# GRADUATING YEAR REVIEW PROCEDURES

Contents:


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


© This Policy is the property of Massey University

## 1. Introduction:

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

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

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

## 2. Process Overview:

- The qualification / specialisation coordinator (or equivalent) conducts a self-review critically analysing the qualification / specialisation in relation to the original CUAP proposal and GYR requirements.
- A GYR Panel, comprising of experts external to the qualification / specialisation, is appointed and conducts the GYR using the self-review document, the original CUAP proposal, student enrolment and completion numbers, reports of any other reviews on the qualification / specialisation, the aggregated results of any applicable student surveys and any other relevant documentation.
- The GYR Panel x

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

## 4. Process Details :

4.1 Schedule:

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

4.2 Data:

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

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

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

Review Outcomes

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

(Massey University only requirement: Include Maori and Pasifika professional organisations and communities, with

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

(b) Appropriate institutional review processes have been followed to an acceptable standard.

(c) Criteria 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been met satisfactorily, namely:

i. The adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole course.

ii. The adequacy and appropriateness of delivery and learning methods, for all modes of delivery, given the stated learning outcomes.

iii. The acceptability of the course to the relevant academic, industrial, professional and other committees in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure.

iv. The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations that specify requirements for admissions, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning. Course length and structure, integration of practical/work-based components, assessment procedures, and normal progression within a programme.

(d) The targets stated in the origina

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

4.8 Peer Review

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

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

4.9 Deferrals:

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

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

Deferrals will be considered on the following grounds:

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

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

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

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

4.10 General:

A timeline is attached as Appendix F.

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

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

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

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

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

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

(b) Assessment procedures and student performance
(Provide a statement on the ongoing appropriat( -1.174 T(nc)-26xof( or)-2(g ( ) 1.217 0 (n)11(6x or)-2s)9( )11( [(A 1

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

Massey University Policy Guide

# Graduating Year Review Procedures

## Committee on University Academic Programmes Graduating Year Review Requirements and Information

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

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

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

The Graduating Year (s)-33.651 MCID 13 <</MCID 13>>BDC BT/F1 14 Tf 1 0 0 1 56.811 [(1)-12(2)-14(.)]TJ 0.01(unn)-12(g oE11( )-12(udem)-24

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

iv. The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations that specify requirements for admissions, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning. Course length and structure, integration of practical/work-based components, assessment procedures, and normal progression within a programme.

d. The targets stated in the original CUAP proposal have been met and, if not, the university states the actions to be taken.

e. Any concerns raised by CUAP at the point of approval, and any required changes, have been adequately addressed.

Deferral or Programme N ot Offered

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

i. The programme either has not yet been offered or was first offered at a later date than first envisaged

ii. All or most enrolments are part-time and there have been no completions by the time the report is due

iii. The due date for the Graduating Year Review precedes or coincides with a scheduled departmental or programme review

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

If a programme has not been offered, or has attracted no enrolments, in the five years following its introduction, it should be re-submitted to CUAP (as in Seecedesment [(f)-13()-1(t)-1(d2 Ty22(S)2 Tc 0.122 6( h 6( h 10(P)246n)2(eec)0 ei)

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

Outcomes

CUAP may,

1. a. Accept the review report.

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

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

2. Require one further report after a specified time in response to concerns about the programme specified by the committee.

3. Establish a review panel to report to the committee on specified issues. The processes on review panels set out in section 5.7.4 of this booklet would be followed.

4. Withdraw approval where there are reasonable grounds for doing so after considering reports generated during either outcome 2 or outcome 3 above. The offering university would be given an opportunity to comment further prior to withdrawal of approval, and Universities New Zealand would be consulted in advance. The effect of such a decision would be that no new students could be enrolled for the qualification. The university concerned and the committee would negotiate agreed transition arrangements to protect the interests of students already enrolled. The qualification could be reinstated only through successful completion of a fresh Round One or Round Two proposal.'

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

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

GYR Procedures Appendix C

## Review Panel Guide for Report s

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

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

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

Considerations :
Are the following adequate and appropriate?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What is your evaluation of the programme?
Recommendations / Commendations:
Does the Review Panel agree with any recommendations made in the self-review?

What additional recommendations does the Review Panel have to make?

What commendations does the Review Panel have to make?

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

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

© This Policy is the property of Massey University

# Sample Graduating Year Review Defer ral Request

To: Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic & International)

From: College of XX

Date: 1 June 2012

Subject: Request to D efer Graduating Year Review for the Bachelor of University Studies

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

Bachelor of University Studies

Period of deferral: 1 year

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

OR
ORROR

© This Policy is the property of Massey University