

CUAP Handbook 2021

(updated)



Committee on University
Academic Programmes



Universities New Zealand – Te Pōkai Tara is the name used by the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC), established under the Education Act 1989. All references to Universities New Zealand in this book should be taken as references to the NZVCC.

The CUAP Handbook is under constant review. The latest version may be found on the Universities New Zealand website at:
www.universitiesnz.ac.nz/quality-assurance

For any further information about CUAP, please email
cuap@universitiesnz.ac.nz

Cover credit: Ross Findlay

Universities New Zealand – Te Pōkai Tara

Level 9, 142 Lambton Quay | PO Box 860

Wellington 6140 | New Zealand

P. 64 4 381 8500

E. cuap@universitiesnz.ac.nz

www.universitiesnz.ac.nz

Preface

This handbook sets out the approval and accreditation procedures for the quality assurance of academic programmes in New Zealand's eight universities and outlines the work of the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP).

New Zealand's universities fulfil the rules for the approval and accreditation of qualifications and programmes within those qualifications, as provided for in s. 453 of the Education and Training Act 2020.

Also outlined is the work of the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA), a body operationally independent of Universities New Zealand, set up by the universities to ensure the quality of their academic activities.

The information in this handbook will help university staff develop acceptable proposals. It also informs people outside universities about CUAP's procedures for approval and accreditation.

Revised editions are published as required on the Universities New Zealand website at: www.universitiesnz.ac.nz/quality-assurance.

April 2021

The following sections were updated in June 2022: 2.1 (Members); 5.2 (research project); 5.3 (Conjoint programme) and 7.2 (Members).

July 2023

The following sections were updated in July 2023: 2.1 (Members); 5.5.2 (Jointly-awarded qualifications); 6.7.2 (Deferred decision); 7.2 (Members); 11 (Procedures for the approval and accreditation of jointly-awarded qualifications); 13 (Offshore Programme delivery rules).

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 7 |
| 1.1. The universities in New Zealand | 7 |
| 1.2. New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework | 8 |
| 2. The Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) | 11 |
| 2.1. Members | 11 |
| 2.2. Terms of reference | 12 |
| 2.3. Additional responsibilities of the Committee on University Academic Programmes | 14 |
| 2.4. Programme and qualification development process | 14 |
| 2.5. Relationships with professional registration bodies | 16 |
| 3. Rules for approval and accreditation | 17 |
| 4. Application of the rules for approval and accreditation | 19 |
| 4.1. Qualification title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence | 19 |
| 4.2. Delivery methods | 19 |
| 4.3. Assessment and moderation | 19 |
| 4.4. Acceptability of the programme and consultation | 20 |
| 4.5. Regulations | 21 |
| 4.6. Resources | 22 |
| 4.7. Evaluation and review | 22 |
| 4.8. Research required for degrees and postgraduate qualifications | 23 |
| 5. Definitions and Terminology | 24 |
| 5.1. Qualifications | 24 |
| 5.2. Terminology | 30 |
| 5.3. Terms used for enrolment in more than one qualification | 32 |
| 5.4. Definitions, principles and guidelines for cross-crediting and transfer of credit | 33 |
| 5.5. Definitions of relationships between universities and other institutions | 35 |
| 6. CUAP procedures in detail | 37 |
| 6.1. Proposals that must be submitted to the committee | 37 |
| 6.2. Proposals that must be reported to the committee | 38 |
| 6.3. Proposals that need not be submitted to the committee | 38 |
| 6.4. Preparation of proposals for the committee | 38 |
| 6.5. Submission of proposals and reports to the committee | 43 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 6.6. How CUAP comes to decisions | 43 |
| 6.7. Types of decisions made by the committee | 44 |
| 6.8. Implementation of approvals | 45 |
| 6.9. Approved programmes which are not offered | 45 |
| 6.10. Graduating Year Review (GYR) | 46 |
| 6.11. Timetable | 50 |

Appendices

| | |
|--|----|
| 7. Appendix A: CUAP's Subcommittee on University Entrance | 51 |
| 8. Appendix B: University programme reviews | 53 |
| 9. Appendix C: Review of qualifications with conditional approval – Terms of reference | 54 |
| 10. Appendix D: Guidelines for postgraduate funding agreed by Universities New Zealand and the Tertiary Education Commission | 55 |
| 11. Appendix E: Agreed procedures (UNZ/NZQA) for the approval and accreditation of jointly-awarded qualifications, July 2006 | 57 |
| 12. Appendix F: Jointly taught qualifications with other New Zealand universities | 59 |
| 13. Appendix G: Qualifications with significant contributions from overseas institutions and/or delivered offshore by New Zealand universities | 60 |
| 14. Appendix H: Quality assurance of university courses and programmes not leading to a qualification | 65 |
| 15. Appendix I: Guidelines on information for intending students | 68 |
| 16. Appendix J: Universities New Zealand–Te Pōkai Tara: Conflicts of Interest Policy | 70 |
| 17. Appendix K: Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA) | 72 |



1. Introduction

1.1. The universities in New Zealand

New Zealand's university system is unusual in that—while it comprises administratively separate institutions—our universities cooperate to maintain standards and have done so for more than five decades.

The eight universities—the University of Auckland, Auckland University of Technology, the University of Waikato, Massey University, Victoria University of Wellington, the University of Canterbury, Lincoln University and the University of Otago—differ in age and size and, in some respects, have different perspectives and cultures. But they also have much in common. They abide by the principle of academic freedom, which the Education and Training Act 2020 seeks to preserve and enhance (s 267), and fully meet the definition of a university set out in that Act (s 268(2)(d)(i)).

The eight universities are autonomous institutions devoted to teaching and research, serving their communities in a range of ways. They also seek to maintain standards that are internationally respected among universities.

To achieve these common objectives, the institutions adopt a range of strategies. They seek to ensure access to those who might benefit from the programmes available, to offer research-based teaching, to provide a stimulating intellectual environment, and to offer qualifications that have international acceptance. They also search for highly-qualified staff in an international market, providing them with opportunities for career development, and supporting their research and publication in national and international journals.

While the universities are autonomous institutions, some with over a century of service to New Zealand and the world of scholarship, they also work together to improve access, and to maintain and advance standards. Measures to achieve this include peer review and external assessment. Several inter-university bodies carry out this work, as well as exchanging information on current activities and plans. These activities endorse and enhance good practice.

Programme development and assessment are the main focus of activity at the institutional and inter-institutional levels. Following the dissolution of the national University of New Zealand in 1961, individual institutions continued to collaborate on these matters. Their proposals for major new programmes and qualifications were subject to local consultation and internal approval processes as well as inter-institutional approval by the Curriculum Committee of the University Grants Committee (UGC).

So valuable was this process that the Committee's role has been enhanced since the abolition of the UGC under the 1989 Act (as amended in 1990). That Act recognised that the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC), now called Universities New Zealand—Te Pōkai Tara, would continue its important work. As a result, the NZVCC set up the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP). As well as its functions of approval and accreditation, CUAP has several other tasks, which include advising Universities New Zealand on academic policies that affect New Zealand universities, and assisting in the conduct of its relationships on these issues with the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), the Ministry of Education and other agencies. (See section 2.3.)

The role and effectiveness of CUAP's inter-institutional activity needs to be understood within the context of institutional arrangements within each of the eight universities. CUAP plays a vital role in the hierarchy governing the rational development of academic programmes. Each university has its own organisation and procedures, but there are also consistent processes for consultation, modification and review of academic offerings, for moderation of student assessment, and for staff development.

All universities involve students in the development, institutional approval, modification and review of academic offerings. While the mechanisms for doing this vary, the important role of students and the student voice is enshrined in the statutes and policies of all universities.

Research and publication are a high priority, as each university aims to maintain international standards in its teaching and research activities. The effectiveness of CUAP depends on the strength of this institutional culture.

To further ensure the maintenance of high quality in their teaching and learning, the New Zealand universities set up the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA). Relevant extracts from its Constitution are set out in Appendix K of this handbook. The universities individually, along with CUAP, are subject to auditing by the AQA. The combination of institutional and CUAP procedures, together with those of the AQA, provide a comprehensive quality assurance programme that fulfils the requirements of s. 253 of the Act.

While this handbook outlines the procedures for programme approval and accreditation in our universities, its main focus is to provide information about CUAP's activities. More information is available in the calendars, booklets and websites of each university.

1.2. New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework

The New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework (NZQCF) is hosted by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) and is accessible online at www.nzqf.govt.nz. Its purposes are:

- to clearly identify all quality-assured qualifications in New Zealand
- to ensure that all qualifications have a purpose and relation to each other that students and the public can understand
- to maintain and enhance learners' ability to transfer credit by the establishment of a common system of credit; and
- to enhance and build on the international recognition of New Zealand qualifications.

It is a comprehensive list of all quality-assured qualifications in New Zealand, being those approved by either of the two statutory quality assurance bodies (Universities New Zealand and NZQA).

Every qualification appearing on the NZQCF is listed with the following information:

- title
- level at which registered
- outcome statement
- credit requirements
- subject classification
- name of provider.

The levels used for qualifications are as follows:

| | |
|----|---|
| 10 | Doctorates |
| 9 | Master's degrees |
| 8 | Postgraduate Diplomas and Certificates Bachelor's Degrees with Honours |
| 7 | Bachelor's Degrees Graduate Diplomas and Certificates |
| 6 | Diplomas |
| 5 | |
| 4 | |
| 3 | |
| 2 | Certificates |
| 1 | |

NZQCF Level Descriptors

Descriptors used in New Zealand universities for levels 8, 9 and 10 are set out below. (Descriptors for levels 1-7 can be seen at www.nzqf.govt.nz)

| | Level 8 | Level 9 | Level 10 |
|---|--|--|--|
| Knowledge | Advanced technical and/or theoretical knowledge in a discipline or practice, involving a critical understanding of the underpinning key principles | Highly specialised knowledge, some of which is at the forefront of knowledge, and a critical awareness of issues in a field of study or practice | Knowledge at the most advanced frontier of a field of study or professional practice. |
| Skills | Analyse, generate solutions to complex and sometimes unpredictable problems Evaluate and apply a range of processes relevant to the field of work or study | Display skills in research and/or advanced scholarship by developing and applying new skills, techniques, and knowledge to existing or emerging problems Mastery of the field of study or practice to an advanced level | Critical reflection on existing knowledge or practice and the creation of new knowledge. |
| Application (of knowledge and skills) | Developing identification with a profession and/or discipline through application of advanced generic skills and/or specialist knowledge and skills Some responsibility for integrity of profession or discipline | Independent application and/or development of highly specialised knowledge and skills in research and/or advanced scholarship within a discipline or professional practice Some responsibility for leadership within the profession or discipline | Sustained commitment to the professional integrity and to the development of new ideas or practices at the forefront of discipline or professional practice. |

Note: The descriptors for Level 9 differ from those used by NZQA particularly in the references to “research” and to “advanced scholarship”.

2. The Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP)

2.1. Members

(As of July 2023)

Chair

Professor Grant Edwards
Vice-Chancellor
Lincoln University

Deputy Chair

Professor David Crabbe
E. david.crabbe@vuw.ac.nz

Members

Professor Bridget Kool
Waipapa Taumata Rau,
University of Auckland
E. b.kool@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Wendy Lawson
Auckland University of Technology
E. wendy.lawson@aut.ac.nz

Professor Robyn Longhurst
The University of Waikato
P. 07 838 9173
E. robynl@waikato.ac.nz

Professor Giselle Byrnes
Massey University
E. g.byrnes@massey.ac.nz

Professor Stuart Brock
Te Herenga Waka –
Victoria University of Wellington
E. stuart.brock@vuw.ac.nz

Professor Catherine Moran
University of Canterbury
E. catherine.moran@canterbury.ac.nz

Dr Megan Clayton
Lincoln University
E. megan.clayton@lincoln.ac.nz

Professor Tim Cooper
University of Otago
E. tim.cooper@otago.ac.nz

Quintin Jane
New Zealand Union of Students' Associations
E. president@ousa.org.nz

Enquiries concerning the committee's activities may be directed to the CUAP member at the enquirer's university, or to:

Wendy Robinson
Portfolio Manager –
Academic Programmes
Universities New Zealand –
Te Pōkai Tara
P. 04 381 8505
E. cuap@universitiesnz.ac.nz

2.2. Terms of reference

Functions

1. To act for Universities New Zealand and on behalf of the New Zealand community of universities by:
 - a. setting up and applying inter-university programme approval, accreditation and moderation procedures, which ensure that the quality of programme developments is consonant with high academic standards and mindful of the nation's interests
 - b. granting or refusing approval under the agreed procedures to new qualifications and courses of study, or changes in qualifications and courses of study for which approval is required, and for which due application has been made by a university
 - c. promoting the coherent development of courses of study within the New Zealand university system and ensuring that the quality of programme developments is consonant with high academic standards
 - d. encouraging the development of courses of study within the New Zealand university system that will facilitate the transfer of students between programmes and institutions.
2. To act for Universities New Zealand:
 - a. as the body which the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) will consult about policies and criteria for the approval of courses of study and their accreditation in the universities
 - b. through its subcommittee on university entrance, as the body which is consulted by NZQA on the standards to be established for entrance to university, and which makes recommendations to NZQA on such standards
Note: Before setting such standards, NZQA is required to consult the Council of each university as well as Universities New Zealand.
 - c. in establishing, through its subcommittee on university entrance and after consulting with NZQA, criteria for discretionary entrance and *ad eundem* admission at entrance level
 - d. in obtaining university representatives for NZQA approval panels, committees and other similar bodies, as required.
3. To provide advice and comment on academic developments across the university system to institutions, professional bodies and agencies.
4. To undertake specific tasks as may be requested of it from time to time by Universities New Zealand.

Composition

5. The committee shall be a committee of Universities New Zealand.
6. The membership of the committee shall be as follows:
 - a. a chairperson appointed by Universities New Zealand, currently a member of that committee or a member of the staff of a university
 - b. a deputy chairperson appointed by Universities New Zealand
 - c. one representative of each university, currently a member of the staff of that university, usually the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic or equivalent, or delegate
 - d. one nominee of the New Zealand Union of Students' Associations.
7. Persons appointed under 6 a. and c. above who cease to be members of Universities New Zealand, or who cease to be employed by the relevant universities will be deemed to have

resigned as members of the committee from the dates on which that membership or employment ceased.

8. The term of appointment of each member shall be 3 years in the first instance.
9. Those appointed to replace members who have resigned their appointments will be eligible to serve a full 3 years.
10. Those completing a term of appointment may be reappointed for a 3-year term subject to their eligibility.
11. A member who is unable to attend a particular meeting may nominate another representative of the university or body concerned, subject to appropriate notification to the chairperson before the meeting.

Note: The effectiveness of the committee depends on continuity between meetings and it is important that members attend all meetings wherever possible. Approval of substitutes will not be made for any one university or body on a continuing basis.

Standing procedures

12. The committee will establish and make known such detailed rules of procedure as it judges necessary to the regular conduct of its business, particularly in the discharge of its functions as set out in paragraphs 1 and 2 above.
13. The committee will carry out its work within the terms of reference as approved by Universities New Zealand, and through consultation with each of the participating universities. Changes to the terms of reference may be initiated by Universities New Zealand or by the committee by way of recommendation to Universities New Zealand.
14. Each university represented on the committee is deemed to have agreed to recognise the standing of the committee in decisions taken within its terms of reference and undertakes to submit all relevant course and programme proposals to the committee.
15. Where necessary, decisions will be made by simple majority vote of the members, the chairperson having a casting vote, but no deliberative vote. Except when acting as the chairperson, the deputy chairperson does not have a vote.
16. Any dispute as to whether a particular decision of the committee has been properly taken within the terms of reference, apart from section 1(b), shall be referred to the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, whose decision shall determine the dispute. A dispute relating to a decision taken under function 1(b) shall be referred to the Chief Executive of Universities New Zealand who shall ask the CUAP Appeal Authority to determine the dispute, having regard for the rules for approval and accreditation and the application of those rules set out in the CUAP Handbook. A determination by the CUAP Appeal Authority will be binding.
17. The committee shall have the power to establish subcommittees (whose members need not be members of the committee) on a continuing or ad hoc basis to deal with specific matters arising from its functions. All such subcommittees will be responsible to the committee and through it to Universities New Zealand.
18. The committee will meet twice yearly for the purposes of programme approval and accreditation, and at other times as it may determine.
19. Expenses incurred by members attending meetings of the committee or approved meetings of any of its subcommittees shall be met as follows:
 - a. the expenses of members appointed under 6(c) above shall be met by the universities under the current policy of Universities New Zealand for equalising such expenses between universities.
 - b. approved expenses of members appointed under 6(a), (b) or (d) above shall be met by Universities New Zealand.
20. Universities New Zealand's Conflict of Interest policy will apply (see Appendix J).

Secretariat and CUAP Appeal Authority

21. The committee shall be serviced through Universities New Zealand under the overall direction of the Chief Executive.
22. The Chief Executive will establish a suitable person to act as the CUAP Appeal Authority after consultation with the Vice-Chancellors' Committee and CUAP. The Authority will have the power to co-opt up to two additional members with expertise necessary to determine a dispute.

2.3. Additional responsibilities of the Committee on University Academic Programmes

Joint Consultative Group (Universities New Zealand/NZQA/AQA)

In addition to its programme approval and accreditation role, CUAP is actively involved at the interface between Universities New Zealand and NZQA. Two of its members represent Universities New Zealand on the Joint Consultative Group (Universities New Zealand /NZQA /AQA), established in late 1991 to provide a forum for regular consultation on matters of mutual interest and shared responsibilities. These matters include the relationship of university qualifications to the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework, university entrance requirements, and the transfer of credit to and from university qualifications. A statement of the agreed procedures for the approval and accreditation of jointly-awarded qualifications appears in Appendix E. The Director of the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit (now AQA) became a member of the Joint Consultative Group in 2012.

CUAP's subcommittee on University Entrance

The subcommittee is chaired by a nominee of Universities New Zealand. Membership is drawn from the eight universities (one representative of each) and may include co-opted members from the secondary teaching profession (one from the state sector and one from the private sector), and one representative of the university student recruitment managers. Three members comprise the Executive, which has decision-making powers.

Refer to Appendix A for Terms of Reference and Membership.

Other bodies

CUAP supplies Universities New Zealand representatives on bodies such as ministerial advisory groups, NZQA working parties and senior secondary education advisory groups. Members of the subcommittee on university entrance may represent Universities New Zealand on working groups related to university entrance.

2.4. Programme and qualification development process

A proposal for a new qualification or programme, or for a major change to an existing offering, must proceed through various university deliberative bodies before it is submitted to CUAP, where it is subjected to peer review across the entire university system. Student, non-academic and professional input at various levels in the university is also sought.

Proposals for new qualifications or programmes, or for other major changes to a university's academic offerings, usually originate within the universities, often after programme reviews or direct approaches from professional bodies or due to a staff member's experience elsewhere. The typical pattern is for an individual or a group of colleagues to draft a proposal for discussion by an appropriate committee. If support is received, the library, laboratory, staffing and other resource implications will be identified and, where appropriate, comments sought from potential employers and the relevant professional organisations before a decision is made on whether to proceed with the proposal.

Most universities have formats for presentation of proposals for changes to academic offerings. These changes may include the introduction of new qualifications or amendments to the wording of individual course prescriptions. Where new qualifications or programmes are involved, typically the originators are required to describe each component of the proposed new offering in considerable detail: to specify contact hours and modes of assessment; provide drafts of regulations and any other calendar entries; to identify who will teach any new material; and to estimate the need for additional resources. This documentation is then sent to representatives of the teaching staff of the division for wider debate on the merits of the proposal.

If the proposal is not consistent with that body's plan, it may be returned to the originators or deferred until the next planning round. If it appears appropriate to the aims of the body, the originators may be invited to respond to questions and to clarify points raised at the meeting. Although the academic merits of a proposal tend to be the focus of attention, the employment of the graduates, linkages with other study programmes offered by the university, and the potential for overlap with courses or programmes in other universities are also considered. If the proposal is supported, it goes, after any required amendments have been made, to the appropriate academic committee. There, attention will tend to focus on the regulations, course prescriptions and related calendar entries. The originators may again be invited to respond to the committee's queries and to make changes to the proposal before approval is granted. The committee may reject the proposal or require major revision.


Few proposals for new programmes are without resource implications. Once the academic merits of a proposal have been recognised, it goes to a committee or committees concerned with the provision of resources throughout the university: for example, student access to language laboratories and computing facilities; specialist lecture theatres and rooms for tutorials; use of distance teaching facilities; and holdings of books and serials for the library. Approval for the proposal to proceed to the next stage may be withheld by the committee(s) due to resource constraints.

Proposals that have received approval to this stage then go to the university's highest academic committees, normally the Academic Board or Senate, followed by the Council, the governing body. Further modifications may be required, in which case the proposal is referred to the relevant university committee or manager for action or rejected on academic or resource grounds. When approved by the Council, proposals falling into the categories to be submitted to CUAP are submitted via the online proposal management system.

CUAP includes a student representative to ensure that a student perspective is considered, and student feedback is also sought when a university plans for substantial changes to its qualifications or programmes.

Proposals sent to CUAP are subject to peer review across the entire university system through CUAP's online system. After a period of peer review, proposals may be approved without any changes, or approved changes proposed and agreed during the peer review process or debated at a CUAP meeting at which particular concerns are discussed to reach a resolution. Proposals may also be referred back to the university or rejected. It should be noted that without approval from a quality assurance body such as CUAP, no new or significantly modified programme or major change will be funded by the Tertiary Education Commission.

A typical process is illustrated below:



As with the development of programmes, responsibility for assessment, reviewing the curriculum and maintaining standards is usually undertaken at more than one level in this system.

2.5. Relationships with professional registration bodies

Some degrees—such as accounting, architecture, education (teaching), engineering, law and medicine—prepare students for a career as practitioners of a particular occupation. Registration is generally a prerequisite to practice. The professional registration bodies are therefore keenly interested in the content and quality of education offered by the universities and many stipulate monitoring and periodic review visits as requirements to ‘license’ the universities to offer the qualifications.

Requests for academic approval from CUAP should be accompanied by evidence of consultation with appropriate professional registration or licensing bodies. An application process for approval from such a body may overlap with aspects of CUAP processes (e.g. evaluation of content related to clinical practice), but the two are separate review and approval processes. (See section 4.4.)

Where a university seeks to make changes to its offerings in a professional area, it is responsible for seeking agreement from the professional registration or licensing body concerned and advising CUAP that the proposed changes are acceptable.

2.5.1. LEAD group professions

The professional registration bodies responsible for Law, Engineering, Accounting and Medicine (known as the LEAD group) and CUAP have developed closer relationships through the establishment of a working group. The objective is to ensure that decisions made by the registration bodies and CUAP are harmonised and of maximum benefit to both parties.

3. Rules for approval and accreditation

The Education Act 1989 set up the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). Some of the authorities that NZQA holds in respect of other sectors are, in the instance of the universities, held by CUAP on behalf of Universities New Zealand, and either CUAP or its subcommittee on university entrance is the focus for consultation with NZQA on a range of issues, generally through the Joint Consultative Group. (See section 2.3.)

Under s 452 of the Education Act and Training Act 2020, NZQA published in the New Zealand Gazette, the Programme Approval, Recognition and Accreditation Rules 2022. Under s 453(3) (a) of the Act, Universities New Zealand must apply the relevant rules. The criteria for approval and accreditation of university academic programmes within these rules are set out below.

Criteria for approval of programmes for institutions under s 439 of the Act

1. Qualification to which the programme leads

The programme meets the definition of the applicable qualification type.

2. Title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence

The title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence of the whole programme are adequate and appropriate and clearly meet the graduate profile and specification for the qualification, as listed on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework.

3. Delivery methods

The delivery methods are adequate and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes for the programme. Where specific resources are necessary for the programme to be provided, those resources are clearly outlined.

4. Acceptability of the programme and consultation

There is a written summary of the consultation undertaken, the views expressed, and consideration of the views. The consultation and summary must articulate the need for and acceptability of the programme to the relevant communities (including ākongā, whānau, hapū, iwi or hāpori Māori) and other key stakeholders (including any relevant academic, employer, industry, professional and other bodies).

5. Regulations

There are clear, relevant, and appropriate regulations that specify requirements for:

- admission
- credit recognition and transfer
- recognition of prior learning
- programme length and structure
- integration of practical and work-based components
- assessment procedures, including authenticity of student work
- normal progression within the programme.

6. Assessment and moderation

Assessment methodology is fair, valid, consistent and appropriate given the stated learning outcomes.

There is an effective system for moderation of assessment materials and decisions.

7. Programme review

The institution:

- assesses the currency and content of the programme
- has adequate and effective processes for the ongoing review of the programme, taking account of the results of any review of the qualification
- has adequate and effective processes for monitoring the quality of outcomes for learners and other stakeholders, and for reviewing programme regulations and content
- updates the programme accordingly.

8. Research required for degrees and postgraduate qualifications

The links between research and the curriculum are clear, adequate and effective.

Criteria for accreditation of institutions to provide approved programmes or parts of approved programmes under s 441 of the Act

1. Assessment and moderation

The institution has the capability and capacity to ensure assessment materials and decisions are fair, valid, consistent and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes.

2. Resources

The institution has the capability and capacity to support sustained delivery of the programme through appropriate academic staffing, teaching facilities, educational and physical resources, and support services.

3. Support for delivery

If the applicant institution is not the holder of the programme approval, there is support from the holder of the programme approval.

4. Assessment and review

There must be adequate and effective review of programme performance and the institution's capability to support the programme.

There must be monitoring of improvement following review, and processes for determining whether the programme should continue to be delivered.

5. Research activity required to deliver degrees and postgraduate qualifications

Research facilities and the support of staff involved in research are adequate, the levels of research activity of staff involved in the programme are satisfactory, and the ways by which the research-teaching links are made in the curriculum are appropriate.

4. Application of the rules for approval and accreditation

Universities normally seek approval for a programme and the accreditation to deliver that programme in one step. Each criterion in the Programme Approval, Recognition and Accreditation Rules 2022 is the subject of attention both at the institutional and at the inter-institutional level. But the balance differs. CUAP is substantially involved in applying programme approval criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5. The institutions themselves are mainly responsible for the other approval criteria and the accreditation criteria, subject to scrutiny by CUAP and audit by the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA).

Note: Criterion 3 – Support for delivery – of the accreditation rules is not relevant for universities. Criterion 3 is relevant “if the applicant institution is not the holder of the programme approval” and this situation does not apply with New Zealand universities.

4.1. Qualification title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence

Qualification to which the programme leads

The programme meets the definition of the applicable qualification type. (Criterion 1 of approval rules.)

Title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence

The title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole programme are adequate and appropriate and clearly meet the graduate profile and specification for the qualification as listed on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework. (Criterion 2 of approval rules.)

CUAP and the universities share the application of these criteria. For their part, the universities consult with the relevant communities and develop proposals that may be meaningfully described through their goals, outcome statements and graduate profiles. The committee, having issued guidelines on nomenclature (see section 6.4.5), is concerned to ensure that the title of each qualification is concise and appropriate. It takes care to satisfy itself that the programme follows a logical progression and that the stated goals are reflected in the graduate profile.

4.2. Delivery methods

The delivery methods are adequate and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes for the programme. Where specific resources are necessary for the programme to be provided, those resources are clearly outlined. (Criterion 3 of approval rules.)

Modes of delivery are determined and implemented by the universities. CUAP’s role is confined to ensuring that appropriate methods are proposed.

4.3. Assessment and moderation

The institution has the capability and capacity to ensure assessment materials and decisions are fair, valid, consistent and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes. (Criterion 1 of accreditation rules.)

Assessment methodology is fair, valid, consistent and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes. There is an effective system for moderation of assessment materials and decisions. (Criterion 6 of approval rules.)

The assessment of students is primarily an institutional responsibility, but there is also an inter-institutional element.

All students undergo some form of assessment, whether by formal examination or coursework or a combination of the two. All universities have regulations that ensure that assessment material and decisions within courses are fair, valid, appropriate and consistent given the discipline and stated outcomes. Where appropriate, universities will appoint external moderators and/or examiners to ensure the validity, consistency and appropriateness of assessment. For doctoral degrees, it is usual for one overseas examiner to be included in the panel.

Examiners' meetings at departmental and/or divisional level open marks to internal peer review and final marks are often not determined until such meetings have been held.

All universities provide for aegrotat or compassionate passes to be awarded where students are suffering from the effects of illness or other misfortune on the day of the examination, as long as work undertaken during the course reached an adequate standard. Aegrotats may not be available in courses or content areas where demonstrating mastery is necessary (for example, clinical practice) or where a rescheduled assessment opportunity is provided for such students.

Some universities provide for further examinations to be taken in failed courses and most universities have a system of awarding compensation, conceded or restricted passes in cases of narrow failure and according to detailed criteria laid down by the individual institutions. In some cases, such passes are granted only to students in their final year of study.

Each university provides CUAP with an account of its assessment procedures. If a programme that is presented to CUAP for approval involves exceptional provisions, these are included in the proposal.

4.4. Acceptability of the programme and consultation

There is a written summary of the consultation undertaken, the views expressed, and consideration of the views. The consultation and summary must articulate the need for and acceptability of the programme to the relevant communities (including ākongā, whānau, hapū, iwi or hāpori Māori) and other key stakeholders (including any relevant academic, employer, industry, professional and other bodies.) (Criterion 4 of approval rules.)

Application of this criterion is shared between CUAP and the universities. In both areas, the agreed definitions of degrees, diplomas and certificates are kept in view. (See section 5.)

CUAP requires that a proposal demonstrate how the programme is consistent with the university's commitment to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

The development of proposals for new qualifications or programmes at the institutional level, already described, involves staff, students, representatives of the professions (where appropriate), and of the community. Where a proposed programme may affect students in an existing programme, there should be an explanation of how the interests of those existing students will be protected.

To ensure such proposals receive rigorous scrutiny, CUAP distributes them through the online system to all members of CUAP, being the eight universities and the student member. The proposals are then submitted to peer review, the comments from the universities' reviewers providing opportunities for objections to be met, improvements to be made, and errors to be rectified. By the time CUAP meets, a number of proposals may have been found satisfactory by all parties and may therefore require no further discussion.

If CUAP is satisfied that the proposals meet CUAP's approval and accreditation rules, then it will approve them. Proposals on which agreement has not been reached are discussed by the committee. Agreement may be reached around the table, or proposals may be referred back to the originating universities for amendment, in which case approval may be deferred. Where CUAP is faced with a proposal that it cannot determine by this process, or which

crosses education sectoral boundaries (such as university/ITP), it employs further measures to inform itself of the issues in order to reach a conclusion—typically involving a working party representing the groups concerned.

Programme content is subject to annual change at the departmental level; significant modifications being approved at the division and academic board level. In general, the only proposals that must be forwarded to CUAP are those that introduce a new major, a new minor where there is no existing major, or new endorsement; or that affect minimum entrance requirements and crediting provisions; or make substantial structural changes.

The universities provide CUAP with an outline of their procedures for developing, introducing and amending programmes as described in section 2.4. In submitting each proposal, a university advises CUAP of the consultation it has undertaken in developing the programme to ensure its acceptability to relevant professional or employer groups.

As explained in section 2.5, proposals for qualifications linked to professional registration of some kind should show evidence of consultation with the appropriate professional registration or licensing body. Where that body customarily comments on, or indicates acceptance or approval of, proposed qualifications, this commentary or notice of approval should be provided to CUAP as part of the proposal.

4.5. Regulations

There are clear, relevant and appropriate regulations that specify requirements for:

- admission
- credit recognition and transfer
- recognition of prior learning
- programme length and structure
- integration of practical and work-based components
- assessment procedures, including authenticity of student work
- normal progression within the programme. (Criterion 5 of approval rules.)

CUAP procedures provide for careful scrutiny of the regulations of new programmes, and for amendments of them, when they affect admission, minimum entry requirements and crediting arrangements. The detailed provisions for assessment of particular courses—whether by formal examination or coursework or a combination of the two—are the responsibility of an institution.

CUAP and the universities aim to facilitate appropriate *ad eundem* or transfer credit and cross-crediting. Cross-crediting, *ad eundem* or transfer crediting are common features within universities and these arrangements have been extended to include a range of non-university qualifications such as relevant NZQA-approved degrees and qualifications registered on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework. (See section 1.2). All universities have regulations to govern credit recognition and transfer arrangements.

The practice of CUAP and the universities follows two principles. First, to avoid devaluing qualifications, it seeks to avoid undue double-crediting, with, for example, a limit on the amount of cross-crediting or credit transfer. Second, it tends to take account of standard of achievement. Therefore, very good performance in a previous course of study may make up for some irrelevance or inadequacy of content as a basis for study at a university. Wherever possible, a clear statement is offered of credit generally available, but fairness demands that individual consideration be given. A merely mechanical system that precludes the exercise of judgment is seen as disadvantageous to students and might affect course or programme completion rates.

4.6. Resources

The institution has the capability and capacity to support sustained delivery of the programme through appropriate academic staffing, teaching facilities, educational and physical resources, and support services. (Criterion 2 of accreditation rules.)

Each university has responsibility for ensuring the availability of appropriate academic staffing, teaching and research facilities, as well as support services. CUAP, however, when it receives a proposal to offer a new programme, must be satisfied that the institution has the resources required to offer it to current national and international standards. The committee appreciates that the requirements of a programme vary depending upon whether it is at undergraduate or postgraduate level, a general degree or a specialised qualification. Resource requirements will vary with the mode of delivery; for example, laboratory, studio and field work, online and teaching space.

In most cases, departments and divisions are responsible for each programme offered. Where interdisciplinary or cross-division programmes are offered, it is common university practice to set up advisory committees or boards of studies. In the case of higher degrees, in particular doctoral programmes, universities characteristically have an infrastructure with the special task of monitoring the enrolment, supervisory and examining processes.

To appoint staff, advertisements are placed nationally and internationally for posts of lecturer status or above. Universities in New Zealand seek to appoint staff of the highest possible international standard, and normally a doctorate is one of the prime qualifications sought. Once appointments are made, opportunities for staff development are offered, including periods of study leave. Staff are expected to publish in refereed international journals and to take part in international conferences. At more junior levels, staff are more likely to be recruited locally, often including those seeking to complete full-scale theses or doctoral qualifications in their subject. Staff development procedures within the universities include providing for appraisal of individuals and for monitoring the courses taught.

Providing adequate resources is a major consideration in the provision of programmes. It includes, as appropriate, library and computing needs, as well as teaching and laboratory accommodation and equipment.

Facilities for students are provided at departmental levels and university-wide. Universities provide special academic and other student services, designed to enhance the learning opportunities of students.

4.7. Evaluation and review

The institution:

- *assesses the currency and content of the programme*
- *has adequate and effective processes for the ongoing review of the programme, taking account of the results of any review of the qualification*
- *has adequate and effective processes for monitoring the quality of outcomes for learners and other stakeholders, and for reviewing programme regulations and content*
- *updates the programme accordingly. (Criterion 7 of approval rules.)*

There must be adequate and effective review of programme performance and the institution's capability to support the programme. There must be monitoring of improvement following review, and processes for determining whether the programme should continue to be delivered. (Criterion 4 of accreditation rules.)

For new qualifications and new major subjects or endorsements, CUAP requires universities to carry out Graduating Year Reviews. These submit the programmes to internal scrutiny under prescribed headings, and results are considered by CUAP. Every new programme undergoes one Graduating Year Review.

To ensure the currency and quality of existing programmes, all universities carry out formal academic reviews. These are designed to assess the direction the university has been taking and should take in terms of the programmes it offers; the tasks it should perform; and the standing of programmes and disciplines in relation to allied departments in New Zealand and elsewhere. The review committees include representatives from other universities and from outside the universities. The universities advise CUAP annually of reviews they have undertaken.

Professional subjects like engineering, accountancy and law are also subject to accreditation review by professional bodies, which are concerned with the relevance, strength, and resourcing of the respective courses or programmes of instruction.

The Academic Quality Agency's audits of the universities are an additional aspect of evaluation and review. The AQA's audit reports are publicly available.

CUAP is advised of the qualifications, programmes or major and minor subjects where there is no existing major, or endorsements that, after due consultation, universities have decided to withdraw.

4.8. Research required for degrees and postgraduate qualifications

The links between research and the curriculum are clear, adequate and effective. (Criterion 8 of approval rules.)

Research facilities and the support of staff involved in research are adequate, the levels of research activity of staff involved in the programme are satisfactory, and the ways by which the research-teaching links are made in the curriculum are appropriate. (Criterion 5 of accreditation rules.)

See section 4.6 on provision of staffing and resources. This is primarily a university responsibility. CUAP seeks to be assured that the provision meets current national and international norms. CUAP also requires that a proposal include a statement demonstrating the programme's connection with the research goals of the university.

5. Definitions and Terminology

Note: 120 credits = 1 EFTS, i.e. one year of full-time study. NZQCF levels are described in section 1.2.

5.1. Qualifications

Bachelor's degree

A qualification conferred by a university on persons who have completed a structured course of study that builds on prior qualifications or study, has a total value of not less than 360 credits (3 EFTS) and contains a minimum of 72 credits (0.6 EFTS) at NZQCF level 7 (300-level). The programme requires completion of a specified number of components of work (typically described in terms of units, courses, or credits) chosen in accordance with the programme regulations to include:

1. one or more sequential programmes (a sequential programme is one in which enrolment in advanced—typically second- or third-year—components is permitted only after completion of relevant prerequisite components)
2. sufficient components from a variety of subject areas to provide the broad academic foundation needed to pursue a career, or graduate or postgraduate qualifications, with confidence and understanding.

Completing a bachelor's degree denotes a mark of proficiency in scholarship and is the foundation for higher studies, particularly honours or master's degrees.

Teaching is carried out mainly by people engaged in research, whose primary concern is with advanced learning, with the principal aim of developing intellectual independence combined with analytical rigour. The university is a repository of knowledge and expertise and provides an environment which is international in orientation. The degree is thus expected to enjoy international recognition.

The programme provides students with a systematic and coherent introduction to a body of knowledge, to underlying principles and concepts, and to problem-solving and associated basic techniques of self-directed work and learning. Students are expected to develop the academic skills and attitudes needed to comprehend and evaluate new information, concepts and evidence from a range of sources, so that after completion of the degree they can continue to review, consolidate, extend and apply what they have learned in their undergraduate studies. The programme includes areas of study in which a significant literature is progressively studied to a level that provides a basis for postgraduate work. The prescribed minimum length of the course of study allows for proper assimilation of the subject matter and study techniques so that at the end of the time a consolidation will have taken place to the point that the successful student is deemed proficient and worthy to have the degree conferred.

Some degrees (e.g. engineering, law, medicine) additionally equip students with the practical skills and techniques needed to apply their knowledge effectively in a professional context. Such degrees may take more than three years to complete.

Bachelor's honours degree

This definition represents the minimum requirements for a bachelor's honours degree. Universities may set greater EFTS or credit values at their discretion.

Definition

An honours degree recognises distinguished study at an advanced level and may be either a 480-credit (4 EFTS) bachelor's degree that requires a particular level of achievement, or a discrete 120-credit (1 EFTS) degree following a bachelor's degree.

1. It will normally have a minimum of 90 credits (0.75 EFTS) at level 8 and a research

component of at least 30 credits (0.25 EFTS) at level 9. In special cases, fewer than 90 credits, but in no case fewer than 30 credits (0.25 EFTS), may be allowed at level 8 with the remaining at least 30 credits at level 9. Special cases are most likely to be degrees in which professional or accreditation requirements make it difficult to meet the 120-credit level 8/9 requirement, e.g. degrees in law or engineering.

2. The award of honours recognises outstanding achievement, meritorious achievement or a pass in courses which include the highest 120 credits (1 EFTS) of the degree. These may be termed first class honours, second class honours: first and second divisions; and third class honours.

Notes:

- a. *The research component should be in a discrete easily identifiable paper.*
- b. *Where the honours degree is a 480-credit (4 EFTS) (or more) programme, it must provide an exit point at the end of the study that meets the requirements for a bachelor's degree.*
- c. *Entry to honours study is normally based on achievement of at least a B average grade in the credits that are relevant to the proposed honours study.*
- d. *Achieved to an appropriate standard, an honours degree will prepare graduates for consideration for entry to doctoral studies.*

Definition of research

Research in the context of a bachelor's honours degree develops a student's ability to design and undertake a project under supervision, and to report on this in an appropriate form. It sharpens the student's analytical and communication skills, and provides a supported introduction to planning, conducting and reporting on the type of independent research that may be undertaken at higher levels.

Master's degree

A master's degree qualifies graduates who apply an advanced body of knowledge in a range of contexts for research, a pathway for further learning, professional practice and/or scholarship.

Credit requirements

The master's degree is at least 240 credits except:

- where it builds on a bachelor's degree with honours or an equivalent qualification, or significant relevant professional experience, in which cases it can be fewer than 240 but no fewer than 120 credits
- where it builds on a three-year bachelor's degree or an equivalent qualification completed at a specified level of attainment, in which cases it can be fewer than 240 but no fewer than 180 credits.

The master's degree must comprise a minimum of 40 credits at level 9 with the remainder at level 8 and where at least some of the level 9 credits are preceded by level 8 credits.

For a master's degree with specified outcomes, credit requirements may vary according to a candidate's entry qualifications.

Constitution

Master's degrees are constituted in one discipline or coherent programme of study. They may be undertaken by taught courses or research or by a combination of both.

Master's degrees usually build on undergraduate degrees, bachelor with honours degrees or postgraduate diplomas. They may also build on extensive professional experience of an appropriate kind. Their outcomes are demonstrably in advance of undergraduate study, and require students to engage in scholarship and/or research.

Master's degrees are structured in three principal ways:

i. By thesis or primarily by thesis

Entry to a master's degree by thesis or primarily by thesis is normally based on a bachelor's honours degree or a postgraduate diploma in the same field of study. The degree (normally 120 credits) consists of a research project presented in the form of a thesis, dissertation, substantial research course or creative work, worth at least 90 credits (0.75 EFTS).

ii. By coursework and thesis

Entry to a master's degree by coursework and thesis is normally based on an undergraduate degree in the same field of study. The degree includes a thesis, dissertation, substantial research course or creative work worth at least 90 credits (0.75 EFTS) and may include up to 150 credits (1.25 EFTS) of coursework.

iii. By coursework only

Entry to a master's degree by coursework worth 120 to 240 credits is normally based on an undergraduate degree. The degree is achieved through coursework consisting of courses, project work, creative work and research in varying combinations. It may build on undergraduate study in the same academic field, or it may build on the more generic graduate attributes of an undergraduate degree in other fields, or in some cases on relevant professional experience. Master's degrees that build on generic attributes and/or experience (often called "conversion master's") are usually in professional fields and are recognised as appropriate professional preparation by the industry concerned. Where entry is from a non-cognate discipline, any research component will normally be restricted to a maximum of 60 credits.

Entry

Providers of programmes leading to master's qualifications are responsible for establishing entry requirements. The minimum entry qualification for a 240-credit (2 EFTS) master's degree is a bachelor's degree or equivalent. For a master's degree of fewer than 240 credits, normally the minimum entry qualification is a bachelor's degree with honours or a postgraduate diploma or an undergraduate degree followed by relevant professional experience. For a master's degree comprising 180 credits, the minimum entry qualification is a three-year bachelor's degree or an equivalent qualification, completed at a specified minimum level of attainment.

Admission as a candidate for a master's degree is based on the evaluation of documentary evidence (including the academic record) of the applicant's ability to undertake postgraduate study in a specialist field of enquiry or professional practice.

Outcomes

A person with a master's degree can:

- show evidence of advanced knowledge about a specialist field of enquiry or professional practice
- demonstrate mastery of sophisticated theoretical subject matter
- evaluate critically the findings and discussions in the literature
- research, analyse and argue from evidence
- work independently and apply knowledge to new situations
- engage in rigorous intellectual analysis, criticism and problem-solving.

If a master's degree includes a component of supervised research of not fewer than 40 credits (0.33 EFTS) at level 9, the graduate is also able to:

- demonstrate a high order of skill in the planning, execution and completion of piece of original research, and
- apply research skills learned during the study programme to new situations.

The research should be completed to internationally recognised standards and demonstrate that the graduate has a capacity for independent thinking.

Achieved to an appropriate standard, such a degree will prepare students for consideration for entry to doctoral studies.

Degrees that may be awarded with honours

In addition to degrees with ‘honours’ in their titles, other degrees may also be awarded with honours. They must be either master’s degrees or 480-credit (4 EFTS) bachelor’s degrees, with a research component at level 9 that normally represents at least 30 credits (0.25 EFTS). The award of honours is a mark of outstanding achievement and may be in one of three classes: first class, second class (first division) and second class (second division). The suffix (Honours) is not appended to the titles and the degrees may also be awarded without honours. Graduates of these programmes who are awarded honours are eligible to be considered for admission to doctoral studies.

Doctoral qualifications

CUAP has adopted the following guidelines.

The New Zealand universities have developed doctoral qualifications that are recognised internationally. These include degrees for which the research component is expected to lead to publication in refereed journals or other equivalent scholarly work (PhD/DPhil), or degrees awarded for a corpus of published scholarly work (higher doctorates). In addition, they may be awarded for outstanding achievements in the public arena or unusually meritorious service to a university (honorary doctorates). More recently, discipline-specific doctoral qualifications have been developed that include a significant component of coursework (named doctorates).

- A doctoral qualification¹ is a research degree that is distinct from and of significantly higher status than a master’s.
- A university proposing to offer a doctoral programme must be able to demonstrate that it has staff with the necessary qualifications and training; staff who are active in advancing knowledge; a library equipped to support research; and equipment and other essential resources to ensure that the stated outcomes of the qualification can be met by candidates.
- For a PhD/DPhil, the thesis constitutes the entire body of work on which the award of the qualification is based. This does not preclude coursework, but any coursework only contributes to the preparation for and acceptance of a candidate to undertake the research that leads to the thesis.
- The major component of a programme leading to a doctoral qualification by research and coursework is the original research² presented either as a thesis or as a work of artistic and creative merit.

For a named doctorate, coursework may contribute to the assessed programme of study but the work contributing to the thesis must engage the candidate for a minimum of two full-time academic years and contribute not less than two-thirds of the overall credit for the degree.

The coursework component may include courses, practicums or any other appropriate piece of

1. *The doctorate involves a sustained, rigorous and systematic approach to the relevant body of knowledge, undertaken through experimentation, archival work, or other appropriate means; it includes an original research project that makes a significant contribution to knowledge and understanding or application of knowledge; it requires the preparation of a substantial thesis that presents the outcome of the research and places it in the broader framework of the discipline or field of study; and, undertaken under qualified supervision, it promotes intellectual independence and the capacity to undertake further research at an advanced level.*

2. *Research is intellectually controlled investigation. It advances knowledge through discovering and codifying new information or developing further understanding about existing information. It is a creative and independent activity conducted by people with expert knowledge of the theories, methods and information of the principal field of enquiry and its cognate discipline(s). Research typically involves enquiry of an experimental or critical nature driven by an hypothesis or intellectual position capable of rigorous assessment. Its findings must be open to scrutiny and formal evaluation by others in the field, and this may be achieved through publication or public presentation. A long-term and cumulative activity, research is often characterised by fruitful new topics for investigation and unexpected uses for its findings.*

work, as long as the coursework is not lower than level 9 and, taken together with the research work, it provides a coherent programme.

- The coursework should normally engage the candidate for no more than one full-time academic year, or equivalent.
- For a named doctorate, a candidate must obtain a passing grade in each component of coursework and for the thesis or its equivalent.
- The proposed nomenclature for a named doctorate involving research and coursework must be simple, accurate, informative and succinct and have wide international currency and provide a link to a recognised professional field.
- Any doctorate must fulfil the following criteria:

Criteria

1. A higher degrees committee, or its equivalent, will have general oversight of the admission, progress and assessment of candidates for a doctorate and, in particular, will ensure that:
 - the programme is coherent
 - the candidate's progress is monitored by regular reports
 - the assessment is appropriate and fair, and includes provision for two external examiners for the thesis, one of whom should be from outside New Zealand; and
 - where taught components contribute to the overall result, they should be subject to external assessment. One of the external assessors should normally be from an overseas institution.
2. A doctoral degree requires at least 360 credits and is at NZQCF level 10. Normally this represents 3 to 4 years of full-time study.

Diploma

A qualification at the undergraduate or pre-degree level (NZQCF level 5 or 6) with a total value of not fewer than 120 credits (1 EFTS), which may build on defined prior qualifications or experience, of which at least 72 credits must be at the level assigned to the diploma or above.

Graduate diploma

A qualification open to graduates or to those who have been able to demonstrate equivalent practical, professional or scholarly experience of an appropriate kind, comprising a coherent programme with a total value of not fewer than 120 credits (1 EFTS). Of these, 72 credits (0.6 EFTS) must be at NZQCF level 7 (300-level) or higher.

Postgraduate diploma

A qualification that builds on attainment in the prior degree, open to graduates or to those who have been able to demonstrate extensive practical, professional or scholarly experience of an appropriate kind, comprising a coherent programme with a total value of not fewer than 120 credits (1 EFTS). The courses or other work prescribed must be in advance of NZQCF level 7 (300-level).

Foundation certificate

A qualification at the pre-degree level (NZQCF level 3 or 4), with a total value of not fewer than 60 credits (0.5 EFTS) and not more than 120 credits (1 EFTS),³ which is designed to provide an introductory and coherent programme that encourages the student to undertake tertiary studies and/or equips the student with the skills needed to successfully attempt a tertiary level course of study.

3. *Students who have completed Year 13 at a secondary school may take a 60-credit (0.5 EFTS) certificate. Students who have completed only Year 12 must take a 120-credit (1 EFTS) certificate.*

Certificate

A coherent qualification at the pre-degree level with a total value of not fewer than 60 credits (0.5 EFTS) and typically not more than 120 credits (1 EFTS), which is designed to provide a student with a basic tertiary level qualification in a particular area of study. Certificates offered by universities are normally at NZQCF level 5 or above (100-level or higher).

Graduate certificate

A qualification open to graduates or to those who have been able to demonstrate equivalent practical, professional or scholarly experience of an appropriate kind, comprising a coherent programme with a total value of not fewer than 60 credits (0.5 EFTS), 40 of which (0.33 EFTS) must be at NZQCF level 7 (300-level) or higher.

Postgraduate certificate

A qualification that builds on attainment in the prior degree, open to graduates or to those who have been able to demonstrate equivalent practical, professional or scholarly experience of an appropriate kind, comprising a coherent programme with a total value of not fewer than 60 credits (0.5 EFTS). The courses or other work prescribed must be higher than NZQCF level 7 (300-level).

Certificate of Proficiency (COP) (also known as Individual Paper Credit (IPC))

Universities do not offer Certificates of Proficiency (COPs) in the same way they offer other qualifications defined in this handbook. A Certificate of Proficiency is not a qualification like a degree, diploma or another certificate.

The term Certificate of Proficiency is reserved for when a student wishes to take a course at a university without crediting it to a qualification. The reasons for doing so may be simply to pursue a personal interest, improve the chances of employment or make progress towards registration for a particular profession. In some instances, the student might not have the formal prerequisites for the course but may nevertheless enrol if the university is satisfied there are reasonable prospects of success.

A student enrolled for COP in a course is expected to comply with all the course's requirements regarding attendance and assessment, including sitting the final examination (if any). In theory, if not always in fact, the successful student is eligible to receive a certificate stating the name of the course in which proficiency has been demonstrated. Later, it is often possible to credit a COP pass in a course to a qualification that the student is then enrolled in. Regulatory structures may preclude this, however.

Some universities prefer to use the term Individual Paper Credit (IPC), which means the same thing as COP.

Guidelines for the use of Certificates of Proficiency (COP) / Individual Paper Credits (IPC)

1. Students must normally be matriculated.
2. Students may apply to enrol in any course. Enrolment is generally subject to departmental permission and often requires fulfilment of prerequisites, corequisites and other regulatory requirements. All enrolment and assessment requirements for the course must also be met.
3. A course passed for COP may subsequently be credited to a university qualification, provided it is appropriate for that qualification and pre- and co-requisites and any structural requirements of the qualification were met at the time the course was taken. Opportunities are rare at the graduate level.
4. A final-year course, generally NZQCF level 7 (300-level), but may be level 8 (400-level) in a 4-year degree, from another provider may be credited to a qualification but cannot

normally be counted as contributing to any required minimum of final-year work for the qualification. Such required minimum must normally be fulfilled from courses offered by the university awarding the qualification.

5. A student wishing to enrol in a course already passed may only do so for COP and may not subsequently credit it to any qualification without forfeiting the earlier pass.
6. Secondary school students may be enrolled in courses for COP if the regulations of the university permit.

Note: References to COP apply equally to IPC.

5.2. Terminology

100-level, 200-level, 300-level

There are three main levels at which undergraduate courses are offered by a university: 100-level being first-year, 200-level being second-year, and 300-level being third-year (often the final year of a bachelor's degree). These levels normally correspond, respectively, with levels 5, 6 and 7 on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework (NZQCF) in section 1.2.

Advanced Scholarship

Formal study at the forefront of a discipline or professional practice.

Course or paper

Usage varies, but either term can refer to the smallest unit of work in which a student can enrol, identified by a unique number, and delivered by means of lectures, tutorials, seminars, practical requirements etc, or in distance mode by correspondence or electronically. The length of a course is generally one semester. In appropriate combinations, courses fulfil programme requirements and thus contribute to qualifications.

Conjoint programme (refer to section 5.3)

Credit

One credit is regarded as normally equivalent to 10 hours of work by a student for one course, including formal lectures, tutorials, assignments, examinations and private study. For one academic year (120 credits) the number of hours expected is therefore 1200. This definition comes from the NZQCF in section 1.2.

Dissertation

A substantial research project or study, an extended analysis of a topic, or a work of artistic and creative merit submitted as part of a taught master's degree or honour's degree. It will have a credit value of more than 40 and less than 90 credits.

Double degree (refer to section 5.3)

EFTS (Equivalent Full-time Student)

A unit of measurement used in Student Achievement Component (SAC) funding and resource allocation to and within tertiary education providers. One EFTS is equivalent to the number of courses considered appropriate for one full-time student in one year (2 semesters). One EFTS is therefore equivalent to 120 credits on the NZQCF in section 1.2.

Endorsement

A subject that is appended to the name of a qualification, most commonly a graduate or postgraduate diploma or certificate, e.g. DipGrad(Finance) (but not excluding an undergraduate qualification), to indicate normally a minimum of a 40% concentration of study in that area. An endorsement with at least such a minimum would be named on the graduation certificate.

Grandparenting

Transition between old and new requirements, enabling qualifications that do not meet the new definition to continue in their existing form until the date specified by which they must meet the definition.

Major or major subject

A substantial component of a degree (usually at least one-third and often consisting of one subject only) selected by the student, in accordance with the regulations, as the principal area of study for the degree. Where two majors are taken within the same degree, the terminology is a double major.

Matriculated

Officially entered on the books of the university as a student, having met the entrance requirements.

Minor or minor subject

A component of an undergraduate degree, usually of at least 60 credits, in a subject area selected by the student, in accordance with the regulations, to formally recognise a secondary area of study for the degree. Minors need not be a compulsory component of a degree.

Programme

The requirements set down by a university, in the form of regulations, for the completion of a qualification, generally expressed in terms of eligibility to enrol, duration (years or credits), and the courses to be included, together with regulations covering matters such as practical work, cross-credits and exemptions, preparation and submission of a thesis etc. May also be used for a defined set of courses that do not lead to a qualification.

Also used by some universities (a) as a synonym for major, or (b) referring to an individual student's selection from the requirements.

Qualification

A degree, diploma or certificate as defined in the "Definitions" section of this Handbook, approved by CUAP in terms of s 453 of the Education and Training Act 2020; or a degree, diploma or certificate approved by the Curriculum Committee of the University Grants Committee (disestablished 1990); or a degree, diploma or certificate offered by the University of New Zealand (disestablished 1961) and still on the books of the universities.

Research portfolio

A research portfolio is normally the same length overall as a 120-point thesis but usually consists of two to four research projects or essays instead of a single project. The different projects form a coherent package organised around a central theme.

Research project

An individual or collaborative enterprise that is carefully planned to achieve a particular research aim. Normally no more than 45 credits.

Semester (also trimester)

A period of approximately 15 weeks, of which 12 - 13 are teaching weeks, and the remainder vacation and examinations.

Subject

An academic discipline such as economics, anthropology or physics offered through courses at various levels that are taken sequentially.

Suite of qualifications

A group of qualifications with a common theme, which might be broad—e.g. arts—or narrow—e.g. a subject area such as computer studies. A typical suite might consist of a bachelor's degree, a bachelor's degree with honours, a master's degree, a postgraduate diploma, a postgraduate certificate, a graduate diploma and a graduate certificate, or only some of these.

Note: When the above terms are used in this Handbook they have the meanings given above. This is not to suggest that this is a university-wide convention. Some universities use these terms in different ways.

For example, the word 'course' is not used at all universities and the words 'paper', 'module' or 'unit' are used instead, while some universities use 'programme' to denote a coherent group of related courses from different subjects, which become, in effect, a major for a degree even though several subjects may be involved.

Thesis

A report on a research project or study, or an extended analysis of a topic, or a work of artistic and creative merit. A thesis will constitute the entire body of work on which the award of the qualification is based in the case of a PhD, but may constitute two-thirds of the overall credit for a named doctorate. In the case of Master's by thesis it will be at least 90 credits.

5.3. Terms used for enrolment in more than one qualification

Concurrent enrolment: Simultaneous enrolment in two distinct qualifications (e.g. BA and BCom, LLB and BMS) offered by the same university. Exceptionally, one of the qualifications may be offered by another provider.

Conjoint programme: An intra-institutional arrangement whereby a university provides for two qualifications to be completed in a shorter timeframe than would normally be the case, even allowing for the full realisation of cross-crediting potential, and with a smaller number of courses to be completed. The regulations set out the required quantum of work that must be credited to each qualification. Students must normally take courses for each of the two qualifications in each year of study. Admission to such a programme is not available to a student who has already completed one of the qualifications involved.

The qualifications that may be combined in a conjoint programme are bachelor's degrees. As the lengths may vary, CUAP has determined the lower limits on total credits that it expects to be achieved in a conjoint programme, as set out below.

These lower limits are not less than 70% of the total number of credits in the two qualifications.

The number of credits required at 300-level for each half of a conjoint programme must meet a minimum of 60 credits each.

| Degrees combined | Total number of credits | Lower limit |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 4.5 + 4 years | 1,020 | 715 |
| 4 + 4 years | 960 | 675 |
| 4.5 + 3 years | 900 | 630 |
| 4 + 3 years | 840 | 590 |
| 3 + 3 years | 720 | 510 |

A common practice is for a university to issue one degree certificate covering both qualifications in a conjoint programme. A university may, if it chooses, issue two degree certificates.

Double degree programme: A programme within which the requirements of two complete degrees, normally at undergraduate level, are satisfied. The two constituent degree programmes may have overlapping elements (either compulsory or elective), in which case certain courses may count towards both. The number of credits required at 300-level for each degree must meet a minimum of 72 credits each. This cross-crediting, in accordance with individual university policy, normally enables the two programmes to be completed in a shorter time than if no sharing of courses were permitted. A double degree programme may proceed by concurrent enrolment in all or some years, or the second degree may be started after the first has been completed.

Note: Cross-crediting is generally limited to one-third of any programme to which it can be applied.

5.4. Definitions, principles and guidelines for cross-crediting and transfer of credit

Definitions

CUAP has adopted the following definitions of terms used in the awarding of credit, principles for credit transfer and guidelines for credit transfer involving non-university qualifications:

Complete: In respect of an individual course: to attend the required classes, submit the required assignments, sit the required examinations and emerge with a 'pass' result or better.

Credit: The value assigned to a completed block of learning, such as a course, for the purpose of contributing to the requirements of a qualification.

Cross-credit: The application towards one undergraduate university qualification of credit gained in another qualification of the same university, at the same or a lower level, taken concurrently or previously, e.g. the crediting of a psychology course to both BA and BSc. If both qualifications are completed, the maximum cross-credit has normally been accepted as no more than one-third.

Exemption: Exemption from completing certain requirements for the qualification without granting credit.

Graduate status: The university accepts the qualification of a student previously at another institution as the equivalent of its own first degree. Such a status will not necessarily permit advancement to a higher degree. Additional work may be required.

Special credit: Credit offered towards a qualification granted by a university in respect of work done for a qualification at another institution, according to understandings reached by the institutions.

Specified or unspecified credit: In any of the above cases, part or all of the credit may be granted specifically in terms of courses offered by the university, or in terms of unspecified courses, e.g. two 100-level courses.

Transfer (or *ad eundem*) credit: The application towards a university qualification of credit gained for another qualification at a university or other institution. If the latter qualification is complete, the credit would normally be limited to one-third.

Principles for transfer of credit

1. Credit transfer arrangements must recognise the distinctive differences among providers and the integrity of their programmes. The aim is to facilitate access and promote new study opportunities without compromising the quality or standards of qualifications. A consistent approach to the recognition of courses and qualifications does not mean rigid uniformity: codified minimum credit arrangements for all students who have passed a course or completed a qualification may be supplemented by grants of additional credit/exemptions to high achievers.
2. Credit should be granted at the highest level consistent with the student's chances of success, and consistent with stated policies on applying credits to more than one qualification either within the one institution/establishment, or when a student transfers between institutions/establishments.
3. For previous studies, credit should be granted for recorded success, whether or not it forms part of a complete qualification. Credit should be based on the minimum recognition negotiated at a national level, or between providers according to Universities New Zealand or NZQA guidelines, for qualifications and their component courses, with providers having discretion to recognise high levels of individual achievement. Wherever possible, specified credit that satisfies prerequisites should be granted, rather than unspecified credit that is of limited use.
4. For uncertificated and non-formal prior learning, credit should be based on an appraisal of the student's achievements in relation to the objectives of the relevant courses, according to clearly-documented procedures.
5. Eligibility for credit does not guarantee a place in the course in which that credit would be available.
6. Information on credit transfer arrangements should be comprehensive and readily accessible in up-to-date publications.
7. Transferring students should be helped to progress, e.g. with bridging programmes, or prescribing ad hoc additional studies, where the student's ability is not in doubt, but elements of core curriculum have not been mastered.
8. There should be procedures in each institution/establishment for students to seek a review of initial decisions on credit transfer matters.

[Agreed by the JCG, 1993]

Guidelines for credit transfer involving non-university qualifications:

1. The prime responsibility for determining the level and quantum of credit resides with the university awarding the degree or other qualification.
2. Evaluation of credit involves a full analysis to establish an appropriate congruence between previous learning at the non-university provider and that which would have been provided at a university.
3. The core requirements at the final level of a qualification, typically NZQCF level 7 (300-level) for a bachelor's degree, should be substantially completed at the university awarding the qualification.
4. There should be no upper limit on the amount of credit awarded, although cognisance should be taken of point 3 above.
5. Appropriate audit procedures should be in place to ensure that the academic requirements of all students being awarded the same qualification are equivalent, irrespective of the extent of any transfer of credit involving non-university institutions.
6. The processes used in the granting of transfer of credit should be documented, explicit, and challengeable.

CUAP supports the policy statement, Credit Recognition and Transfer Policy (NZQA, December 2002).

5.5. Definitions of relationships between universities and other institutions

This statement is designed to offer definitions of the various relationships, to outline some of the issues that arise from them and to indicate the role CUAP has in connection with them.

1. **Jointly-taught university qualifications.** These can occur between two or more New Zealand universities or between a New Zealand university and another tertiary organisation where the contribution of each is substantial. In the former case, one application should be made in the normal way to CUAP. In the latter case, jointly awarded qualifications would fall within both Universities New Zealand and NZQA spheres for the purposes of approval and accreditation. The qualifications would not, however, be subject to the full procedures of both, but to an agreed process that satisfied both. (See Appendix E.)
2. **Jointly-awarded qualifications.** These can occur between two or more New Zealand universities or between a New Zealand university and another tertiary organisation where the contribution of each is substantial. In the former case one application should be made in the normal way to CUAP. In the latter case jointly awarded qualifications would fall within both Universities New Zealand and NZQA spheres for the purposes of approval and accreditation. The qualifications would not, however, be subject to the full procedures of both, but to an agreed process that satisfied both. (See Appendix E.)
3. **Articulation agreements.** Arrangements between collaborating providers that permit students to gain credits for programmes offered/delivered by those providers.
Note: If both providers are in New Zealand and one is not a university and will be enrolling the students (and claiming any available Student Achievement Component (SAC) funding) then the non-university provider must be accredited by NZQA to offer the qualification.
4. **Twinning arrangements.** These might be described as articulation arrangements made with tertiary institutions overseas.

- 5. Franchising.** This is defined as the offering by one institution of a programme developed by another, generally for a fee, but not for the qualification offered by the institution that developed it. In such a case, the institution that developed the programme must ensure it is properly taught. The transfer of such programmes as credit would in any case be subject to the procedures already agreed upon for transfer or *ad eundem* credit.
- 6. Exchange agreements.** These are agreements between universities in New Zealand and tertiary institutions overseas. Where they provide for the teaching of undergraduate students, they will generally provide for the crediting of courses done at the host institution to qualifications being pursued in the home institution.

Notes:

- a. *Generally the above arrangements already come—in some sense or another—under the aegis of CUAP. Any agreements in the ‘articulation’ style should be reported to CUAP. In so doing, the university concerned should indicate how it plans to ensure that the teaching in the non-university institution is of the nature and standard required for the teaching of the papers when they are taught within the university.*
- b. *If secondary schools seek to offer first-year university papers, any resulting arrangement should take the form of articulation.*

6. CUAP procedures in detail

The following section details the CUAP procedures and is particularly directed to the staff involved. Details of procedures for the universities' internal processes are set and held by the individual universities.

The Education and Training Act 2020 authorises Universities New Zealand, through CUAP, to determine approval and accreditation for new qualifications and to withdraw approval where there are reasonable grounds. Approval by a quality assurance body such as CUAP is required before a programme can receive funding from the Tertiary Education Commission.

Acting for Universities New Zealand, CUAP has adopted the following procedures and timetable, which are designed to facilitate approval and accreditation, and clarify the committee's role in the continuing scrutiny of academic programmes in the universities.

6.1. Proposals that must be submitted to the committee

(For instructions re format of a proposal see sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2)

Proposals fall into the following ten categories:

1. The introduction of a new academic qualification (see section 5.1), including any that are the property of an overseas institution.
2. The introduction of a new subject.
A new subject may be defined as:
 - a. **at the undergraduate level:** a collection of courses with a common theme offered at 100-, 200- and 300-levels, constituting a 'major' (whether or not that term is used by the university concerned) for a degree or diploma. The introduction of a limited number of courses with an intention to increase the offering in future years into a 'major' also comes into this category.
 - b. **at the graduate level:** any new subject, option or programme for honours and master's degrees or graduate and postgraduate diplomas/certificates.
A 'programme' that in effect amounts to a 'major' is also treated as such, even if component parts have been previously approved by the institution or CUAP.
3. The introduction of a minor subject (see section 5.2) when there is no established major in the subject.
4. The introduction of an endorsement (see section 5.2) when the concentration of study is 40% or greater and the endorsement is stated on the graduation certificate.
5. The introduction of a new conjoint programme or a new programme consisting of existing qualification or subjects.
6. Substantial changes to the structure of a qualification such as changes to the duration or credit/EFTS value of a programme and extensive changes to the courses that comprise the programme.
7. Changes lowering the minimum entry requirements for a programme.
8. A change in the name of a qualification or subject.
9. Transfer of credit, cross-crediting or exemption regulations falling outside regulations currently in place.
10. Qualifications with significant contributions from overseas and/or delivered offshore may need to be submitted to the committee. Refer to Appendix G for detailed regulations.

Universities in doubt about any proposed change should ask the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes at Universities New Zealand for advice.

The closing dates for submission of proposals to the committee are:

Round One – 1 May

Round Two – 1 August

Where either of these dates falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the closing date is the following Monday.

6.2. Proposals that must be reported to the committee

Note: New qualifications of the kind described in 6.2 (1 to 3) and reported to CUAP will be entered on the NZQCF by the Portfolio Manager Academic Programmes and submitted to the Tertiary Education Commission as CUAP-approved qualifications for funding purposes.

(For instructions re format for reports of the kind described in 1 to 3 see section 6.4.3; for instructions re format for reports of the kind described in 4 see section 6.4.4)

1. The introduction of a postgraduate diploma, postgraduate certificate, graduate diploma or graduate certificate, only when the university already has an established bachelor's honours or master's programme in the subject and the new qualification draws on existing courses. This would include the introduction of a certificate where there is an established diploma. (See note after 2.)
2. The introduction of an undergraduate diploma or a certificate, only when the university already has an established bachelor's degree in the subject and the new qualification draws on existing courses.

Note: All other introductions of diplomas and certificates, at any level, must be submitted as in 6.1 above.

3. The introduction of a minor subject in an undergraduate degree only when the university has an established major in that subject. The university must show that the structure of the minor subject complies with the definition (see section 5.2).
4. The deletion of entire qualifications, major subjects, minor subjects where there is no established major subject, or endorsements.

Note: Notification of deletions is for the committee's information only. No approvals of deletions are required.

Reports may be submitted at anytime. For details contact the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes at Universities New Zealand.

6.3. Proposals that need not be submitted to the committee

Certain proposals may be dealt with internally. These are proposals that add or delete courses within current offerings, add or delete prerequisites/corequisites to individual courses, amend the wording of prescriptions, and make other minor adjustments to regulations or statutes. These include introducing an endorsement in an undergraduate, graduate or postgraduate qualification when the concentration of study in the area of the endorsement comprises less than 40% of the qualification and when the endorsement is not stated on the graduation certificate.

For courses and programmes not leading to a qualification, refer to Appendix H for detailed guidance.

6.4. Preparation of proposals for the committee

Proposals will be submitted electronically via the CUAP online system. All pages should be numbered consecutively, and the proposal's identifier should appear on every page.

Material relevant to institutional decision-making processes but not directly to CUAP may be

removed or attenuated before proposals are submitted. Material in this category may be that which addresses the criteria on resources, assessment and review and research in detail.

CUAP is interested in staffing and resource provisions to ensure these are adequate for new programmes. Coverage of these matters should be included where appropriate.

Any exceptional provision proposed under criteria on assessment and moderation, assessment and review, and research should be briefly explained.

The three sections below set out the detailed requirements.

6.4.1. Template for proposals in categories 1-5 (as listed in section 6.1)

The following template of requirements is available electronically from the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes, Universities New Zealand.

In the first instance, only Section A should be submitted. If CUAP or another university requires the information in Section B during the peer review process it should be provided.

Template for Proposals

(overall serial no.) univ./yr – qual.

(e.g. (03) UO/11 - BDS/1)

Name of university

Name of new qualification or

Name of qualification being amended

Page references in Calendar of year of submission

(in the case of amendments to current qualifications)

Note: Where there are multiple page references, e.g. admission requirements separate from regulations, all must be included. It is also useful to provide URLs since not all staff have access to printed Calendars.

SECTION A

Purpose of proposal: A succinct description of the purpose.

Justification: A statement as to why the proposal is being put forward at this time, in the context of the institution's strategic and planning goals.

Qualification: Confirmation that the programme meets the relevant CUAP definition.

Acceptability of the programme and consultation: Evidence of consultation in the preparation of the proposal and acceptability to relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities. If there is a professional registration or licensing body relevant to this area of study, it must be named and written evidence from that body of the university's consultation with it provided.

When changes are proposed to existing qualifications or programmes, evidence of consideration must be given to their effect on currently enrolled students.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi: A statement of the implications for how this proposal is consistent with the university's commitment to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Goals of the programme: A statement as to what the programme aims to achieve, the academic rationale on which it is based, its connection with the research of the university, and how overall programme coherence is achieved.

Outcome statement: Goals of the programme (which may include employment or other pathways).

Graduate profile: A statement of the generic and specific attributes and skills of graduates of the programme including the body of knowledge obtained. (See notes below.)

Programme overview: A brief narrative setting out the progression from the entry requirements to the end of the final year, identifying landmarks such as initial or intermediate selection processes, work placements, research projects.

Proposed regulations: Include the complete new degree statute (with schedules) or amendments to existing statute(s) as they are intended to appear in the Calendar.

Proposed teaching/delivery methods: An overview statement that describes any distinctive features of delivery and also comments on inclusion of practical applications, e.g. a clinical component. If there is a contribution by another provider, that contribution must be clearly identified and quantified as a percentage of the programme.

Prescriptions for courses: Include the proposed prescriptions for all new courses.

Assessment and moderation procedures: A description of the proposed assessment regime for the programme, including the use of external assessors and examiners.

Resources: A clear statement of the institution's ability to offer the new programme at a high level of quality (including reference to factors such as the availability of appropriate expertise, physical facilities, equipment and library resources; access to practical and clinical experience [where appropriate]; strengths in related disciplines.)

Plans for monitoring programme: A clear statement of provisions for monitoring quality, including teaching quality; reviewing regulations, content and delivery; reviewing whether courses should be added or deleted. These provisions should include the establishment of a small monitoring group to collect information in respect of student numbers, pass rates, retention, and student satisfaction, to prepare any peer or self-review reports and to compile the Graduating Year Review.

Review of the programme: A statement of how the programme fits into the university's regular review cycle. (See Appendix B.)

Statement re Section B: A confirmation that Section B has been prepared and will be made available to CUAP on request.

If the programme is new, the following are also required:

7. **EFTS value:** Required for funding purposes.
8. **A statement regarding funding:** For new postgraduate qualifications, the statement should indicate whether the qualification meets the criteria to be fully funded at the postgraduate level or whether the courses or programmes will be disaggregated and funded appropriately at postgraduate or undergraduate level. If disaggregated, the courses to be funded in each mode must be clearly specified. The guidelines regarding funding may be found in Appendix D of this Handbook.
9. **Information about the Agreement:** Where the programme will be jointly taught or jointly awarded with another New Zealand university or an overseas provider, confirmation of the existence of an Agreement, as set out in sections 11, 12 and 13.4.3.

SECTION B

- Learning aims/objectives for each new course
- Student workload, terms requirements and assessment procedures for each course
- Availability of teaching and support staff
- Availability of teaching space and other required facilities (e.g. laboratory, theatre, etc.)
- Availability of library resources
- Timetabling arrangements
- The required extracts from any Agreement agreed with another New Zealand university in respect of a jointly-taught, or overseas provider in respect of a jointly-awarded, qualification (see sections 11, 12 and 13.4.3).

Notes re graduate profile: The following extracts are from the CUAP definition of a bachelor's degree.

The programme provides students with a systematic and coherent introduction to a body of knowledge, to the underlying principles and concepts, to problem-solving and associated basic techniques of self-directed work and learning ...

Some degrees (e.g. engineering, law, medicine) additionally equip students with the practical skills and techniques needed to apply their knowledge ...

These statements define the degree in terms of programme input requirements. What is requested in the Graduate Profile section is that proposed graduate outcomes are described. The framework for graduate outcomes may need to vary from degree to degree. However, whatever the framework adopted, attention should be given to the development in graduates of lifelong learning skills so that graduates are prepared to go on learning after graduation.

6.4.2. Proposals in categories 6–9 (as listed in section 6.1)

Section A of these proposals needs a one-sentence purpose of proposal, a justification statement, details of the proposed amendment and an indication of any implications the proposal will have for students, staffing, library resources, laboratory space, etc. Page references (from the current Calendar) should always be given. In the case of qualifications jointly taught by two or more universities, Section B should also be prepared. (See section 11.)

6.4.3. Format of reports under section 6.2

The report should list:

- the name of the university
- the name(s) of the new qualification(s) or minor
- confirmation that the programme meets the relevant CUAP definition
- the established degree(s) which justify the introduction of the new qualification(s) or endorsement
- a calendar reference to the existing courses which can be taken to be awarded the new qualification(s) or endorsement.

One report may cover several subject areas. A qualification established in this way should draw on existing courses. If new courses are proposed, a full submission—as under section 6.1—must be prepared.

6.4.4. Deletions

No special format is required for advising CUAP of deletions. But the advice should specify

the qualification, major subject, minor where there is no established major subject, or endorsement it is proposed to delete, and indicate briefly what effect this might be expected to have on the tertiary sector. Where appropriate, the university should indicate where in New Zealand a similar qualification/subject continues to be available.

6.4.5. Qualification nomenclature guideline

Qualifications listed on the NZQCF have a title where the generic stem of the title begins with the qualification type and is normally completed by a designator, which identifies its main discipline and/or subject field and the level. The title may include other qualifiers, but any qualifier will not precede the qualification type.

Every attempt should be made to ensure that the titles of qualifications represent the objectives and content of the qualifications. Account should be taken, however, of convention, particularly where it is widely accepted internationally.

Nomenclature should not aim to be a sufficient guide to content, but it should give a realistic indication. The generic stem of a title and any bracketed endorsement should reflect the particular emphasis and content of the qualification. A degree or diploma of a general nature is not required to have such an endorsement.

As future developments in areas of study are not predictable, no rigid limitations on nomenclature are envisaged. But unreasonable proliferation of descriptors is not encouraged.

6.4.6. External review in cases of limited disciplinary expertise

An external review may be invoked when a university proposes a new qualification and fewer than two other universities provide equivalent qualifications in New Zealand, or where the disciplinary expertise is limited. This applies to submissions to approve new qualifications and to substantial changes to existing qualifications. An external review is additional to the normal CUAP processes.

At the time of submission, the proposing university should suggest external peers who may be approached for a report on the content and professional standards associated with the proposed programme. The chair of CUAP, in consultation with the originating university, will then appoint an appropriate external reviewer who has not been involved in the development of the proposal and who will be asked to comment.

For undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications, the external peer report should be provided by an international reviewer, although the process may be modified if there are existing qualifications in the discipline area that are at a higher level. For sub-degree qualifications, the external reviewer may be sought from either another tertiary provider in New Zealand, if appropriate, or from overseas.

At the time of submission, the proposing university should include Section B statements in a form that allows appropriate evaluation of the accreditation requirements for delivery of the proposed programme.

In making its decisions, CUAP will consider the views expressed by the external peer reviewer. If the external peer reviewer does not support a proposal, the proposing university and CUAP may decide to interact with the reviewer or to seek further external advice. Any costs incurred in connection with an external review will be met by the university concerned.

6.4.7. CUAP discussion for proposals jointly submitted by four or more universities

Where four or more universities jointly submit a proposal for CUAP approval, this will follow the normal online resolution process, except that approval will not be granted until the proposal has been discussed at the next CUAP meeting. This will allow queries and comments by any universities that are not part of the joint submission and will also ensure that any proposal in which at least half the universities have an interest will be fully discussed before approval is granted.

6.5. Submission of proposals and reports to the committee

All proposals are to be submitted electronically via the CUAP online system.

For details on how to use the system contact the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes at Universities New Zealand for advice.

6.5.1. Online resolution process

Proposals will be assessed initially by online discussion and a resolution advised by the due date. If any committee member is unable to recommend approval, the proposal will be flagged for discussion at a meeting of the committee.

During the period allowed for scrutiny of the proposals, in accordance with the rules (section 3), it is expected that each university will make them available to interested staff and invite comment. The NZUSA representative on CUAP may also seek information or make concerns known to the originating university. Comments on the system will initially be visible only to the submitting and commenting universities. Three weeks after submission, all comments will become visible to all CUAP coordinators and members.

The time allowed for comments and responses to be exchanged is two months. Concerns should be made known to the originating universities within the first three weeks to allow them to prepare their response, which may generate further comment. These discussions will be visible to all universities after three weeks. At any point after three weeks, universities may sign-off to indicate their approval of a proposal through the online system.

By the end of 8 weeks the enquiring university shall inform the originating university if its concerns have been addressed. Proposals which have not been signed off by all universities will be discussed at the CUAP meeting.

6.6. How CUAP comes to decisions

6.6.1. Meetings

The committee schedules meetings in July and October to deal with approval and accreditation matters and normally meets in March for more general matters.

6.6.2. Online resolutions

1. Where all members of the committee have indicated their approval, the proposal concerned will be formally approved by the Chair under delegation from the committee and noted at the next meeting of CUAP.
2. A proposal will be scheduled for discussion at a meeting of the committee if at least one member requests it.

6.6.3. Resolutions at meetings of the committee

1. Resolutions will be carried by a majority vote in favour. The Chair will have a casting vote only. The Deputy Chair will have no procedural vote but will have a casting vote when acting as Chair.
2. If a significant minority of the committee abstains from voting, the wording of a resolution may be reconsidered.
3. Dissenting votes will be recorded at the request of those concerned.

6.6.4. Outcome of the committee's consideration

After each meeting, the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes will advise universities of the status of the proposals considered at that meeting.

Approval granted to any proposal may be provisional for a period of not less than two years, during which time it may undergo either a detailed review by a panel convened for the purpose, or review assessment by the committee. The committee will advise a university if any of its proposals are subject to either of these methods of further assessment.

6.6.5. Appeals

Where an originating university believes that concerns raised by another university during the online resolution process fall outside the rules and criteria for approval of programmes set out in section 3 of the CUAP handbook, or the application of those rules set out in section 4 of the handbook, they may complain to the Chair of CUAP. The Deputy Chair will attempt to resolve the matter by consultation with CUAP members and the Chair.

6.7. Types of decisions made by the committee

6.7.1. Unconditional approval

A proposal that meets all the committee's requirements will be approved unconditionally either through the online system or at a CUAP meeting.

6.7.2. Deferred decision

The purpose of a deferred decision is to reconsider a proposal where agreement has not been reached through the regular process of peer review and, if required, discussion at a meeting of CUAP. Deferred decisions may be necessary if there are significant concerns that cannot be resolved, or where further information is required before the committee makes a final decision.

Deferred decisions should be guided by the principles of focusing only on issues where agreement could not be reached in the initial proposal and/or discussion, and that the purpose of process around the second iteration of the proposal is to reach a swift and timely decision to provide certainty to the proposing university.

If a proposal needs amendment, it will be returned to the proposing university, which will make the amendment/s within a specified timeframe (normally two weeks after the CUAP meeting). The amended proposal will be lodged through the online system. CUAP members will be given a specified timeframe in which they can comment on the amended proposal. A discussion among CUAP members before making a final decision may be possible at the request of any member and with the approval of the Chair. Decisions will be made by a simple majority vote of the members. The proposal will be either unconditionally approved, declined, or re-submitted, or the university may withdraw it.

6.7.3. Conditional approval

6.7.3.1. Review assessment

When new qualifications are being introduced, the committee may require universities to report on implementation and progress at the end of the first and second years. The first report should be submitted to the July meeting of the committee following the first complete year of operation of the programme, and the second the following July, unless the committee requests otherwise. The committee will compare the reports with the original proposals to satisfy itself that their development has been in accord with the stated aims. The committee may waive the requirement for a second report if it is fully satisfied with the development of the qualification in its first year.

The committee has the power to withdraw approval from courses or programmes where there are reasonable grounds for doing so. [Education and Training Act 2020, s 439]

Format of review assessment reports

These should be headed: (name of university), Review Assessment Report (year), (name of qualification), originally approved (year). Unless the committee requests otherwise, all review assessment reports should include brief information on the following matters:

- names and qualifications of teaching and support staff, together with brief details about the contribution of each to the programme
- number of students enrolled and expected growth in numbers, together with comment on perceived demand and likely limits on enrolments
- performance of students to date
- accommodation (e.g. classroom space, staff studies, graduate students' areas), resources (e.g. library, computer, laboratories) and support services (e.g. administrative, library, technical staff)
- mode of teaching
- methods of assessment, including the use of external assessors where appropriate (e.g. where there is a research component)
- summary of course evaluations by students
- contributions by other institutions
- industry/professional support and any contributions, financial or otherwise
- procedures for periodic peer review of the programme
- comparison with and relationship to similar courses or programmes offered by other providers
- other relevant information.

The committee may also identify particular features of the programme on which comment is required.

A copy of the original proposal should be attached to each copy of a review assessment report for reference.

6.7.4. Declined

A proposal may be declined, withdrawn by the university or withdrawn with a view to resubmission.

6.8. Implementation of approvals

Recognising the pre-eminence of the Calendar as a statement of a university's regulations and statutes, the committee expects that all proposals that have been approved will be included in the Calendars of the originating universities as soon as practicable and in the same format as approved by the committee. Supplementary publications, including regulations, should acknowledge that the Calendar is the only official statement of all regulations.

The attention of universities is drawn to Guidelines for Intending Students (Appendix I).

6.9. Approved programmes which are not offered

Under s 443 (2) of the Education and Training Act 2020, Universities New Zealand has determined the circumstances in which universities require an extension of the period specified in sub-sections 443 (1)(a) and (b), after which approval and accreditation will lapse for a programme that has not been offered wholly or in part. Approved proposals remain approved for a period of five years following their introduction or following the most recent enrolments. If a programme has not been offered, or has attracted no enrolments, in any five-year period following its introduction, and a university wishes to continue to offer it, the programme should be submitted to CUAP for re-evaluation.

6.10. Graduating Year Review (GYR)

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

The committee requires a follow-up programme review of all successful proposals involving the introduction of new qualifications, and major subjects and endorsements comprising 40% or more of a qualification. When a cluster of related qualifications has been approved, the GYR review report may cover all those qualifications, and up to one extra page per qualification is allowed in such cases. (Higher doctorates and PhDs 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 (independent of the programme) and 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 template. The review is intended to assure the committee that programmes are meeting both their original objectives and an acceptable standard of delivery. Lower than expected graduate numbers may reduce the quantity of data available to the review, but the process remains an essential part of CUAP's overall quality assurance function.

The reports should be summary statements only and no more than four pages long. Members of CUAP will be entitled to ask for copies of all documentation referred to in the reports. Following the response to such a request, if any member still has 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 October meeting of CUAP, i.e. by 1 October. 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 report.

For jointly taught qualifications only one GYR needs to be submitted but it should include information from all institutions.

Where a university has deleted a programme and notified CUAP of this deletion, no GYR is required. If a university has discontinued a programme with an intention to delete, it may submit an abbreviated GYR and should advise CUAP of when it intends to report the deletion in the online system.

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 can be enrolled in the programme until the committee lifts 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 approval criteria 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7. (See section 3.)

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. approval criteria 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 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

Template for GYRs

Overview statement

With its Graduating Year Reviews, in any year a university must provide an overview statement. Where there is only one GYR, the required information may be included in the body of the report.

The overview should provide, in no more than 4 pages:

1. a list of the GYRs submitted and whether the university intends to continue or discontinue each programme (criterion e)
2. any features of a programme that are not evident from the report itself
3. a description of the GYR process undertaken by the university. If only one GYR is being submitted, this may be included in the GYR for the particular programme(s)
4. an overview of the guidance issued to the internal review panel
5. a brief summary of the review outcomes.

The GYR template is below. GYRs and overview statements should be uploaded onto the CUAP online system by the date shown in the CUAP schedule of dates (section 6.11).

Graduating Year Review

(report should be not more than four pages)

Current year:

Name of programme:

Identifier for original proposal (eg MU13-BBS/R2):

Name and position of independent GYR convenor:

Name of other panel members and position held:

1. Programme statement:

- a. **Description:** Provide a brief description of the programme structure (include required or compulsory components and credit points) and NZQCF levels as approved by CUAP and how it has been introduced and consolidated.
- b. **Purpose:** 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 GYR 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. (Criterion b)

3. Review outcomes:

Summarise the outcomes of the review processes under the following headings:

- a. **Adequacy and Appropriateness:** Provide a statement of the ongoing adequacy and appropriateness of the:
 - i. Title, aims, graduate outcomes and coherence of the whole programme. (Criterion c.i)
 - ii. Regulations for admission, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning, structure, integration of practical/work-based components and progression within the programme of study. (Criterion c.iii)
- b. **Acceptability:** Provide a statement of the ongoing acceptability of the programme to the relevant academic, student, industrial and professional communities. Provide evidence that the graduate profile of the programme is being achieved. (Criterion c.ii)

If applicable comment on how any concerns raised by CUAP at the point of approval have been addressed. (Criterion d)
- c. **Assessment procedures and student performance:** Provide a statement on the ongoing appropriateness of methods of assessment, including (if relevant) any procedures for external assessment and/or moderation. (Criterion c.iv).
- d. **Data:** Provide information on student numbers actually enrolling and completing. This should be provided in an easily interpreted format with a commentary. (Criterion c.i and ii)
- e. **Programme evaluations:**
 - i. External reviews: If the programme has been subject to any external reviews e.g. by professional or accreditation bodies, include, where relevant, a statement of intention, or revisions, to address any recommendations identified in an external review. (Criterion c.ii)
 - ii. Provide a summary evaluation of the outcomes of the GYR review panel and a summary of actions that are being put in place to address any recommendations identified by the GYR panel and that support the continuation of the programme. (Criterion c.v)
 - iii. Provide a date when the programme will next be reviewed. (Criteria a and b)

GYRs and overview statements should be loaded onto the online system by the due date.

Deferral or programme not offered

Universities may request deferral of a GYR on the following grounds:

- i. The programme either has not yet been offered or was first offered later 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 GYR.

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 6.1) for re-evaluation or formally deleted (as in section 6.2.) (See section 6.9.) In the latter case no GYR is required.

Process for consideration of the reports

- a. Each set of reports submitted by a university will initially be 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 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 Appendix C of this Handbook 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 before 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.

5. Appeal. A university may invoke the appeal procedures under standing procedures if they dispute a decision.

6.11. Timetable

The committee publishes an annual timetable. The main features are expected to remain as follows:

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 March | Universities must submit a list of programme reviews undertaken in the previous year to CUAP (via the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes) by 1 March. |
| 1 May | Round One starts Round One proposals must be uploaded to the CUAP online system by 1 May. |
| 3 weeks | Three weeks from the start of Round One: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments from all universities will be open and visible to all users • Initial comments on proposals should have been posted • Universities can start to sign-off on proposals. |
| 8 weeks | Eight weeks from the start of Round One, universities must nominate proposals for discussion at the CUAP meeting or sign-off the proposals. |
| 1 July | Due date for submitting review assessment reports to CUAP (via the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes). |
| mid July | Meeting of CUAP to consider Round One proposals that have not been signed-off. Proposals signed-off during the round will be noted at the CUAP meeting and recorded in the minutes. |
| 1 August | Round Two starts Round One proposals must be uploaded to the CUAP online system by 1 August. |
| 3 weeks | Three weeks from the start of Round Two: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments from all universities will be open and visible to all users • Initial comments on proposals should have been posted • Universities can start to sign-off on proposals. |
| 8 weeks | Eight weeks from the start of Round Two, universities must nominate proposals for discussion at the CUAP meeting or sign-off the proposals. |
| 1 September | Closing date for uploading Graduating Year Reviews to Universities New Zealand |
| mid October | CUAP meets to consider Round Two proposals that have not been signed off and Graduating Year Reviews. Proposals signed off during the round will be noted at the CUAP meeting and recorded in the minutes. |

Specific dates will be available from the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes at Universities New Zealand.

Appendices

7. Appendix A:

CUAP's Subcommittee on University Entrance

7.1. Functions

The subcommittee is chaired by a nominee of Universities New Zealand. Membership is drawn from the eight universities (one representative of each) and may include co-opted members from the secondary teaching profession (one from the state sector and one from the private sector), and one representative of the university student recruitment managers. Three members comprise the Executive, which has decision-making powers.

The subcommittee reports to CUAP on:

1. the criteria for entrance to universities to be recommended to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority
2. any consultation carried out by NZQA on the criteria to be established for discretionary (provisional) entrance and entrance *ad eundem statum* to universities
3. the status and acceptability of qualifications provided by international bodies for entrance *ad eundem statum* to universities
4. advice and information to the universities on the administration of discretionary entrance and *ad eundem* admission policies, and reviews that advice annually
5. applications for Universities New Zealand recognition of university foundation programmes offered in New Zealand by non-university providers
6. the involvement of university staff in the process of curriculum development and examination in the senior secondary school through liaison with the Ministry of Education and NZQA
7. policy advice on matters related to the secondary-tertiary interface, senior school/ university curriculum, and the university entrance standard
8. any other matters related to entrance which may from time to time be referred to it by the Committee on University Academic Programmes.

7.2. Members (as of June 2022)

Chair

Professor David Crabbe*
E. david.crabbe@vuw.ac.nz

Waipapa Taumata Rau, University of Auckland

Sue Laurenson*
E. s.laurenson@auckland.ac.nz

Auckland University of Technology

Heather Merrick*
E. heather.merrick@aut.ac.nz

The University of Waikato

Dr Tracy Bowell
E. tracy.bowell@waikato.ac.nz

Massey University

Associate Professor Peter Rawlins
E. p.rawlins@massey.ac.nz

Te Herenga Waka – Victoria University of Wellington

Associate Professor Bronwyn Wood
E. bronwyn.wood@vuw.ac.nz

University of Canterbury

Professor Catherine Moran
E. catherine.moran@canterbury.ac.nz

Lincoln University

Dr Megan Clayton
E. megan.clayton@lincoln.ac.nz

University of Otago

Rhonda Brodie
E. rhonda.brodie@otago.ac.nz

Co-opted members

State Schools Representative

To be confirmed

Independent Schools Representative

To be confirmed

Schools-liaison Representative

Cathy Powley

Victoria University of Wellington
E. cathy.powley@vuw.ac.nz

* Executive Members

Enquiries concerning the subcommittee's activities may be directed to the subcommittee member from the enquirer's university or school sector, or to the Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes at Universities New Zealand for advice.

For information about admission *ad eundem statum*, contact Universities New Zealand:

Portfolio Manager – Academic Programmes Universities New Zealand – Te Pōkai Tara

PO Box 860, Wellington 6140
P. 04 381 8505 (direct) or 04 381 8500
E. cuap@universitiesnz.ac.nz

8. Appendix B:

University programme reviews

All programmes offered by a university are reviewed. As well as CUAP's Graduating Year Review process, which is mandatory for all new qualifications, subjects and endorsements, a university might plan for reviews on a 5 to 10-year cycle, such as:

Professional accreditation visits

These are regular visits undertaken by external bodies such as the Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand, the Australian Medical Council and Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand.

Academic unit reviews

Departmental or school reviews generally focus on a department's structure, management, resources, policies, objectives and activities, including teaching and research, and how it achieves and maintains quality. They may include programme reviews.

Programme reviews

A programme review concentrates on an individual programme such as a degree or a diploma, or on a major disciplinary component of a suite of qualifications. It examines the regulations, the subjects/majors and the courses that contribute to those subjects/majors, to establish whether the programme is achieving its objectives, is based on an appropriate curriculum, and meets the needs of students and employers.

To assure itself that quality is being maintained after qualifications have been through the Graduating Year Review process, CUAP expects universities to review them regularly, either as full qualifications or by ensuring that major subject components are regularly reviewed. The following guidelines are suggested:

1. Reviews should be carried out on a regular cycle, which might be five years, or at any other interval that suits the university and is appropriate to the discipline being reviewed.
2. A panel of reviewers, including some from outside the discipline, should be constituted. At least one should be from outside New Zealand.
3. The staff of the programme should be required to respond to any issues raised in the review report.
4. The report, its responses and recommendations for implementation should be signed off by the Academic Board or another responsible committee within the university and made public according to the university's own practice in this regard.

CUAP requires universities to report annually by 1 March the programme reviews they have undertaken in the previous year.

Review of qualifications with a substantial non-university contribution should be specified in any application for new qualifications that involve substantial non-university contributions.

9. Appendix C:

Review of qualifications with conditional approval – Terms of reference

9.1. Introduction

A review panel may be set up to advise CUAP whenever the committee decides to grant conditional approval to a qualification. Each panel will be chaired by a university member of CUAP and include two subject experts, one of whom will usually be a senior university staff member with considerable administrative experience. Secretarial services will be provided by staff of Universities New Zealand, including arrangements for travel and accommodation. Panel members will not receive a fee, but reasonable travel, accommodation and out-of-pocket expenses will be reimbursed. The financial cost of conducting the review will be carried by the university that proposed the qualification.

Unless CUAP determines otherwise, the panel will submit a preliminary report on the qualification during the first year it is offered and a final report not more than 12 months later. The first report should state whether, in the panel's view, the qualification is likely to achieve final approval and what, if anything, should be done to ensure that. The second report will be used by CUAP to determine final approval. At each stage in the process, the Vice-Chancellor of the university that proposed the qualification will be informed in writing of the panel's recommendations. The university that proposed the qualification may at any time either offer a commitment to implement the panel's recommendations that CUAP agrees are essential for final approval or withdraw from offering the qualification. In the latter instance, CUAP should be advised of transitional arrangements for students who have still to complete the qualification.

9.2. Criteria for academic approval and institutional accreditation

The panel is required to inform CUAP whether the university that proposed the qualification (as well as any associated educational institution) satisfies or jointly satisfy a number of specified criteria, which will normally include the following:

- there should be adequate administrative structures and academic resources for the qualification, as well as the financial commitment to support it for the foreseeable future
- there should be appropriate, up-to-date and adequate accommodation, facilities and resources for the qualification
- the qualification regulations should be fully prescribed and readily available
- the university should have procedures for periodic academic reviews of the qualification
- academic staff involved with the qualification should hold recognised academic and/or professional qualifications, the former normally at the postgraduate level
- the university and any associated educational institution should have policies to ensure that academic staff involved with the qualification are able to attend subject conferences and take study leave under conditions that satisfy current university norms
- where appropriate, there should be procedures for the external assessment of student work
- any other matters that CUAP shall determine when it grants conditional approval to the qualification.

10. Appendix D:

Guidelines for postgraduate funding agreed by Universities New Zealand and the Tertiary Education Commission

(Originally between the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors Committee and the Ministry of Education, May 1995)

1. The essential principle is that the learning involved must be at postgraduate level, or beyond that of the final year of a bachelor's degree, in terms of content and challenge to the learner.
2. It is agreed that entry into the programme by non-graduates does not automatically mean that a programme is not postgraduate, provided that the main entry is by graduates, and that non-graduates enter as a result of substituting for the first degree other qualifications, prior learning and experience deemed equivalent to it.
3. At the same time, it is also agreed that entry into a programme by graduates or those deemed equivalent does not necessarily make a programme a postgraduate one. What is important is the level of the programme, rather than the qualifications of those admitted to it.
4. The second principle to be followed is that of 'disaggregation'. A programme open to graduates or the equivalent may be made up of a mix of courses, some postgraduate, some not. 'Disaggregation' permits their being differentially and correctly funded.
5. These two concepts help resolve some of the issues that arise. Where a programme is at master's level, postgraduate funding is appropriate. Where part of a prescribed non-master's programme is at the master's level, that part of the programme deserves postgraduate funding, but if a stage 3 course is included in an individual's master's programme it would be funded at stage 3 level.
6. In some cases, the level of a programme may not be immediately apparent. Some clearly, in whole or in part, build upon work done in the final year of a first degree. But in other cases, their position may be less easy to define, for example where a programme broadens into a multidisciplinary field or into a field not explicitly catered for in undergraduate studies.
7. In some cases, again, the numbering of a programme or its component parts may make it difficult to determine at what level it is taught. The numbering is not a safe guide. Not all courses with numbers above the 300s justify postgraduate funding. Some universities use numeric codes that may differentiate the type of qualification more clearly than its level.
8. When the guidelines cannot be clearly applied, the institution should state the grounds on which it could be argued that a programme is wholly or in part postgraduate. The present guidelines indicate ways in which that might be argued. A brief questionnaire or list of headings could be used.
9. Bachelor's honours degrees present other problems. In general, postgraduate funding is currently offered by the Tertiary Education Commission for honours programmes that require admission from a completed bachelor's degree; or that comprise a 'fourth year' honours stream into which students are specifically admitted; or for the part of a 'fourth year' programme that is specific to the honours stream. It is not given to a degree in which honours is open to all who have studied it.
10. Offering two sequential bachelor's degrees does not automatically render the second one eligible for postgraduate funding. The second degree would have to be considered in the light of the guidelines for postgraduate funding.

11. An undergraduate course of study cannot become postgraduate as a result, say, of adopting more intensive methods or small-class teaching.
12. Research informs all university and degree teaching. In the case of postgraduate qualifications, it is likely to be a particular requirement of the course of study itself. It may not always be a necessary requirement, nor, if required, may it be made apparent by being separated out by some such description as project or dissertation. But its presence could be a criterion for determining that all or part of a programme is postgraduate, and thus form an item in the proposed questionnaire.
13. A programme may also be considered in terms of the preparation it provides for further research. A qualification that, on successful completion, permits enrolment for PhD might qualify in whole or in part for postgraduate funding.

11. Appendix E:

Procedures for the approval and accreditation of jointly-awarded qualifications.

11.1. Principles

The guiding principles for the evaluation of applications to award a qualification jointly are:

- increased collaboration within the tertiary sector and better use of national tertiary education capability
- enhanced benefits for students
- capability-building for the institutions involved.

11.2. Outcomes

The outcomes are:

- one set of documentation submitted
- one approval process
- a site accreditation, where relevant, for the institutions involved.

11.3. Process

The process consists of the following:

One set of documentation

- Where the application is by two universities, the applicant universities should submit only one set of documentation to CUAP in the normal way via the CUAP online system.
- Where the application involves a university and an institute of technology, polytechnic, private training establishment or a wānanga, the applicant institutions should submit only one set of documentation, which in the first instance will go to NZQA. After an initial analysis—and only if it addresses all requirements—the application will be sent to the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) by one of the due dates.

One approval process

- For an application by two universities, CUAP will follow the same procedure as it does for applications by a single university.
- For an application by a university and another tertiary organisation, NZQA will appoint a designated specialist to do an initial analysis of the documentation to ensure it can meet the criteria for programme approval. If it does not appear to, NZQA should consult the applicant institutions and return the documents for the required improvements or amendments.

When the documentation is acceptable to NZQA, it should then be forwarded to CUAP in time to fit in with CUAP cycles, i.e. by 1 May or 1 August. Any comments from NZQA should accompany the documentation to be considered by CUAP, in the same way that comments from any university will be considered.

If CUAP has any concerns, it should discuss these with the designated NZQA person.

When the application meets CUAP criteria for programme approval and accreditation, CUAP should recommend approval and notify NZQA. If CUAP does not approve the application, it must advise NZQA and both applicants immediately. The rationale for leaving the approval

process with CUAP is to streamline it. Two approval processes are not considered necessary, especially given the same criteria are used and CUAP has the expertise to approve degree programmes.

Site accreditation for non-university participants

For any applicant other than a university, there should always be a site accreditation by NZQA.

This should be a full panel visit as described in the NZQA document 'Degrees and Related Qualifications: Guidelines for Programme Approval and Accreditation to Provide Programmes', as it will focus on accreditation only.

The panel for the visit will consist of one representative from the universities and one from the industry/profession with other representatives as appropriate.

To reduce the overall timeframe, the accreditation visit may take place while the CUAP process is under way. The outcome of the accreditation visit may be reported to CUAP if necessary.

12. Appendix F:

Jointly-taught qualifications with other New Zealand universities

Two or more New Zealand universities proposing a jointly-taught qualification should provide CUAP with the following information:

1. If the qualification is a new one, a single proposal, submitted by the universities concerned, in the format described in section 6.4.1 of this Handbook, including confirmation of the existence of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), of which the matters outlined below must be available to CUAP as part of Section B of the proposal:
 - information on the relevant contribution of each university to the qualification proposed
 - procedures for monitoring and periodic review
 - assessment and examination arrangements
 - academic grievance and appeal procedures
 - means of, and responsibility for, communicating to students any particular requirements of the programme arising out of its collaborative nature
 - availability of resources (e.g. relevant library holdings) for both students and staff at each site
 - procedures to be adopted should any provision of the MoU relating to academic matters not be met, for whatever reason.
2. If the qualification already exists at one of the universities concerned (i.e. has already been approved by CUAP), the proposal should be in the format described in section 6.4.2 of this Handbook, and should include confirmation of the existence of an MoU, of which the matters outlined in 1. above must be available to CUAP as part of Section B of the proposal. A single proposal, submitted by the universities concerned, will suffice.
3. As required by 6.4.7, where four or more universities jointly submit a proposal for CUAP approval this will follow the normal online resolution process, except that approval will not be granted until the proposal has been discussed at the next CUAP meeting.

13. Appendix G:

Qualifications with significant contributions from overseas institutions and/or delivered offshore by New Zealand universities

CUAP's requirements for the delivery of university qualifications with significant contributions from overseas institutions⁴ and delivery of qualifications offshore by New Zealand universities have been amended to reflect the Offshore Programme Delivery Rules 2022 in so far as they apply to the universities.

These requirements do not apply:

1. to programmes offered by New Zealand universities by distance delivery to students outside New Zealand, or
2. to PhDs and other wholly research doctoral degrees, except where the offshore agreement includes changes to existing admission, supervision or examination provisions.

13.1. Definition of significant contribution

A significant contribution is one in which the overseas institution contributes one or more of the following:

- the core of a programme
- an entire major subject
- more than 60 credits (0.5 EFTS).

13.2. Circumstances in which applications might arise

The following circumstances pertain:

1. A university develops a new qualification and wishes to award it jointly with an overseas institution or institutions.
2. A university wishes to award an existing qualification jointly with an overseas institution or institutions.
3. A university develops a new qualification which will be taught wholly or in part by an overseas institution or institutions or delivered offshore by the university itself.
4. A university makes arrangements for an existing qualification to be taught wholly or in part by an overseas institution or institutions.
5. A university decides to deliver an existing qualification offshore by itself.

In all cases where an overseas institution is involved in the delivery of the qualification, an Agreement must be drawn up and signed by all institutions making a significant contribution to the delivery. In the case of new qualifications, the Agreement must be submitted to CUAP as part of the proposals for those qualifications. In the case of qualifications that have already been approved by CUAP the Agreement must be submitted to CUAP for review by the subcommittee specified in section 13.4.2 prior to the commencement of the offshore delivery.

4. The term "overseas institution" covers both higher education institutions and other types of institutions, including government agencies.

13.3. Requirements for a jointly-awarded qualification with an overseas institution or institutions

A New Zealand university proposing a jointly-awarded qualification with an overseas institution or institutions should provide:

1. a statement on the standing of the overseas institution(s) and sufficient information to ensure that CUAP recognises the overseas institution(s) as meeting appropriate quality and programme management requirements, that are essentially equivalent to those expected by a New Zealand university
2. a statement of formal agreement between the New Zealand university and the overseas institution(s), that must include a detailed outline of processes for the management of the qualification and students, including the provisions for the management of students should the proposed arrangement cease to operate
3. details of the qualification approval and accreditation processes applying to the overseas institution(s) with respect to the particular qualification under consideration
4. a proposal (Sections A and B) outlining the relevant contributions of the institution(s) to the qualification proposed
5. a detailed statement of operational performance and effectiveness, in respect of the qualification, as part of the Graduating Year Review.
6. a statement providing CUAP with assurance that consideration has been given to the mitigation of any risks that might arise in respect of teaching implications related to the Trusted Research – Protective Security Requirements.

CUAP may seek to invoke the Review Panel process, costs to be apportioned equally among the institutions making the application.

CUAP may require further and ongoing monitoring of the arrangement with an overseas institution, depending upon issues raised at the time of programme approval or as a result of a Graduating Year Review.

These requirements do not apply where PhDs or other wholly research doctoral degrees are being jointly awarded with an overseas institution or institutions, but the New Zealand university is expected to have a partnership agreement in place with the overseas institution/s.

13.4. Requirements for the Agreement with the overseas institution or institutions

An Agreement should be between institutions, not between individual departments or staff members.

13.4.1. Preamble

Approval of any New Zealand programme or qualification involving contributions from an overseas provider is based on the following principles:

1. That the relationship with the partner will not cause damage to the reputation of the individual New Zealand university, or to New Zealand universities as a whole.
2. That the partner has experience in tertiary education, has sufficient resources and has the necessary local legal standing to offer the programme or courses.
3. That consideration is given by both parties to the national and local contexts within which the partners are working, including in particular:
 - the local higher education system and the partner institutions' positions in it
 - the statutory requirements governing national and overseas recognition of awards

- any relevant professional requirements governing recognition of awards and qualifications (e.g registration)
- transfer of credit arrangements
- portability of the award or qualification
- local educational tradition and conventions, including practices relating to delivery and assessment
- local cultural relevance and acceptability of curriculum and modes of delivery
- copyright and intellectual property protection
- maintenance of professional and ethical standards which are consistent with those expected in New Zealand.

13.4.2. CUAP requirements

Proposals for new programmes to be offered offshore will be considered under the procedures set out in section 6 and must be submitted to CUAP by the closing dates specified in section 6.1.

Proposals to offer offshore, existing programmes already approved by CUAP may be submitted at any time for consideration by a subcommittee comprising the chair, deputy chair and another CUAP member. The subcommittee may issue guidelines for the submission of existing programmes to be offered offshore.

All proposals for programmes or awards to be offered by a New Zealand university and involving participation by an overseas partner must satisfy normal CUAP assessment requirements. A statement must be provided on the standing of the overseas institution(s) and sufficient information to ensure that CUAP recognises the overseas institution(s) as meeting appropriate quality and programme management requirements that are essentially equivalent to those expected by a New Zealand university. In addition, the Agreement with the overseas institution, which includes the issues outlined in section 13.4.3 below, must be made available to CUAP as part of the proposal that is submitted.

Where a New Zealand university has academic collaboration for the same programme or qualification or part thereof with more than one overseas institution, whether as partners or through sub-contracting, then an Agreement must be agreed to by all partners individually.

13.4.3. The Agreement

Agreement to incorporate courses or programmes from an overseas provider will be based on a written Agreement that defines the means by which the quality of the student experience will be assured and the academic standards of the programme maintained, and which ensures that the collaborative arrangements operate smoothly in terms of clear channels of communication, accountability and authority.

Nine issues must be addressed. The Agreement must:

1. affirm that staff teaching the course or programme have appropriate qualifications and employment conditions
2. include agreements about availability of required staffing, libraries, equipment, support services and other resources, for both students and staff
3. confirm that the programme of study being delivered overseas and the institution(s) comply with local law
4. specify any approval already received (and provide documentation on request) from:
 - any local accrediting agency
 - any relevant professional body
 - any other statutory body which has programme approval authority in that country

5. outline procedures that will be adopted to ensure academic standards appropriate to a New Zealand qualification are met, including in particular:
 - procedures for initial validation and approval
 - procedures for evaluation, monitoring and periodic review
 - assessment and examination arrangements
 - responsibility for oversight of the above, and procedures for resolving any difference which might arise between the collaborating institutions.
6. outline procedures that will be adopted to ensure student interests are considered, with respect to:
 - academic grievance and appeal procedures
 - means of, and responsibility for, communicating to students any particular requirements of the programme arising out of its collaborative nature
 - culturally-specific needs in terms of academic practice and access to resources
 - management of student interests should the arrangement between the partners cease.
7. confirm the financial stability of all partners with respect to their capacity to contribute to the programme
8. outline the procedures to be adopted should any of the provisions of the Agreement with respect to academic programmes not be met, for whatever reason
9. specify the individuals from each institution responsible for oversight of the Agreement, with respect to the above academic requirements.

13.5. Requirements for universities delivering qualifications offshore without an overseas partner institution

All proposals for programmes or awards to be offered by a New Zealand university offshore must satisfy normal CUAP assessment requirements. If a New Zealand university proposes to deliver a new qualification offshore, it must advise CUAP of this as part of the proposal submitted under section 6.1 and provide a report on the matters listed below. Where a university proposes to deliver offshore a qualification that has already been approved by CUAP, it must seek CUAP's approval before offshore delivery starts, and provide a report on the matters listed below for consideration by the CUAP subcommittee specified in section 13.4.2.

- the design of the programme is suited to delivery in the host country and suited to the needs of the intended students
- the following aspects of the programme to be delivered offshore are comparable to the New Zealand-based programme delivery:
 - programme learning outcomes
 - content
 - acceptability to the relevant academic bodies, employers, industry bodies, professional bodies and other relevant bodies
 - student workload (credit value, level and duration)
 - appropriate resources, including academic staff, are available to deliver the programme
 - assessment methods, criteria and moderation procedures are consistent with the New Zealand based programme delivery
 - effective student and academic support services are provided together with relevant and accurate information for intending and enrolled students
 - provisions for the management of students are in place should the offshore delivery of the programme cease

- the offshore delivery of the programme has been included in the university's quality assurance systems
- that consideration has been given to the mitigation of any risks that might arise in respect of teaching implications related to the Trusted Research – Protective Security Requirements.

14. Appendix H:

Quality assurance of university courses and programmes not leading to a qualification

Universities provide a range of courses and programmes, including courses delivered as adult and continuing education, micro-credentials, professional development, community education and other outreach activities. These are open to the public, to particular professional groups, or delivered under contract and do not lead to the award of a qualification. The following quality assurance principles and processes apply to these courses and programmes. They do not apply to single events and lectures organised by universities.

Below are outlined:

1. the guiding principles related to the approval and quality assurance of courses and programmes provided by universities
2. the priorities for adult and continuing education in universities
3. an approval process that will ensure university courses and programmes are appropriately quality assured.

14.1. Guiding principles

Courses and programmes provided by a university should:

- reflect the university's commitments and objectives in its Strategic Plan, in particular with respect to community access to education and the provision of professional development
- satisfy the university's quality assurance requirements
- reflect the standing of the university as a provider of advanced learning and its priorities for adult and community education and the provision of professional development.

14.2. Adult and community education priorities for universities

University adult and community education engages communities in university-level learning to:

- provide access to current fundamental and applied research
- stimulate critical thinking, innovation and creativity
- develop active and informed global citizens
- facilitate pathways to advanced learning and performance.

14.3. Process

A university offering courses and programmes should:

- have proposals approved by the university's Academic Board or delegated authority
- ensure that the courses meet the university's academic requirements for sub-contracting arrangements, where there are such arrangements
- ensure that the courses are taught by appropriately qualified staff in a suitably resourced learning environment
- ensure that the courses offer university-level learning and meet one or more of the university's strategic priorities
- ensure that the university's processes for handling grievances and disciplinary matters extend to students participating in the courses
- gather feedback on courses including, where appropriate, student evaluation data, and use it to inform programme development.

14.4. Courses and programmes leading to an award⁵ by the university

Where such a course or programme leads to an award by the university of a certificate or other document recognising the student's achievement and completion of the course or programme, the university's Academic Board or delegated authority must ensure that the course or programme meets the criteria set out in this section, which are based on the NZ Qualifications Authority's Training Scheme Rules 2021.

Exemptions

Under the Education (Exempt Training Schemes) Notice 2012, promulgated by NZQA, the following types of courses and programmes which are of less than three months' duration are exempt if they meet the criteria set out further below:

- a. courses and programmes of a recreational nature, i.e., for the pursuit of recreation, pleasure or leisure and the skills gained are not designed to lead to further or higher study, or entry into employment, or
- b. courses and programmes arranged for the personnel of one or more organisations, which are paid for by the organisations and are not open to participation by the general public unless the course or programme is designed to meet regulatory requirements for occupational registration, occupational licensing, or health and safety in the workplace, or
- c. courses of less credit value than ten credits unless the course is designed to meet regulatory requirements for occupational registration, occupational licensing, or health and safety in the workplace.

Criteria

1. Structure of the course or programme

It has a coherent structure in terms of its learning outcomes, content, level and credit value, which is appropriate for its purposes.

2. Delivery methods

Delivery methods are clearly identified, appropriate to the needs and level of the intended students and support achievement of the learning outcomes.

3. Resources and staff

There are adequate and appropriate teaching staff (with appropriate qualifications and/or experience), facilities, physical resources, and student support systems to enable sustained delivery. The role of sub-contractors, if any, in the delivery of the course or programme is clearly defined.

4. Information for students

Adequate information is available to students including, where applicable, information on entry and selection requirements, recognition of prior learning, reassessment and appeals, student progress, requirements for completion, and the availability of assessment in te reo Māori.

5. As defined by s. 10(1) of the Education and Training Act 2020

5. Assessment and moderation

Assessment methodologies provide fair, valid, consistent and appropriate assessment of student achievement, given the stated learning outcomes. There is an effective system for moderation of assessment materials and decisions.

Approval will not be granted by the Academic Board or delegated authority where the course or programme:

- a. has a credit value of 40 or more credits and is substantially similar to a qualification listed on the NZ Qualifications Framework, or
- b. includes in its title any of the words “New Zealand”, “national”, “diploma”, “degree”, “bachelor”, “master”, “doctor”, “undergraduate” or “postgraduate” where it may cause confusion with a qualification on the NZ Qualifications Framework, or
- c. includes in its title the name of a person, organisation or product unless the approving authority is satisfied that there is sound justification for the inclusion.

14.5 Universities’ guiding principles: Micro-credentials

The following principles are designed to ensure the consistency and quality of university micro-credential offerings:

1. The university sector should only recognise and/or offer micro-credentials where five criteria are met:
 - a. Level – they have been objectively and consistently assessed as being at an appropriate level relative to the qualifications framework.
 - b. Credit – they have a credit value that has been derived consistent with the credit value of other comparable courses offered by universities.
 - c. Assessment – there are adequate mechanisms for verifying that students themselves have successfully completed necessary work and assessment.
 - d. Quality assurance – there is credible quality assurance behind the design, delivery, and assessment of whatever is being offered.
 - e. Industry, employer and community support - there is support from the relevant industries, employers or communities.
2. Micro-credentials may be used to award formal credit towards a university qualification. Published university policies on credit transfer limits will apply to credits from micro-credentials and credits from other sources.
3. Where universities offer micro-credentials:
 - a. The university should have a micro-credential framework detailing clear policies and procedures for developing micro-credentials, assessing their level and credit value, quality assuring them, and for delivering them and assessing skills and capabilities of students.
 - b. Universities should adhere to the ‘Quality assurance of university courses and programmes not leading to a qualification’ appendix of the CUAP Handbook in their development and approval of micro-credentials, along with other courses not leading to a qualification.

April 2018

15. Appendix I:

Guidelines on information for intending students

Preamble

While a major role of CUAP is to approve qualifications, it has an interest in ensuring that the information promulgated about qualifications is accurate and helpful to students. It has therefore adopted the following guidelines, which it commends to the universities.

Basic criteria

All publications containing programme listings should satisfy the following basic requirements:

1. Every entry should be clearly comprehensible to its target audience.
2. There must be clear and accessible contact information that relates to both specific and generic connections.
3. Date and currency of each publication should be stated.
4. The publisher of the document should be clearly identified.
5. There must be no misleading statements or implications.

General publications

In all general publications which provide information about programmes (e.g. Calendar, prospectus), the following institutional requirements should be satisfied:

1. There should be explanations of naming conventions (credits, units, courses etc.), technical terms and jargon.
2. The target audience and general purpose of the document or listings should be indicated.
3. Entrance requirements to the institution, and how they are achieved, should be stated.

Specific course information

In any publications that relate to a particular programme or course (e.g. brochure, flier) as well as in those generic publications that list information on specific programmes or courses, the following requirements should be met:

1. The name of the programme and each course, both in full and in common abbreviation or rubric, should be given.
2. Selection procedures and criteria for the programme or course, and number of available places, should be stated.
3. The structure and context of each course should be stated (i.e. What qualification is it part of? Who is the approving authority of the qualification?) along with any transfer, cross-credit or institutional inter-relationship arrangements that exist.
4. An outline of each course, including content, duration, value within a broader qualification (credits or units for a degree etc.), hours per week, should be available.
5. There should be a statement of who is responsible for the course (department, division, staff member and position held.)
6. Wherever applicable, there should be a statement of particular prerequisites and corequisites, overall structural context (what is needed to major with that particular course etc.), and follow-on courses available.
7. Any caveats or known problem areas (e.g. a department retrenching or closing, staff on sabbatical leave, a course not being offered in a particular year, a qualification still awaiting approval) must be clearly stated.

Postgraduate information

In publications that relate to postgraduate qualifications, the following additional requirements should be met:

1. There should be information available on research and thesis supervision arrangements, regulations, requirements and obligations on the part of both students and staff.
2. Specific information on the research specialisations and skills of staff should be available.
3. Information on available physical resources (office space, study facilities, computers, networking, library etc.) should be stated.

Advertising

In advertising, all information relating to qualifications is subject to the strictures of the various Acts that govern all advertisements. In addition, it is suggested that a brief set of ethical considerations, relating to truthfulness, balance and the absence of unreal expectations, should be adopted by each university. For example, claims about employability, relative position etc. (“New Zealand’s best diploma”, “preferred by employers” etc.) have to be able to be substantiated by objective data. This needs to be informed by legislation and current codes of advertising practice.

16. Appendix J:

Universities New Zealand – Te Pōkai Tara: Conflicts of Interest Policy

16.1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish principles and procedures which ensure that in making decisions Universities New Zealand (UNZ) office holders, committee members and staff exercise discretion in their personal and professional capacities so that they manage any conflicts of interest and act in a manner consistent with the public interest.

16.2. Scope

This policy applies to all office holders, committee members and staff of UNZ. As appropriate, it may also apply to university staff, independent contractors, and advisors to UNZ.

16.3. Policy

16.3.1. Definition of conflict of interest

A conflict of interest exists where the responsibilities that the person has to UNZ or one of its committees could be affected by some other separate interest that the person may have in relation to a particular matter. That other interest may exist because of a relationship or role that the person has and may lead to a perception that the person might not be impartial with respect to the matter.

16.3.2. Identification of conflict of interest

Office holders, committee members and staff of UNZ are required to ensure that that they have identified and assessed any actual or potential conflicts of interest and that these conflicts of interest are disclosed and managed in accordance with this policy.

16.3.3. Disclosure of conflict of interest

UNZ office holders, committee members and staff are required to disclose to the best of their knowledge any external interests which may give rise to conflicts of interest and to keep this disclosure updated.

Where any potential or actual conflict of interest relates to some aspect of the agenda of a meeting, it will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

Other disclosures of interests will be recorded in a secure register maintained by the Chief Executive and updated annually.

16.3.4. Undeclared Conflicts of Interest

If any UNZ office holder, committee member or staff member is aware of any undeclared conflict of interest, they have a responsibility to declare it under the protection of the Protected Disclosures Act 2000 and Universities New Zealand's Protected Disclosures Policy. Disclosure of the conflict of interest should be made to the Chair of Universities New Zealand, the Chair of the committee, or the Chief Executive as appropriate.

16.4. Conflict of interest procedures

16.4.1 Meeting procedures

At the start of any meeting where decisions are to be made, those involved will be asked to declare any actual or potential conflicts of interest regarding any matters on the agenda. Any conflicts of interest advised to the meeting will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

These procedures apply specifically to the following meetings and committees but are not limited to those meetings and committees:

- Vice-Chancellors' meetings
- Joint meetings of Chancellors and Vice-Chancellors
- Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP)
- Scholarships Committee and scholarships selection committees.

At the discretion of the Chair of the meeting, the member having declared a conflict of interest may be permitted to remain for the discussion of the matter to which the conflict applies.

There are some instances where members of a committee or working group are asked to make decisions via an email (or equivalent) process. The person coordinating the decision-making process (usually the Chair of the committee or a Universities New Zealand staff member) will include in the email (or equivalent) a request for those involved in decision making to declare actual or potential conflicts of interest.

16.4.2 Procurement procedures

Before UNZ starts any formal procurement process for services or goods (involving Expressions of Interest, Requests for Proposal, tenders, or Quotes with a value of more than \$20,000), office holders, committee members and staff in a position of decision-making or influence over the procurement of the services or goods will be asked to declare any conflicts of interest applying to the procurement of the services or goods. Any conflicts of interest will be recorded in UNZ's Conflicts of Interest register.

At the discretion of the Chair of UNZ, the person having declared a conflict of interest may be permitted to continue their involvement in the procurement of the services or goods to which the conflict applies.

16.5. Administration

The Chief Executive is responsible for the interpretation and revision of this policy and for maintaining the Conflicts of Interest register. The policy will be reviewed by August 2026.

Policy adopted April 2014, reviewed June 2017 and August 2020

17. Appendix K:

Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA)

The Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA) was established in 1993 by the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee to maintain and enhance the quality of the academic activities of universities.

Independence of AQA

AQA's governing Board is appointed by the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC). NZVCC approves the Constitution of AQA, which is operationally independent of NZVCC and Universities New Zealand-Te Pōkai Tara. The functions of the AQA Board include appointing the director of AQA, receiving and approving the release of quality assurance reports, and ensuring that the process of quality assurance will produce reliable reports that reflect an independent judgement and are perceived as authoritative, rigorous, fair and perceptive. Neither NZVCC, Universities New Zealand-Te Pōkai Tara nor the individual Vice-Chancellors have authority to amend quality assurance process or the content of quality assurance reports or otherwise direct the operations of AQA.

Purpose

The purpose of AQA is to contribute to the advancement of New Zealand university education by:

- engaging as a leader and advocate in the development of academic quality
- applying quality assurance and quality enhancement processes that assist universities in improving student engagement, academic experience and learning outcomes; and
- supporting confidence in the academic quality of New Zealand universities.

Terms of reference

AQA will:

- acknowledge the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi
- maintain consistency with international expectations, standards and developments in external quality assurance
- advise the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee and Universities New Zealand on quality assurance matters
- reflect areas of importance to universities with respect to their teaching, learning, student experience and student outcomes activities
- undertake quality assurance reviews (currently in the form of an academic audit) that are robust, fair and perceptive and that assist universities and their students
- acknowledge and respect the individual contexts of universities in undertaking quality assurance reviews
- make provision for appeals regarding the content of a quality assurance review
- publish quality assurance reviews of universities
- identify and promote good practice in quality assurance and enhancement
- support the contribution of an effective student voice in quality assurance and enhancement
- recognise other accountabilities and responsibilities of universities
- maintain a constructive relationship with the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) that recognises the responsibilities of CUAP and AQA
- contribute to the development of quality assurance in New Zealand and internationally
- undertake contract work as is compatible with its purpose and terms of reference.

Participation by all New Zealand universities

All New Zealand universities have undertaken to participate in supporting the existence of AQA and to participate in academic quality assurance activities. The scope of AQA's operation may not be extended without the consent of NZVCC.

Academic audits and auditors

AQA undertakes periodic external quality assurance reviews, currently in the form of an academic audit, of New Zealand universities. The period between academic audits in Cycles 5 and 6 will be up to eight years for an individual university. Academic audits are carried out by panels of peers and include a student, or recent graduate. Auditors appointed to audit New Zealand universities are individuals who have been identified by AQA as meeting specific criteria pertaining to academic audit of a university. Auditors are most commonly senior academics or other professionals experienced in quality assurance who have been trained as academic auditors either by AQA or by another quality assurance body. All AQA audit panels include at least one overseas auditor.

Reporting of audit findings

AQA academic audit reports are public documents and are available from the AQA website. Before publication, the university that has been audited may appeal against the content of the audit report on grounds of a failure of audit process or where, in its opinion, a conclusion is not adequately supported by evidence. Universities are required to respond to audit recommendations in their 12-month follow-up report to the AQA Board, in a mid-cycle report and in the subsequent audit cycle.

International quality assurance principles

In its procedures, AQA bases its operations on the concepts of quality management systems and quality auditing as defined by the International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO), paying attention to both process and outcomes. AQA is a full member of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) and has been assessed as meeting its Guidelines of Good Practice in Quality Assurance. AQA is also a full member of the Asia-Pacific Quality Network (APQN). AQA is itself subject to regular external review (to date, in 1997, 2001, 2009 and 2015).

Relationship with the Committee on University Academic Programmes

AQA recognises that one quality assurance mechanism which is used by all New Zealand universities is the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP). AQA and CUAP recognise the importance of effective communication and a constructive relationship with each other on the one hand, and recognition of the different responsibilities of CUAP and AQA on the other.

Contact for information

For more information, including AQA's audit framework and Audit Handbook, audit reports, constitution, appeals process, current Board composition and the AQA Register of Auditors and Reviewers, please refer to the AQA website:
www.aqa.ac.nz.

Level 9, 142 Lambton Quay
P O Box 5787
Wellington 6140
P. 64 4 801 7925
E. director@aqac.ac.nz



Universities New Zealand – Te Pōkai Tara

Level 9, 142 Lambton Quay | PO Box 860

Wellington 6140 | New Zealand

P. 64 4 381 8500

E. cuap@universitiesnz.ac.nz

www.universitiesnz.ac.nz