Approval of Programmes Procedures

Contents

1.   PURPOSE

These procedures support the Programme Approval Policy.

2.   SCOPE

These procedures apply to all proposals for new programmes, including new major subjects, and cover the steps from initial authorisation to final approval. They also include the steps necessary for the approval of major and minor changes to programmes.

3.   DEFINITIONS

Definitions can be found here.

4.   ACTIONS

Authorisation to develop a new programme[1]

1. The initiator of the development prepares a Concept Proposal for each new qualification or new major subject. The draft Concept Proposal is sent to the Strategy and Planning office by the Faculty. Strategy and Planning (S&P) will undertake a survey/analysis and will provide information on other universities' offerings, apparent growth, international potential, outlooks for graduates etc. S&P will contact the initiator to seek clarification if required. Early submission to S&P is encouraged as a minimum of one month (unless by prior arrangement with S&P) is required to research a proposal and provide commentary.

2. The Head of School provides comment on the proposal including input from S&P and forwards it to the Board of Studies for discussion and endorsement. The Board of Studies forwards the proposal to Faculty Board for discussion and endorsement.

3. Faculty Registrars submit to the Academic Quality Office (AQO) the completed concept proposals including input from S&P for each new qualification or major subject being proposed for approval in the following year.

4. The Faculty Registrar is responsible for ensuring the concept proposal documentation is complete, and that the documents have been moderated by them and have gone through the appropriate internal faculty approval before submitting proposals to the AQO.

5. The AQO will forward to APSG members the proposals to be considered in the light of the University's academic direction. The outcome is that the proposal is:

    a) authorised for development; or
    b) authorised for development with further actions suggested; or
    c) not authorised for development.

6. The AQO will provide a record of the outcomes, indicating which proposals have been authorised for development, which require further discussion prior to being authorised and which have not been authorised for development. The outcomes as recorded in the record of the APSG electronic process will be circulated to members, Academic Board, the Deans and Faculty Registrars. The Faculty Registrars will communicate with the initiators of proposals, relevant Heads of School and Boards of Studies.

7. Where any proposals have significant funding implications, the Faculty Registrar should liaise with the Strategy and Planning Office on a submission to TEC.

---

[1] Refer to Appendix 1 for an overview for the authorisation and approval processes.

8. The Strategy and Planning Office is responsible for including programmes authorised for development in the University's Investment Plan.

Approval process

9. The AQO will publish an annual timeline for programme approval processes, including meeting dates for the Programme Approval and Review Committee (PARC) to consider reports from approval panels.

10. Early in the year, faculty registrars / faculty nominees will indicate to the AQO which of their authorised proposals will be submitted for approval to each of the two CUAP rounds (Round 1 or Round 2).

Where a programme is scheduled for review within the next 1-2 years, and new developments or significant changes are being considered, the review should occur before they are finalised so that it informs the process. Reviews can be brought forward to accommodate this.

11. Approval of new qualifications and major subjects involves:

- APSG authorisation to develop
- preparation of the two-part CUAP proposal as per the guidelines for Types 1-5 proposals in *Programme Approval Guidelines: Developing CUAP Proposals*
- checking by the Faculty that the proposal is ready for submission to a panel
- evaluation of the proposal by a panel, with a view to ensuring that
  ~ the gazetted criteria for programme approval have been addressed (see Appendix 3)
  ~ the proposal is academically coherent
  ~ the needs of stakeholders will be met by the proposed programme or major subject
  ~ the proposal is consistent with the University's strategic objectives
- preparation of a report by the panel
- comments by the developers on matters of fact in the draft report
- submission of a report and the revised proposal to PARC
- recommendation to Academic Board
- submission of Sections A and B of the proposal to the AQO
- submission of Section A to CUAP
- the CUAP peer review process
- approval by CUAP
- where relevant, approval and/or accreditation by the appropriate professional body

For new qualifications, the process also involves approval by the relevant authority for government funding.

12. The faculty registrar/faculty nominee is responsible for ensuring the documentation for all proposals is appropriately collated and complete, and that the documents have been moderated by them and have gone through the internal faculty committee(s) before being disseminated to the approval panel members.

13. An approval panel meets to evaluate the proposal against specified criteria (see Appendix 3) and prepares a report with recommendations and suggestions for improvement of the proposal. (See below for details about the panel membership, procedure and report.)

14. Where a Faculty wishes to introduce:
    - *a postgraduate diploma, postgraduate certificate, graduate diploma or graduate certificate in a subject where the University already has an established master's or bachelor's honours programme*,
    - *a certificate or diploma in a subject where the University already has an established bachelor's degree*,

      and in each case *the new qualification draws on existing courses*,
    - *or a minor subject in an undergraduate degree only when the university has an established major in that subject*

      the following processes will apply:

15. The faculty registrar/faculty nominee will prepare a report for CUAP in accordance with the guidelines in the *CUAP Handbook*, and submit this to the AQO for inclusion in the next PARC agenda. These types of proposal can be submitted to CUAP at any time.

16. Where there are fewer than two other New Zealand universities providing equivalent qualifications to the one(s) being proposed, a faculty provides the names of at least two potential external academic reviewers whose names can be forwarded to CUAP at the time the proposal is presented. Requirements concerning reviewers and the review process are clearly outlined in the *CUAP Handbook.*

Panel membership

17. The membership of each approval panel should be appropriate to the proposal(s) under consideration.

    AUT members include

    - Chair (a member of PARC or AUT staff member with experience as a Chair and who is external to the Faculty which has developed the proposal)
    - Second panel member – a senior academic staff member external to the discipline of the proposal
      Note: At least one of the members above must have experience in teaching on a similar level of programme.

18. The AQO in consultation with faculty registrars/faculty nominees appoints PARC members or PARC-nominated AUT staff members as Chair and second person.

    External members include

    - At least one academic representative external to the University who is actively engaged in the teaching of a programme in the same or a similar field of study. For a postgraduate qualification, panel members must be from a university and hold a doctoral qualification in a related field.
    - Representative(s) from industry, commerce, the profession or community where the graduates are likely to find employment.

19. Two external members is the minimum number required. More often, depending on the level of the programme, more than one external academic will be required. For honours, one-year research masters or doctorates there is no requirement to have a representative from industry. In these cases, more than one external academic is required.

The faculty registrar / faculty nominee submits a short biography of the external members to the AQO. The panel membership is to be decided in consultation with the AQO with due regard to the nature and scope of the proposal, academic and other relevant expertise of panel members and their independence from the programme.

Approval panel procedure

20. The procedure adopted by the approval panel depends upon the nature of the programme being proposed but will <u>always</u> include:

   - Consideration of Sections A and B of a CUAP proposal document and associated documentation
   - Meeting with the programme developers
   - Determination of key findings and outcomes in the form of recommendations and suggestions as appropriate for the enhancement of the proposal, and in some cases, requirements to address fundamental issues in a proposal.

21. In addition, if issues are identified that need wider discussion, the panel may meet with senior administrative staff including Heads of School or Department.

22. A report writer will attend the approval event to take notes and write the first draft of the report for the Panel Chair (see Appendix 5).

Panel report

23. The Panel may identify **requirements** which must be attended to prior to Academic Board approval. There are two types of requirements:

   - requirements which relate to the substance of the proposal and are fundamental to the quality of the programme
   - requirements relating to documentation (e.g. the library impact report)

24. Requirements and the amended proposal must be signed off by the Panel Chair before the PARC Chair can forward to Academic Board the recommendation for approval and submission to CUAP.

25. The Panel may also make **recommendations** which are matters which are important to the quality of the proposal. They enhance the quality of the proposal. Recommendations are considered by the proposal developers for incorporation into the CUAP proposal as appropriate.

26. The Panel may also make **suggestions** which the development team may or may not act on. Suggestions are defined as matters which are desirable, but not essential. They are considered by the proposal developers for incorporation into the CUAP proposal as appropriate.

27. Names, titles and the positions of panel members are to be included in all reports.

28. All editorial changes will be placed in a separate section at the end of the report.

29. The Chair forwards the final draft to the faculty registrar/faculty nominee to check the report for factual accuracy.

30. The full committee of PARC considers the report together with any requirements, recommendations and suggestions for improvement of the proposal, and the proposal itself, which should normally have been revised prior to the meeting. Any changes to the proposal resulting from the meeting are to be made by the faculty before submitting the final version to the AQO.

31. Where a report includes requirements, these and the amended proposal must be signed off by the Panel Chair prior to the proposal being recommended by PARC to Academic Board for submission to CUAP.

32. The AQO will specify a date by which faculty registrars / faculty nominees must forward finalised proposals for submission to CUAP.

33. The process for peer review via CUAP is described in the current edition of the *CUAP Handbook.*

Links between programme approval and professional accreditation

34. Some programmes are accredited by professional bodies, for example the Teaching Council New Zealand, the Nursing Council of New Zealand, or the Engineering New Zealand. The relationship of accreditation processes to the approval process varies between professional bodies, with some requiring up-front approval and accreditation, and others not accrediting until after the programme has produced its first graduates. The AQO will provide advice on appropriate procedures in specific instances if required.

Reimbursement of external panel expenses

35. AUT is responsible for reimbursing all reasonable travelling and incidental expenses incurred by external panel members. This is handled by the department/school concerned, which also makes all travel arrangements where these are needed. AUT's financial procedures require all reimbursements to be supported by receipts.

Approval of major changes to programmes

36. Major changes are defined in the Policy for the Approval of Programmes as:

    - Substantial changes to the structure, e.g. duration / EFTS / points value, regulations for progression within a programme [including any changes to compulsory elements], balance between levels of courses required for completion of the programme, or the quantum of courses required for a major [i.e. total number of points] (CUAP Type 6)
    - Changes to the entry requirements for a programme (CUAP Type 7)
    - Changes to regulations relating to admission to the University (CUAP Type 7)
    - Changes to the title of a qualification, programme or major subject (CUAP Type 8)
    - Significant changes to the programme's recognition of prior learning regulations (CUAP Type 9)
    - Deletion of an entire qualification, programme or major subject (CUAP requires notification only)

37. Where substantial structural changes are planned, it may be appropriate to submit these to a panel for review, following the same processes as proposals for new programmes. Faculty registrars / faculty nominees will indicate to the AQO the nature of these changes when they notify their CUAP proposals early in the year (see paragraph 12 above).

38. Proposals for major changes are submitted to PARC at a meeting designated for this purpose.

39. Major changes are submitted to CUAP in the formats outlined in the *CUAP Handbook.*

40. In addition, changes to the duration and/or EFTS value of a qualification require approval by TEC.

Approval of minor changes to programmes

41. Minor changes are defined in the Policy for the Approval of Programmes as being of two types – those that faculty boards approve, and those that boards of studies approve.

42. Faculty boards approve

- addition of new courses within current offerings[2]
- deletion of courses within current offerings[2]
- additions or deletions of pre-requisites/co-requisites to individual courses
- regulation changes which do not affect the structure of the programme in a substantial way
- changes to the sequencing of existing major subjects
- any other changes to be published in the Calendar

43. Boards of studies approve changes to:

- assessments
- content of courses
- criteria for recognition of prior learning
- significant changes to the method of delivery

44. Changes that affect the regulations and tables in the Calendar are submitted to the AQO by a date to be agreed annually.

5. RESPONSIBILITIES

Faculties are responsible for providing concept proposals and CUAP proposals for new programmes in accordance with these procedures.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor is responsible for the authorisation of new programmes for development. This responsibility is currently discharged through the Academic Planning Sub-group, which makes recommendations to Academic Board and the Executive Management Team of the University.

The Strategy and Planning Office is responsible for the inclusion of authorised programmes in the University's Investment Plan.

The AQO is responsible for administering the authorisation and approval processes for new programmes on behalf of the University.

PARC is responsible for convening panels to evaluate proposals for new programmes against specified criteria and making recommendations to Academic Board for proposals to be submitted to CUAP.

Academic Board is responsible for approving proposals for submission to CUAP.

The Academic Director has overall responsibility for these procedures.

---

[2] Except where this involves compulsory courses or significant numbers of courses, in which case it may be classed as a major change and require a CUAP proposal (Type 6).

6. POLICY BASE

Education Act 1989
General Academic Statute
Approval of Programmes Policy

7. ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS

Appendix 1: Approval of new programmes (flowcharts for 2-stage approval process)
Appendix 2: Checklist for academic developments
Appendix 3: Responsibilities of staff and panel members involved in approvals
Appendix 4: Approval panel report format

Appendix 1: Approval of new programmes (flowcharts for 2-stage approval process)

	STAGE ONE: CONCEPT PROPOSAL (CP)

Faculty	Developer drafts CP. Faculty submits to Strategy and Planning

Strategy and Planning	Strategy and Planning undertakes analysis and provides commentary to Faculty	⟷	Strategy and Planning will liaise with the initiator where necessary.

Faculty	Faculty considers CP and Strategy and Planning analysis

Faculty sends CP to AQO

Academic Quality Office	AQO collates CPs and submits to APSG for authorisation

Academic Planning Subgroup	APSG considers CPs for development

APSG **authorises** development

APSG **declines** authorisation

Academic Board	APSG forwards list of authorised proposals to Academic Board for information

Faculty	Developer prepares CUAP proposal

STAGE TWO : FULL PROPOSAL

AUT or *External Body*		Approval Timeline

Faculty → Faculty develops full proposal (CUAP format Sections A & B) [1]
Round 1: Nov – Feb
Round 2: Mar - May

Faculty Board/ SCRAP/LTC/BOS → Full proposal considered by Faculty
Round 1: Jan/Feb
Round 2: Apr/May

Panel convened by PARC → Panel considers full proposal
Round 1: Feb
Round 2: May

PARC → PARC considers Panel Report with full proposal
Round 1: Early Apr
Round 2: Early July

PARC Chair → PARC Chair notifies Faculty of requirements, recommendations and suggestions to improve the proposal
Round 1: Early Apr
Round 2: Early July

Faculty → Faculty addresses any requirements and forwards amended proposal to Panel Chair
Round 1: Mid Apr
Round 2: Mid July

Panel Chair → Requirements not met | Requirements met & signed off by Panel Chair. PARC chair notified

PARC Chair → Faculty Registrar/Faculty nominee forwards finalised proposal (Sections A&B) to AQO
Round 1: Mid Apr
Round 2: Mid July

Academic Board → PARC Chair forwards recommendation to Academic Board for approval to submit to CUAP
Round 1: Late April
Round 2: Late July

Faculty Registrar/ Faculty nominee → **Not approved** by Academic Board | **Approved** by Academic Board
Round 1: Late April
Round 2: Late July

AQO → AQO forwards proposal to CUAP
Round 1: End April
Round 2: End July

Other universities → CUAP peer review process
Round 1: May - June
Round 2: Aug - Sept

CUAP → **Approved** by CUAP | **Not approved** by CUAP
Round 1: July
Round 2: October

AQO
Faculty → AQO informs Faculty, Marketing, International. Faculty develops and actions implementation plan | For process for CUAP decisions other than unconditional approval, see CUAP Handbook

[1] Faculty programme development teams will need to have gathered evidence of consultation during the Concept Proposal stage. This can inform parts of the Full Proposal (Section A4 etc).

Appendix 2: Checklist for academic developments

ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENTS: WHAT GOES WHERE?

Academic Development	Concept proposal	TEC approval via Investment Plan	Faculty Board approval	PARC Panel	PARC approval	Academic Board approval	CUAP approval	Documentation required
Introduction of new programme (including any that are the property of an overseas institution)	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	Type 1 proposal: Sections A & B
Introduction of new major subject / specialisation	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	♦	Type 2 proposal: Sections A & B
Introduction of a minor subject where there is no established major in the subject.	♦		♦		♦	♦	♦	Type 3 proposal Sections A & B
Introduction of an endorsement when the concentration of study is 40% or greater and the endorsement is stated on the graduation certificate.			♦		♦	♦	♦	Type 4 proposal Sections A & B
Introduction of a new conjoint programme	flag only	♦	♦		♦	♦	♦	Type 5 proposal: Sections A & B
Substantial changes to the structure, e.g. duration / EFTS / points value, regulations for progression within a programme [including any changes to compulsory elements], balance between levels of courses required for completion of the programme, or the quantum of courses required for a major [i.e. total number of points].			♦		♦	♦	♦	Type 6 proposal
Changes to the entry requirements for a programme OR to regulations relating to admission to the university			♦		♦	♦	♦	Type 7 proposal
Change in the name of a programme or major subject /specialisation		♦	♦		♦	♦	♦	Type 8 proposal
Significant changes to RPL or exemption arrangements falling outside arrangements that are currently in place			♦		♦	♦	♦	Type 9 proposal
Introduction of a postgraduate diploma, postgraduate certificate, graduate diploma or graduate certificate in a subject where the University already has an established master's or bachelor's honours programme, or introduction of a certificate or diploma in a subject where the University already has an established bachelor's degree, and in each case the new programme draws on existing courses.		♦	Section A required ♦		♦	♦	♦ Report only	Use Section A as per Type 1 proposal above for internal approval, then Report Template (PA5) for CUAP

Academic Development	Concept proposal	TEC approval via Investment Plan	Faculty Board approval	PARC Panel	PARC approval	Academic Board approval	CUAP approval	Documentation required
Introduction of a minor subject in an undergraduate degree when the University has an established major in that subject.			♦		♦	♦	♦	Use Report Templates PA7 and PA8
Deletion of entire programmes or subjects		♦ Prog only	♦		♦	♦	♦ Report only	Use Report Template (PA6)
Addition of new courses within current offerings **** Note – where this involves compulsory courses or significant numbers of courses it will be classed as a major change and require a Type 6 proposal.**			♦		◊	◊	◊	Included in BoS report to Faculty Board where not significant. Type 6 proposal in other cases
Deletion of courses within current offerings **** As above for compulsory courses or significant numbers of courses**			♦		◊	◊	◊	Included in BoS report to Faculty Board where not significant. Type 6 proposal in other cases
Additions or deletions to prerequisites/corequisites to individual courses			♦					Included in BoS report to Faculty Board
Changes to prescriptors			BoS only					Included in BoS report to Faculty Board
Minor adjustments to regulations			♦					Included in BoS report to Faculty Board and forwarded to AQO for Calendar
Changes to the content or sequencing of existing majors			♦					Included in BoS report to Faculty Board
Regulation changes which do not affect the structure of the programme in a substantial way			♦					Included in BoS report to Faculty Board
Changes to content of courses			BoS only					

Appendix 3: Responsibilities of staff and panel members involved in approvals

1. The **faculty registrar** (or nominee) is normally responsible for:

   - Submitting to the AQO early in the year a list of Types 1-5 proposals which will be coming through for consideration in Round 1 and Round 2 of the approval process
   - Forwarding to the Academic Director brief bios of potential panel members (2 academic and 2 industry) for each proposal for approval
   - Providing assistance and guidance to programme developers in preparing proposals, including ensuring that the University's conventions on the naming of qualifications have been followed
   - Liaising with panel members and the AQO to set a date for the panel meeting
   - Liaising with the panel chair (usually a PARC member) about the timetable for the day
   - Forwarding the following to the approval panel members no later than 7 working days before the meeting:
     ~ Covering letter, confirming date, time and venue
     ~ Agenda
     ~ Map of campus, if necessary
     ~ Proposal Sections A and B (with appendices)
     ~ *Approval Panel Information*
     ~ Copies to head of school, programme leader and other AUT staff as appropriate
   - Receiving the draft report from the panel chair and, in consultation with the proposal developers, checking for any factual errors
   - Liaising with proposal developers to ensure the panel's requirements are met and/or their recommendations addressed
   - Obtaining a response from the proposal developers to any requirements attached to the panel report
   - If required, coordinating a faculty response to the report for consideration by PARC, and speaking to this at the PARC meeting
   - Forwarding the revised Sections A and B to the AQO for the PARC agenda
   - Forwarding the finalised proposal (Sections A and B) to the AQO for forwarding to CUAP

2. The **school / department** (head of school or nominee, programme developer) in which the programme resides is normally responsible for:

   - Preparing Sections A and B of the proposal
   - Liaising with the faculty registrar/faculty nominee in order to identify external representatives on the panel
   - Sending the proposal (Sections A & B) to the faculty registrar/faculty nominee at least 10 working days before the approval panel is scheduled to convene
   - Arranging a venue
   - Making travel, parking and accommodation arrangements if required for external panel members
   - Organising appropriate refreshments
   - Providing electronic and hard copies of final approved documentation to the faculty registrar/faculty nominee by the stipulated dates

3. The **external academic** is normally responsible for:

- *At the meeting*: providing input as a discipline expert (and not as a representative of his/her particular university)

4. The **representative for industry/business/the profession** is normally responsible for:

- *At the meeting*: providing input from the perspective of a prospective employer of the programme's graduates (and not as a representative of his/her particular business)

   Note: external panel members will be given the opportunity to complete an evaluation of the approval process. A form will be posted after the panel has met.

5. The *AUT second panel member* is normally responsible for:

- *At the meeting*: providing input as someone who is familiar with AUT's programmes, policies and strategic directions
- Acting as a back-up to lead discussion on the proposal at the PARC meeting if necessary

6. The **approval panel chair** is normally responsible for:

   Prior to the day
- Agreeing the timetable for the day with the faculty registrar/faculty nominee
- Requesting any extra information that may be needed
- Meeting with the AUT second panel member prior to the panel meeting to discuss the proposal (if necessary)

   On the day
- Introductions and clarifying roles
- Clarifying the purpose of the process
- Keeping the team on task and timekeeping
- Managing the groups that participate in the approval process
- Ensuring that all the appropriate criteria are covered in the course of the panel approval process
- Facilitating discussion by the team to get agreement as to findings for the report
- Leading the verbal reporting back to the programme development team
- Thanking the approval panel

   After the day
- Receiving and reviewing the first draft of the panel's report written by the report writer
- Sending the draft report to the faculty registrar / faculty nominee, head of school / programme development team for checking for factual errors
- Preparing the final version of the written report and forwarding this to the Faculty and AQO for inclusion in the PARC agenda
- Leading discussion on the proposal at the PARC meeting
- Signing off on any requirements identified before the recommendation for approval and forwarding to CUAP can proceed to Academic Board

7. The **PARC Chair** is responsible for:

- Ensuring that the full meeting of PARC considers the Panel requirements,

recommendations and suggestions together with any submissions from the faculty pertaining to the panel report

- Formulating an appropriate recommendation to Academic Board for approval and forwarding to CUAP

8. The **<u>Proposal Developer</u>** is normally responsible for:

- Ensuring any requirements have been signed off by the panel chair before the recommendation for approval is forwarded to Academic Board
- Considering and implementing any requirements and recommendations in discussion with the faculty registrar/faculty nominee and, where necessary, formulating a response to PARC

Appendix 4: Approval panel report template

PARC Approval Panel Report (for CUAP proposals)

Type of proposal:

Name of subject area:

Qualification involved:

Mode of attendance/
Delivery options:

Faculty:

Programme developers:

Panel date:

Panel members:

[Name]   [Designation]
                                          [Role on Panel]

Report writer: [Name]

Acknowledgements

Summary and General Comments

Overall Recommendations to PARC

THAT the proposal for the introduction of the new [qualification or subject name] be approved for submission to Round [N] of CUAP [year], [subject to any requirements being signed off by the Panel Chair] and THAT the following recommendations and suggestions be considered by the programme developers for incorporation into the CUAP proposal as appropriate.

Summary of Requirements, Recommendations and Suggestions

Requirements

Requirements must be attended to and signed off by the panel Chair before the proposal can be forwarded for approval to PARC and then Academic Board prior to submission to CUAP.

Recommendations

Recommendations are matters which are important but not fundamental to the proposal and enhance the quality of the programme. These are monitored by Faculty Board.

Suggestions

To be considered by the programme developers and included in the proposal as appropriate.

Specific Comments: Section A

Name of New Qualification/New Subject

Page reference in AUT Calendar of year of submission

A1   Purpose of proposal

A2   Justification

A3   Qualification

A4   Acceptability of the programme and consultation

A5   Te Tiriti o Waitangi

A6   Goals of the programme

A7   Outcome statement

A8   Graduate profile

A9   Programme overview

A10   Proposed regulations

A11   Proposed teaching/delivery methods

A12   Prescriptions for courses

A13   Assessment and moderation procedures

A14   Resources

A15   Plans for monitoring the programme

A16   Review of the programme

Academic Procedure No: Apr-AP-01
Prepared by: Academic Quality Office
Updated: 5 October 2021   Page | 18

A17   Statement re Section B

If the programme is new:

i)   EFTS value

ii)   Statement re funding

iii)   Information about the Agreement

Specific Comments: Section B

Editorial Comments/Suggestions

Section A

Section B