Māori, Pacific students, and other priority groups.
- Financial performance.

Reporting: PCRs are submitted to Heads of School who take responsibility for overseeing any recommended actions.

¹ Resourcing constraints mean that colleges may not always be able to review all courses, so the following considerations should guide the selection of courses for Periodic Course Review:

- a. The role of the course in assuring achievement of the University and Qualification Graduate Profile, including courses at key points within a qualification;
- b. Courses that are key foundational courses within a qualification or specialisation;
- c. Courses that are co-taught, or have shared teaching or assessment with other courses;
- d. Courses with high student enrolments and/or that are part of the core /compulsory suite of more than one qualification;
- e. Courses identified to have one or more persistent significant issues, including but not limited to:
 - I. low success rates (overall or for specific equity group(s))
 - II. low student satisfaction
 - III. significant concerns regarding academic integrity
 - IV. high rates of special consideration applications
 - V. high rates of academic appeals
 - VI. low or decreasing enrolments
 - VII. issues related to the enrolment numbers of specific cohorts.
- f. Courses that are integral to a qualification's alignment with and achievement of the University Graduate Profile or key institutional priorities, such as Te Tiriti, employability or sustainability;
- g. Courses that are integral to the external accreditation of a qualification;
- h. Courses identified by internal or external processes to undergo a Periodic Course Review.

Courses that are core for more than one qualification can be reviewed against the needs of all qualifications in a single review, if agreed by all relevant colleges.

Qualification-Level Processes

Processes at the qualification level are governed both by Massey internal policy, and by the regulatory requirements set by CUAP. Responsibility for the management of these processes is shared between the college (Qualification Health Check) and the Office of Academic Quality, Reporting and Assurance (In-cycle Review, Graduating Year Review, Qualification Review).

1. The Qualification Health Check (QHC) takes place annually, starting from the first year of delivery after the qualification is approved by CUAP. The QHC is intended as a higher-level review of the qualification. Trends over time are examined with a view to facilitating early intervention if issues are identified, ensuring the qualification remains current and sustainable.
2. The In-cycle Review is managed by the Office of Academic Quality, Reporting and Assurance, which is designed to be triggered when a Programme Committee, Head of School, or College Office using various university mechanisms (such as Student Experience Survey; No and Low Enrolments Policy) identifies minor concerns with a qualification.
3. The Graduating Year Review (GYR), which is required to take place within three years of the first cohort graduating.
4. The Qualification Review (QR), which takes place every five years following the first QHC, or when the Programme Committee identifies serious concerns with the qualification, or prior to a major refresh of the qualification. The first QR may be combined with the GYR, and may be combined with Accreditation Reviews if there is sufficient alignment between the accrediting body's processes and those of the university.

Table 2 Qualification-level processes

Year 0	Programme accredited and developed	Outcome
Year 1	First offerings	
Year 2	Annual health check	Endorsed
		In-cycle review
		Full review
Year 3	Annual health check/Graduating year review	Endorsed
		In-cycle review
		Full review
Year 4	Annual health check/Graduating year review	Endorsed
		In-cycle review
		Full review
Year 5	Annual health check/Graduating year review	Endorsed
		In-cycle review
		Full review
Year 6	Annual health check/Graduating year review	Endorsed
		In-cycle review
		Full review
Year 7	Full Qualification Review	Re-approved
		Provisional re-approval subject to minor changes
		Conditional re-approval subject to major changes
		No re-approval - qualification closure commences
Year 8	Revised/updated programme developed and approved	Revised/updated programme developed and approved
Year 1	Revised programme implemented	Re-approved or new programme delivered. Review process begins again.

Qualification Health Check (QHC)

The QHC takes place annually and comprises a desktop review of the course health checks of the key courses which make up the qualification, supported by information from a QHC dashboard.

The QHC is conducted by the relevant Programme Committee or other college nominee and reported to the relevant College Board and noted at Academic Committee.

Questions:

1. *Have any recommendations about this qualification been made by any previous reviews (QHC, GYR, QR) or from programme, college or university accreditation processes that require action? (If so, what actions are being taken and what are the outcomes of these?)*
2. *What recommendations for change have been identified through the Course Health Check process? What actions are needed to address these?*
3. *How is the qualification performing?*

Consider trends in the following:

- Student Experience Survey results over time (and other feedback e.g., from focus groups)
 - Enrolments* (overall and by specific cohort, based on NLE policy)
 - Ethnicity
 - Gender
 - Part-time/full-time
 - Distance/internal
 - International/domestic,
 - Students with a disability
 - Retention rates and trends over time and for specific cohorts
 - Staff workloads
 - Staff-student ratios
4. *Is the qualification still constructively aligned and fit for purpose?*

Consider:

- Alignment with university-wide strategies and University Graduate Profile
- Student transitions into, through and beyond the qualification
- Course design, mapping, constructive alignment, assessment
- Rationale for delivery modes
- Delivery costs and return on investment (ROI)
- Impact of changes made to courses over time on programme alignment

In-Cycle Review

The in-cycle review is a desktop review conducted using a subset of the Qualification Review questions², and is designed to be triggered when the Programme Committee identifies concerns with the performance or quality of a qualification that cannot be addressed by minor changes. The process, which is managed by the Office of Academic Quality, Reporting and Assurance, may be conducted by an accredited academic staff member³ not associated with the running of the programme, or by an accredited representative of the Centre for Education Transformation on behalf of the college.

The results of the In-Cycle Review are reported via the Programme Committee to the relevant College Board.

Graduating Year review

A Graduating Year Review (GYR) is conducted within three years of the first cohort of students graduating from a new qualification or specialisation. It is required by CUAP as part of the approval and moderation process for all proposals involving the introduction of new qualifications, and major subjects and endorsements comprising 40% or more of a qualification. The GYR shows CUAP that the approved qualification/specialisation is meeting the objectives as approved in the CUAP proposal and that it is being delivered to an acceptable standard.

CUAP can suspend approval of the qualification/specialisation if the University fails to provide a GYR. In this way the GYR has a compliance component but it also forms part of the University formal review process by checking that what was approved, is being delivered, or if it has changed, how that change has been implemented.

GYRs are conducted formally involving an appointed convener and a Massey staff member, both independent of the qualification/specialisation, a recent graduate and a subject matter expert from outside the University. The process followed to undertake a GYR is similar to that of a Qualification Review (QR). Data such as demographics, enrolment numbers, completions, withdrawals, transfers and grade results are gathered, the programme coordinator or equivalent, in conjunction with other key staff, conducts an initial self-review.

A review panel is appointed, comprising:

- Chair selected from a pool of Massey-accredited staff but from outside the college hosting the qualification
- at least one SME from industry or another NZ university
- a representative of the Office of the DVC Māori
- a Massey staff member from a different school or college that has appropriate expertise or experience to be able to contribute to the review
- a representative of the Centre for Education Transformation
- one or two recent graduates.

The panel conducts the review based on information associated with the programme and including the self-review. The panel write the review report and the College considers the report and provides responses to the recommendations from the report. The report then goes through university committees before being submitted to CUAP.

² The specific questions used will be determined in consultation with the Programme Committee and based on the specific concerns which have triggered the request for an in-cycle review.

³ A process of reviewer accreditation, similar to that used for the accreditation of doctoral supervisors, will be introduced to support qualification-level review processes.

The specific criteria for the GYR are set by CUAP and include:

- a. CUAP 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. approval criteria have been met satisfactorily, namely the adequacy of:
 - i. the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence
 - ii. the acceptability of the programme and consultation
 - iii. regulations
 - iv. assessment and moderation
 - v. evaluation and review.
- d. Any concerns raised by CUAP at the point of approval, and any required changes, have been adequately addressed.
- e. The university has provided an intention to continue or discontinue the programme.

CUAP set the template for the GYR following the above criteria with the addition of enrolment and completion data. The GYR also includes the programme's response to the recommendations made by the review panel. Each university has their own internal process following the template but all are similar. GYRs are submitted to CUAP in September and peer reviewed by the other NZ universities. Further details on the GYR can be found in the [CUAP Handbook](#).

As part of the documentation prepared for the GYR, the course health checks and/or the periodic course review and the qualification health checks will be included.

Qualification review

A Qualification Review (QR) is the quality assurance review of a whole qualification or suite of qualifications. It is designed to check a qualification is:

- meeting the graduate profile
- being delivered to an acceptable standard
- fit for purpose
- meeting the needs of students, industry and communities of interest
- sustainable

Each qualification must be comprehensively reviewed once every five-years and incorporate the GYR (where applicable), and the results of the course health checks and annual qualification health checks.

QRs are conducted by an independent panel, comprising:

- Chair selected from a pool of Massey-accredited staff but from outside the college hosting the qualification
- at least one SME from industry or another NZ university
- at least one international SME (this can be someone residing overseas or within NZ but with considerable international experience)
- a representative of the Office of the DVC Māori
- a Massey staff member from a different school or college that has appropriate expertise or experience to be able to contribute to the review
- a representative of the Centre for Education Transformation
- one or two recent graduates.

NOTES:

1. No panel member may be actively involved with the qualification/s or have taught into them in the past.

2. Depending on the size or number of qualifications and specialisations being reviewed, the panel may include more than one representative from each group.

QRs are reported to College Board, Academic Committee and Academic Board. Six-month and one-year follow-up responses are prepared by the Programme Committee outlining what actions have been taken to address the recommendations in the QR Report. These responses are also reported to College Board, Academic Committee and Academic Board.

Audience:

All staff involved in the design, delivery and review of programmes and courses.

Relevant legislation:

Nil

Legal compliance:

Nil

Related procedures / documents:

Qualification Lifecycle Review Procedures
Curriculum Framework
Qualification Policy
Qualification Framework

Document Management Control:

Prepared by:	Director Education Futures
Authorised by:	Provost
Approved by:	AB25/08/132
Date issued:	August 2025
Last review:	August 2025
Next review:	August 2028

APPENDIX A: Collaborative conversation

Purpose: To support academic development through reflection on teaching practice, the experiences of students in the course, and course alignment within qualifications.

Frequency: Every offering

Who: Course coordinator (and teaching team)

Process: Through a Collaborative Conversation between groups of academic relevant staff (such as those teaching the different offerings; courses at the same level; or teaching into a major, Associate Deans Māori, student achievement coaches, etc.) as determined by a Programme Committee. (It may be helpful to have the conversation facilitated by an academic colleague from a different discipline, or by a member of the Centre for Education Transformation.) Groups discuss the findings of the Course Health Checks, and collaboratively agree actions.

Conversation Prompts:

- What worked well in the course?
- What did not work well?
- How did the students find the course? Consider identified university or TEC priority groups in particular:
 - What was the experience of Ākonga Māori?
 - What was the experience of Pacific students?
 - What was the experience of any disabled students?
 - What was the experience of any international students?
- Was there anything notable with the grade distribution?
- What ideas do you want to implement for the next offering?
- Do you require any support (School/College) to help with this?

APPENDIX B: Periodic course review prompts

1. *Have any recommendations about this course been made by previous reviews or from programme, college or university accreditation processes that require action?*

2. *What is the overall student experience of this course?⁴*

This question asks you to consider the overall performance of the course through the lens of student engagement.

Consider trends in the following:

- MOST results over time (and other feedback e.g., from focus groups)
- Enrolments (overall and by specific cohort)
- Completion rates and trends over time and for specific cohorts
- Academic integrity cases
- Grievances and complaints
- Academic appeals

3. *What is the overall teacher experience of this course?*

This question asks you to consider the strengths and challenges of this course over the past three years from the perspective of the teaching staff and the college.

Consider patterns and trends in the following:

- Staff workload
- Rationale(s) for teaching methods
- Course coordinator and teaching team reflection and feedback
- Staff-student ratios

4. *Is the curricular role of the course still appropriate and fit for purpose?*

Consider:

- Sector benchmarks where possible
- Alignment with University Graduate Profile
- Course design, mapping, constructive alignment, assessment
- Relationship to any pre-reqs or co-reqs
- Rationale for delivery modes
- Delivery costs and ROI
- Impact of changes made to the course over time on programme alignment

5. *Financial sustainability*

Consider

- EFTS, market share and trajectory
- Margins
- Domestic and international demand
- Appeal to market segments

6. *Strategic fit*

Consider how the course aligns with:

- University Strategy and key goals

⁴ An extended course evaluation survey for may be considered for the last offering of the course before review.

- University priorities relating to students, research and internationalisation
- Demand from industry for workforce development
- Campus revitalisation.

APPENDIX C: Qualification review elements and guiding questions

All Qualification Reviews (QRs) address the common areas below (the Core). Where applicable, Colleges may request additional areas to be included. Some of these areas will have more or less significance than others and some may not be applicable depending on the qualification/s under review.

Core elements of a QR:

1. Curriculum alignment and currency
2. Assessment approaches and design
3. Teaching quality
4. Student experience and engagement
5. Resourcing and infrastructure

Review criteria	Guiding questions
1. Curriculum alignment and currency	
Curriculum is fit-for-purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the curriculum support the university's Te Tiriti o Waitangi aspirations? • How does the curriculum align with the University's strategic goals? • How does the curriculum support all students to achieve the University Graduate Profile? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What evidence is provided (curriculum maps, student performance, assessment outcomes)? • How does the curriculum (structure, sequencing, learning supports) enable students to progressively achieve the Qualification Graduate Profile? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What evidence is provided (curriculum maps, student performance, assessment outcomes)? • How does the curriculum meet (or exceed) the following expectations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methods, content, mode of delivery, learning environments, learning activities, tools and resources, pedagogically appropriate, relevant, and up-to-date? ○ Compliance with relevant University policies and standards (consider Code of Pastoral Care, Health and Safety, etc.)? ○ Compliance with relevant accreditation requirements? ○ What evidence is provided (academic, industrial, public sector, non-profit and professional communities' peer review, benchmarking, etc.)?
Curriculum is learning-centred	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is learning situated within the contexts in which it is or will be applied? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How are all students (and in particular, priority cohorts, including Ākonga Māori, Pacific or international students, and students with disabilities) supported to actively connect their learning across the course (other courses, the programme, the field, the 'real world')? ○ How is the relevance of course learning outcomes demonstrated to students, and their alignment with associated qualification learning outcomes, graduate attributes, and discipline or professional standards made explicit? ○ What evidence is provided?

2. Assessment approaches and design	
Assessment encourages and reinforces learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Is assessment designed and delivered in accordance with the University Assessment Policy and discipline-related good-practice?<ul style="list-style-type: none">How does assessment across this qualification support/ provide all students with opportunities to demonstrate their learning?Is assessment consistently designed to allow for timely and constructive feedback to be given to students?How are students provided with multiple opportunities to track their progress?How are students supported (within the content of the course) to develop the academic and discipline skills necessary to complete assessment tasks?How are the teaching team and students supported to make consistent judgements across courses about assessment criteria and performance standards?How are judgements consistent across multiple deliveries of courses, in different modes, locations or years (provide evidence of pre- and post-assessment moderation and assessment review processes)?What evidence is provided? (Assessment maps/blueprints, academic literacy maps, grade reports, etc.)Are students provided with guidance on what constitutes academic or research misconduct and how to develop good practices in maintaining integrity?<ul style="list-style-type: none">How effectively are these issues addressed within the design of courses in the qualification?What strategies are used to identify and address potential breaches of the University Academic Integrity Policy?
Assessment enables robust and fair judgements about a student's performance	
Assessment practices are fair and equitable and give students the opportunity to demonstrate what they have learnt	
Assessment maintains academic standards	
3. Qualification quality	
Qualification management and teaching support effective learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Is the qualification running well (e.g., teaching arrangements, LMS, communication and feedback)?<ul style="list-style-type: none">What evidence is provided (e.g., Health Check Reports, Periodic Reviews, other evaluations)Do courses within the qualification meet University expectations such as Learning Quality Guidelines? How does the qualification achieve this?Do course coordinators and/or teachers:<ul style="list-style-type: none">communicate clearly?provide useful and timely feedback on student work?communicate high expectations?focus student effort on productive learning activity?encourage participation?promote collaboration and active learning?demonstrate respect for learners as individuals?How is this undertaken?In what ways are teaching staff actively engaging in opportunities to develop their teaching skills?
4. Student experience and engagement	

Students are actively engaged in learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the admission and progression regulations fit-for-purpose? • Is the qualification meeting student demand (consider student demographics, enrolment and EFTs numbers, successful course completion, student retention, progression, completion and employability)? • How do students perceive the quality of the course and their educational experience? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do MOST and SES ratings meet the University's expectations/ standards? • Are opportunities provided for students to interact with each other, with the teaching staff, and with course learning activities in ways that support active learning? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What kinds of formal and informal interactions are supported? ○ Are there opportunities to connect international and domestic students? ○ Do students take up those opportunities? What are the barriers or enablers? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence is provided (e.g., Stream analytics, student attendance and participation in forums and other activities)? • Do students in this qualification experience additional support needs? How are these met? (Consider evidence from ???)
Students positively perceive the quality of the course and their educational experience	
5. Infrastructure and resourcing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the physical and digital resources are fit for purpose? • Are the library resources fit for purpose? • Are staff numbers, qualifications, expertise and staff development appropriate? 	