



***Approval and Accreditation of courses leading to
Degrees and related qualifications***

CONTENTS

	<i>Page no.</i>
<i>Contents</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Definitions/Glossary</i>	<i>3</i>
1 Introduction	5
2 Gazetted criteria and requirements for course approval and accreditation	9
3 Gazetted criteria and requirements for course approval	14
4 Gazetted criteria and requirements for accreditation	17
5 Special Issues	21
5.1 Course and Qualification Titles	22
5.2 Credit Recognition and Transfer	23
5.3 Conjoint/Double Degrees	24
5.4 Unit Standards Based Degrees	24
5.5 Research: Definition	25
5.6 Staff Engagement in Research	26
5.7 Collaborative Arrangements (Consortium / Jointly Awarded Degrees)	27
• Where the arrangement does not include a university	27
• Where at least one provider is a university and at least one provider is not a university	29
5.8 The Delivery and Awarding of Overseas Degrees in New Zealand	32
5.9 The Delivery and Awarding of New Zealand Qualifications Overseas	32
5.10 Use of Te reo Māori in assessment	34
5.11 Professional Accreditation	34
6 Application and Evaluation processes	35
7 Post-approval processes	41
7.1 Monitoring	41
7.2 Changes to Approved degree programmes	42

Definitions/Glossary

- **Academic audit:** A systematic and independent examination to determine whether a polytechnic's academic quality practices comply with identified academic quality standards, and whether these practices are effective in achieving those standards.
- **Academic quality standards:** Statements of quality practice defining the expected performance of polytechnics in specified areas of academic quality. (*Polytechnics are expected to adopt the ITP New Zealand Academic Quality Standards or other standards that are at least as rigorous.*)
- **Accreditation:** Process for ensuring that polytechnics have the capability, including management of quality, to deliver programmes based on unit standards registered on the Framework or deliver approved local programmes as defined in Section 259 of the Education Act 1989.
- **AMAP:** Accreditation and Moderation Action Plan
- **Conditions:** Conditions may be placed on approvals and/or accreditation under S258A and S259A of the Education Act 1989
- **Compliance Notice:** Compliance notices may be issued as set out in S255A of the Education Act 1989
- **Course/programme:** The term "course" is used in the Education Act, 1989 and the gazetted criteria. Courses are frequently referred to by providers as "programmes". "Course" is one of several words frequently used to refer to components of such a programme (along with "module", "unit" or "paper"). In order to remain consistent with legislation, these guidelines will use "course" to refer to a full programme of study rather than the components of that programme. Where only components of courses are addressed, this will be specified.
- **Course/programme Approval:** Process for ensuring that a polytechnic programme of study meets defined criteria for the purposes of Section 258 of the Education Act 1989.
- **Corrective action:** Action taken to resolve non-compliances
- **Evaluator:** Person appointed by ITP Quality to assess QMS documentation against the agreed criteria.
- **External Monitor:** Person appointed by ITP Quality to monitor the delivery of programmes approved and/or accredited by ITP Quality.
- **"Focus" Audit:** An external academic audit limited to the second ITP New Zealand Academic Quality Standard (Development of Qualifications and Educational Programmes). The process is described in the ITP Quality Academic Audit Processes and Guidelines ("Focus" Audits-Version 2) – 18 December 2000).
- **Group Accreditation:** Accreditation of a provider to offer a number of units in a specified field, sub-field or domain up to a specified level on the NQF.
- **ITO:** Industry Training Organisation
- **ITP:** Institute of Technology and Polytechnic
- **ITP New Zealand:** Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics in New Zealand
- **ITP Quality:** Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics Quality
- **MOE:** Ministry of Education
- **Monitoring:** Process for ensuring continuing conformity of programme provision and delivery with the requirements and criteria of accreditation for those providers accredited by ITP Quality.
- **Moderation:** Process for ensuring the consistency of assessment with the required standard.
- **NQF:** National Qualifications Framework
- **NZTC:** New Zealand Teachers Council
- **NZQA:** New Zealand Qualifications Authority
- **NSB:** National Standards Body
- **Panel:** A group of individuals selected by ITP Quality to evaluate programmes where appropriate, and capability for accreditation of providers.

- **Panel Chairperson:** person contracted by ITP Quality to lead and facilitate the accreditation and approval process, evaluate documentation, chair accreditation panels, and report with appropriate recommendations.
- **Panel Member:** Person appointed by ITP Quality to an accreditation panel to undertake an evaluation of documentation or a site visit to a polytechnic to evaluate programmes and the capacity of the polytechnic to teach programmes based on unit standards or national programme requirements against NZQA accreditation criteria and to make appropriate recommendations to ITP Quality.
- **Provisional Quality Assured:** ITP status awarded by ITP Quality for a period of 1 year
- **QAB:** Quality Assurance Body
- **QMS:** Quality Management System
- **Quality Assured:** ITP status awarded by ITP Quality for a period of 4 years
- **QSE:** Quality Systems Evaluator (contracted to ITP Quality)
- **SSB:** Standards Setting Bodies (includes NSB, ITO and NZQA Advisory Groups)
- **TEC:** Tertiary Education Commission

1 INTRODUCTION

All courses leading to degrees and related qualifications awarded in New Zealand must be approved.

This approval is conducted by the following bodies:

- the New Zealand Qualifications Authority;
- Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics Quality (ITP Quality), operating under the delegation from the Qualifications Authority to the ITP New Zealand (for degrees to level 7 offered by Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics); and
- the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) of the New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee (for degrees offered by universities).

Where reference is made to the Qualifications Authority in terms of its evaluation, approval and accreditation functions, this also refers to any Quality Assurance Body operating under delegation from the Qualifications Authority (eg ITP Quality). This document is identical to the document published by NZQA but has been changed to reflect that these guidelines are specifically for ITP Quality and the Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics.

In some circumstances, a course may also be subject to the requirements and processes of a professional body where that body is responsible for professional registration. Applicants should seek clarification of these requirements from the relevant professional bodies.

Scope

These requirements include:

- the criteria for approval and accreditation gazetted by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority pursuant to section 253 (3) of the Education Act 1989 following consultation as required by section 253 (2) of the Act;
- the requirements established by the Qualifications Authority to assist applicants and evaluators in respect of the approval and accreditation of courses leading to degrees or related qualifications (These include Bachelors and Masters degrees, Graduate Certificates and Diplomas and Post-graduate Certificates and Diplomas.);
- the requirements established by the Qualifications Authority to assist applicants and evaluators in respect of the approval and accreditation of courses leading to doctoral qualifications;
- requirements for monitoring of approved courses; and
- requirements for approval of changes to approved courses.

The categories of applications to which these criteria apply are:

- (a) All applications in respect of approval of courses and accreditation of organisations to deliver them.
- (b) All applications in respect of course approval only, where the course developer will not deliver the course.
- (c) All applications in respect of accreditation only, where the course has already received approval under (a) or (b) above.

Approval and accreditation in relation to courses other than degrees and related qualifications is addressed in a separate publication (www.itpq.ac.nz)

Terminology

The term “course” is used in the legislation and the gazetted criteria. This has been interpreted by the Qualifications Authority as “a programme of study, generally leading towards a recognised qualification”. Courses are frequently referred to by providers as “programmes” and “course” is one of several words frequently used to refer to components of such a programme (along with “module”, “unit” or “paper”). In order to remain consistent with legislation, these guidelines will use ‘course’ to refer to a full programme of study rather than the components of that programme.

Applicants for course approval and/or accreditation may use whatever terminology is current in their organization.

Approval and Accreditation

Approval is a confirmation that a course meets defined criteria as specified in these guidelines.

Accreditation is confirmation that an institution or registered provider has shown it is capable of delivering an approved course. Courses leading to degrees approved by ITP Quality may only be delivered by providers accredited to do so by ITP Quality.

Evaluation leading to accreditation considers the provider’s capacity to deliver a course and to sustain this delivery over time. Accreditation is required for each site that a course will be offered from and for each mode the course will be offered in. Mode refers to whether the delivery is face-to-face, distance, e-learning or a combination of these modes.

ITP Quality will accept applications for approval and accreditation or for accreditation to deliver a course leading to an approved degree or a related qualification from Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs).

In granting approval and/or accreditation, the Authority may establish conditions.

Treaty of Waitangi

The preamble to the gazetted criteria states that “It is expected that organisations will, in the development and delivery of courses, give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as expressed in their Charter, Profile or Quality Management Documents.” The effectiveness of this approach will be evaluated as the revised criteria are implemented in 2003/4. In order to assist with this evaluation, ITP Quality Evaluators will be asked to consider and express an opinion to ITP Quality on the contribution made by the course to the achievement of the Treaty of Waitangi commitments made in these documents.

Discipline Specific Requirements

Some disciplines have additional requirements, or discipline-specific interpretations of the gazetted criteria that are negotiated between the Qualifications Authority/ITP Quality and the relevant professional or sector group.

New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications

Where the qualification awarded on the basis of successful completion of an approved course meets all relevant criteria, the qualification will be included on the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications (the Register).

Monitoring

The management and delivery of approved degrees is subject to on-going monitoring by ITP Quality. Degree providers and organisations responsible for approved degrees are required to make an annual report to ITP Quality. ITP Quality appoints a monitor to visit and report on each course at least once a year for the first 2-3 years of delivery of the course. Please refer to Section 7.1 for a full description of the monitoring procedures.

Changes to approved degrees

All courses will change as a result of on-going quality management and improvement. Changes to approved degrees must, in certain circumstances, be approved by ITP Quality. These guidelines set out the categories of changes to approved degrees and the level of approval required by ITP Quality (see Section 7.2).

Unit standards based degrees

In addition to course approval and accreditation, organisations wishing to deliver degrees based on unit standards from the National Qualifications Framework must also meet all the requirements for accreditation to assess against the unit standards, including the requirements of the relevant Accreditation and Moderation Action Plans for the scope of unit standards covered by the course.

Period of Approval

Under section 258(7) of the Education Act, 1989 approval may be granted to a course without limitation as to time or for a specified period.

Irrespective of any specified period, on-going approval of courses and accreditation for their delivery is conditional on a provider demonstrating that the course, and its deliver, continue to meet the criteria. This is determined as an integral part of the quality audit process and may also be examined by means of a special review (see below).

Reviews

ITP Quality requires all degree providing ITPs to undertake a major evaluation of any degree course at least every five years. This evaluation should include input from the relevant professional and academic communities. The findings of these reviews should be reported to ITP Quality at the time of the annual report.

Audit

ITP Quality is also responsible for ongoing quality audit of ITPs.

Audit processes will include evaluation of information relating to the quality of individual degree courses as an indicator of the effectiveness of the providers' quality management systems.

Special Reviews

ITP Quality retains the right to undertake a special review of the approval and/or accreditation of a degree. A special review will be established by ITP Quality if it becomes aware of serious or on-going concerns about the quality and/or stability of the course. Such a review will generally be undertaken by a panel established for the purpose.

Gazetted Criteria

The gazetted criteria form the basis for requirements established by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority and ITP Quality. They are intended to be used by all Quality Assurance Bodies. The criteria were revised and gazetted in late 2002 and will be further reviewed in 2005.

Related publications

These criteria replace the following Qualifications Authority publications and documents

- *Guidelines for Quality Assurance of Degrees and Related Qualifications (1995)*
- *Criteria for the Registration of Unit Standard Based Degrees/Postgraduate Qualifications (November 1998)*
- *Criteria and Processes for Doctoral Approval (July 1998)*
- *Degree Definitions and Guidelines (1999)*
- *Additional Information Requirements for offering New Zealand qualifications overseas (March 2001)*

They incorporate information contained in the following Qualifications Authority publications and documents:

- *Definition of Research (February 1998)*
- *Jointly Awarded Degrees (NZQA and NZVCC statement - November 1999)*
- *New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications (August 2001)*
- *Revisions to Gazetted Criteria for Approval and Accreditation of Courses (December 2002)*
- *Supporting Learning Pathways – Credit Recognition and Transfer (December 2002)*

They have also been informed by the NZVCC publication Committee on University Academic Programmes Functions and Procedures .

Applicants will also be subject to the requirements of one or more of the following:

- ITP New Zealand Academic Quality Standards

(for Institutes of Technology polytechnics which are members of ITP New Zealand)
(<http://www.itpnz.ac.nz>)

2 GAZETTED CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL AND ACCREDITATION OF COURSES LEADING TO DEGREES AND RELATED QUALIFICATIONS

The following criteria for the approval and accreditation of courses were gazetted by the Qualifications Authority in December 2002 pursuant to section 253 (3) of the Education Act 1989.

Each criterion is followed by the requirements established by the Qualifications Authority to assist applicants and evaluators in respect of course approval and accreditation for degrees and related qualifications. Accreditation is required for each site that a course will be offered from and each mode it is delivered in.

Where reference is made to the Qualifications Authority in terms of its evaluation, approval and accreditation functions, this also refers to any Quality Assurance Body operating under delegation from the Qualifications Authority (eg ITP Quality).

1 Title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence: *The adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole course.*

1.1 Title

a The title of the course provides an accurate indication of its general subject area.

b The title of any qualification(s) awarded on the basis of successful completion of the course, or part of the course, is consistent with the title of the course and the requirements on nomenclature in the general registration criteria for the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications (the Register) (www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications/register/index.html) and relevant conventions (See Special Issues section).

1.2 Aims

a The stated aims are clearly defined and appropriate to the nature and level of the qualification to which the course leads.

b The aim includes identification of any specifically-targeted student body and the relationship between the course and any industrial, professional or community need.

1.3 Learning outcomes

Course Outcomes statement

a The course outcomes statement, or graduate profile, is consistent with the aims of the course and the requirements of the Register.

Component outcomes

b Clear learning outcomes are specified for each component part of the course.

1.4 Coherence

a Learning outcomes are consistent with the aims and level of the course.

b Appropriate levels and credits are allocated to each component of the course.

c The level and credit value of any qualification to which the course leads are appropriate, clearly identified and meet the minimum requirements of the Register.

d An appropriate New Zealand Standard for Classification of Education (NZSCED) classification is identified. (www2.minedu.govt.nz/step/NZSCED.asp.)

2 Delivery and learning methods: *The adequacy and appropriateness of delivery and learning methods, for all modes of delivery, given the stated learning outcomes.*

2.1 Proposed modes of delivery and delivery sites are clearly identified.

2.2 Delivery and facilitated learning methods are appropriate to the nature of the course, the proposed modes of delivery and the likely student body.

2.3 Any practical, field-based or work-based components, including research, which are based away from the delivery site are integrated into the course.

2.4 Delivery methods do not place students or the public at risk (emotional or physical).

2.5 **In the case of courses with research components**, appropriate systems and facilities appropriate to the level and scale of the research are provided to enable students to undertake relevant research, including:

- Guidance on the development and approval of research projects;
- Criteria and procedures for the appointment of appropriately qualified and experienced supervisors;
- A code of conduct for researchers and research supervisors; and
- Mechanisms for ethical approval of research projects.

3 Assessment: *The adequacy of the means of ensuring that assessment procedures are fair, valid, consistent and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes.*

3.1 Assessment methodology and planning is appropriate.

3.2 The required standards for assessment are clearly specified in relation to each component part of the course.

3.3 Learners are provided with fair and regular feedback on progress and fair reporting on final achievements.

3.4 Where appropriate, assessment policies and practices allow students to request assessment in te reo Māori.

3.5 *Pre-assessment moderation of summative assessment tasks ensures that they are fair, valid and consistent.*

3.6 *External post-assessment moderation of examples of student work and marking/grading ensures that assessment outcomes are fair and consistent;*

3.7 **In the case of courses with research components at postgraduate levels (levels 8 – 10)**, assessment includes external examination of all research components amounting to more than 60 credits.

4 Acceptability of the course: *The acceptability of the proposed course to the relevant*

academic, industrial, professional and other communities, in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure.

4.1 Stakeholders, including relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities, are identified.

4.2 The actual or likely interests of these stakeholders in respect of the proposed course are clearly identified.

4.3 The interests of stakeholders have been appropriately addressed.

4.4 The course is likely to be acceptable to the relevant wider communities: academic, professional, industrial, Māori and other communities.

4.5 Where appropriate, the course is cognisant of Māori tribal tikanga, reo and traditions and is acceptable to Māori as a reflection of their aspirations for quality learning and standards in accordance with te reo me ona tikanga.

5 Regulations: The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations that specify requirements for admission, 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 course.

5.1 General and course-specific regulations are clear, comprehensive and fair and cover, where appropriate:

- Requirements for admission to the organisation and to the course;
- Provisions for the awarding of credit towards a qualification or exemptions from specific course requirements as a result of cross-crediting (from another course within the organisation), credit transfer (from a course awarded by another organisation) or recognition of prior learning (credit awarded for informal or uncertificated learning);
- Course structure, including specified pre- and co-requisites, mandatory and optional/elective components, practical/work-based components and alternative entry and exit points;
- Normal progress through the course and minimum and maximum periods for completion of the course;
- Assessment, including provisions for assessment in te reo Maori, reassessment and appeals;
- Provisions for dealing with instances of impaired performance (eg aegrotat passes);
- Requirements for the award of the qualification;
- Rules and criteria governing any awarding of merit, distinction, honours or other grades.

5.2 **In the case of programmes with research components**, regulations must also cover:

- Definition of the type of research activities acceptable;
- Research project approval;
- Supervision and reporting;
- Requirements for submission of theses (length, format, authenticity, presentation of evidence in other than written form);
- Provision for the resubmission of theses; and

- The respective roles of internal (if applicable) and external examiners with clear statements on reporting and the resolution of differences of opinion.

6 Resources: The capacity of the organisation to support sustained delivery of the course, in all delivery modes, with regard to appropriate academic staffing, teaching facilities, physical resources and support services.

6.1 Academic staff

NB The Education Act 1989 defines a degree as an award that recognises the completion of a course of advanced learning that is taught mainly by people engaged in research.

Collectively, the academic staff involved in the course:

- a are adequate in number and appropriately qualified for the outcomes of the course to be met;
- b are engaged in research;(see special issues, item 6)
- c have experience and expertise in teaching, with regard to the proposed delivery modes; and
- d ***in the case of courses with research components, have experience and expertise in the supervision of research at the appropriate level.***

Standards b-d will not necessarily be equally met by each member of academic staff. The expectation is that a collective view of the staff will acknowledge complementary contributions to meeting the standard.

In the case of courses with practical, field or work based components, the roles and responsibilities of the supervisory staff and the institution are formalised.

In some situations experience in Māori language and culture, and appropriate knowledge, skills and tikanga will also be necessary.

Additional staffing needs are identified where necessary and detailed recruitment and or staff development plans appropriate to the course implementation timetable are in place.

6.2 Teaching facilities and physical resources

The organisation has clearly identified the range of teaching facilities and physical resources, including library facilities, necessary for the implementation and sustained delivery of the course, in all proposed modes of delivery, and

- a put in place the necessary teaching facilities and physical resources, or
- b established detailed development and acquisition schedules appropriate to the course implementation timetable.

6.3 Support staff

There is a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and/or experienced support staff for the outcomes of the course to be met.

6.4 Student guidance and support systems

Adequate and appropriate course information and guidance and support systems are accessible to students.

6.5 Financial and administrative infrastructure

The organisation's financial infrastructure, administrative systems and resource management practices are adequate to support implementation and sustained delivery of the course.

6.6 Quality Management System

The organisation's quality management system incorporates structured processes associated with an Academic Board or equivalent (with delegations to faculty or programme committees as appropriate).

7 Evaluation and review: The adequacy and effectiveness of the provision for evaluation and review of courses: for monitoring the on-going relevance of learning outcomes, course delivery and course standards; for reviewing course regulations and content; for monitoring improvement following evaluation and review; and for determining whether the course shall continue to be offered.

7.1 There is an effective system for the regular monitoring, evaluation and review of courses such that the course approval and accreditation criteria and requirements continue to be met. The system includes structured processes, associated with the academic board (or equivalent), for ensuring that the views of learners and representatives of relevant industries, professions, academic and research communities, Māori and other stakeholders are taken into account.

7.2 Changes to approved courses are managed consistently with external requirements.

8 Research: The adequacy of provision of research facilities and support of staff involved in research, the levels of research activity of staff involved in the course and of ways by which the research-teaching links are made in the curriculum.

8.1 Staff conduct research within their area of experience which advances knowledge and understanding and supports their function as teachers.

8.2 The quantity and quality of staff research outputs are monitored and the collective output is consistent with the development and maintenance of an on-going research culture in support of the course.

8.3 Organisational systems and facilities provide appropriate support to staff involved in research, including access to an appropriate ethics committee.

3 GAZETTED CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL OF COURSES LEADING TO DEGREES AND RELATED QUALIFICATIONS

These criteria and requirements apply to applications in respect of approval only of a course leading to a degree or a related qualification, where the degree developer will not deliver the Course. The numbering system used relates to the criteria for Approval and Accreditation.

The following criteria for the approval of courses were gazetted by the Qualifications Authority in December 2002 pursuant to section 253 (3) of the Education Act 1989.

Each criterion is followed by the requirements established by the Qualifications Authority to assist applicants and evaluators in respect of the approval of courses leading to degrees and related qualifications.

1 Title, aims, learning outcomes and coherence: *The adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence of the whole course.*

1.1 Title

a The title of the course provides an accurate indication of its general subject area.

b The title of any qualification(s) awarded on the basis of successful completion of the course, or part of the course, is consistent with the title of the course and the requirements on nomenclature in the general registration criteria for the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications (the Register) (www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications/register/index.html) and relevant conventions (See Special Issues section).

1.2 Aims

a The stated aims are clearly defined and appropriate to the nature and level of the qualification to which the course leads.

b The aim includes identification of any specifically-targeted student body and the relationship between the course and any industrial, professional or community need.

1.3 Learning outcomes

Course Outcomes statement

a The course outcomes statement, or graduate profile, is consistent with the aims of the course and the requirements of the Register.

Component outcomes

b Clear learning outcomes are specified for each component part of the course.

1.4 Coherence

a Learning outcomes are consistent with the aims and level of the course.

b Appropriate levels and credits are allocated to each component of the course.

c The level and credit value of any qualification to which the course leads are appropriate, clearly identified and meet the minimum requirements of the Register.

d An appropriate New Zealand Standard For Classification of Education (NZSCED) classification is identified. (www2.minedu.govt.nz/step/NZSCED.asp.)

3 Assessment: The fairness, validity, consistency and appropriateness of the assessment methodology, given the stated learning outcomes.

3.1 Assessment methodology and planning is appropriate.

3.2 The required standards for assessment are clearly specified in relation to each component part of the course.

3.3 Learners are provided with fair and regular feedback on progress and fair reporting on final achievements.

3.4 Where appropriate, assessment policies and practices allow students to request assessment in te reo Māori.

3.5 Pre-assessment moderation of summative assessment tasks ensures that they are fair, valid and consistent.

3.6 External post-assessment moderation of examples of student work and marking/grading ensures that assessment outcomes are fair and consistent;

3.7 In the case of courses with research components at postgraduate levels (levels 8 – 10), assessment includes external examination of all research components amounting to more than 60 credits.

4 Acceptability of the course: The acceptability of the proposed course to the relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities, in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure.

4.1 Stakeholders, including relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities, are identified.

4.2. The actual or likely interests of these stakeholders in respect of the proposed course are clearly identified.

4.3. The interests of stakeholders have been appropriately addressed.

4.4. The course is likely to be acceptable to the relevant wider communities: academic, professional, industrial, Māori and other communities.

4.5. Where appropriate, the course is cognisant of Māori tribal tikanga, reo and traditions and is acceptable to Māori as a reflection of their aspirations for quality learning and standards in accordance with te reo me ona tikanga.

5 *Regulations: The adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations that specify requirements for admission, 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 course.*

5.1 General and course-specific regulations are clear, comprehensive and fair and cover, where appropriate:

- Requirements for admission to the organisation and to the course;
- Provisions for the awarding of credit towards a qualification or exemptions from specific course requirements as a result of cross-crediting (from another course within the organisation), credit transfer (from a course awarded by another organisation) or recognition of prior learning (credit awarded for informal or uncertificated learning);
- Course structure, including specified pre- and co-requisites, mandatory and optional/elective components, practical/work-based components and alternative entry and exit points;
- Normal progress through the course and minimum and maximum periods for completion of the course;
- Assessment, including provisions for assessment in te reo Maori, reassessment and appeals;
- Provisions for dealing with instances of impaired performance (eg aegrotat passes);
- Requirements for the award of the qualification;
- Rules and criteria governing any awarding of merit, distinction, honours or other grades.

5.2 **In the case of programmes with research components**, regulations must also cover:

- Definition of the type of research activities acceptable;
- Research project approval;
- Supervision and reporting;
- Requirements for submission of theses (length, format, authenticity, presentation of evidence in other than written form);
- Provision for the resubmission of theses; and
- The respective roles of internal (if applicable) and external examiners with clear statements on reporting and the resolution of differences of opinion.

7 *Evaluation and review: The adequacy and effectiveness of the provision for evaluation and review of courses: for monitoring the on-going relevance of learning outcomes, course standards and quality, and for reviewing course regulations and content.*

7.1 There is an effective system for the regular monitoring, evaluation and review of courses such that the course approval and accreditation criteria and requirements continue to be met. The system includes structured processes, associated with the academic board (or equivalent), for ensuring that the views of learners and representatives of relevant industries, professions, academic and research communities, Māori and other stakeholders are taken into account.

7.3 Changes to approved courses are managed consistently with external requirements.

4 GAZETTED CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCREDITATION TO OFFER COURSES LEADING TO DEGREES AND RELATED QUALIFICATIONS

These criteria and requirements apply to applications in respect of accreditation only, where the course leading to the degree or related qualification has already received approval. Accreditation is required for each site that a course will be offered from and for each mode it is delivered in. The numbering system used relates to the criteria for Approval and Accreditation.

The following criteria for accreditation to offer approved courses were gazetted by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority in December 2002 pursuant to section 253 (3) of the Education Act 1989.

Each criterion is followed by the requirements established by the Qualifications Authority to assist applicants and evaluators in respect of accreditation to offer courses leading to degrees and related qualifications.

2 Delivery and learning methods: *The adequacy and appropriateness of delivery and learning methods, for all modes of delivery, given the stated learning outcomes.*

2.1. Proposed modes of delivery and delivery sites are clearly identified.

2.2. Delivery and facilitated learning methods are appropriate to the nature of the course, the proposed modes of delivery and the likely student body.

2.3. Any practical, field-based or work-based components, including research, which are based away from the delivery site are integrated into the course.

2.4. Delivery methods do not place students or the public at risk (emotional or physical).

2.5. **In the case of courses with research components**, appropriate systems and facilities appropriate to the level and scale of the research are provided to enable students to undertake relevant research, including:

- Guidance on the development and approval of research projects;
- Criteria and procedures for the appointment of appropriately qualified and experienced supervisors;
- A code of conduct for researchers and research supervisors; and
- Mechanisms for ethical approval of research projects.

3 Assessment: *The adequacy of the means of ensuring that assessment procedures are fair, valid, consistent and appropriate, given the stated learning outcomes.*

3.1 Assessment methodology and planning is appropriate.

3.2 The required standards for assessment are clearly specified in relation to each component part of the course.

3.3 Learners are provided with fair and regular feedback on progress and fair reporting on final achievements.

3.4 Where appropriate, assessment policies and practices allow students to request assessment in te reo Māori.

3.5 *Pre-assessment moderation of summative assessment tasks ensures that they are fair, valid and consistent.*

3.6 *External post-assessment moderation of examples of student work and marking/grading ensures that assessment outcomes are fair and consistent;*

3.7 **In the case of courses with research components at postgraduate levels (levels 8 – 10),** assessment includes external examination of all research components amounting to more than 60 credits.

4 *Acceptability of the course:* The acceptability of the proposed course to the relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities, in terms of its stated aims and learning outcomes, nomenclature, content and structure.

4.1 *Stakeholders, including relevant academic, industrial, professional and other communities, are identified.*

4.2 The actual or likely interests of these stakeholders in respect of the proposed course are clearly identified.

4.3 The interests of stakeholders have been appropriately addressed.

4.4 The course is likely to be acceptable to the relevant wider communities: academic, professional, industrial, Māori and other communities.

4.5 Where appropriate, the course is cognisant of Māori tribal tikanga, reo and traditions and is acceptable to Māori as a reflection of their aspirations for quality learning and standards in accordance with te reo me ona tikanga.

6 *Resources:* The capacity of the organisation to support sustained delivery of the course, in all delivery modes, with regard to appropriate academic staffing, teaching facilities, physical resources and support services.

6.1 Academic staff

NB The Education Act 1989 defines a degree as an award that recognises the completion of a course of advanced learning that is taught mainly by people engaged in research.

Collectively, the academic staff involved in the course:

- a are adequate in number and appropriately qualified for the outcomes of the course to be met;
- b are engaged in research;(see special issues, item 6)
- c have experience and expertise in teaching, with regard to the proposed delivery modes; and
- d ***in the case of courses with research components, have experience and expertise in the supervision of research at the appropriate level.***

Standards b-d will not necessarily be equally met by each member of academic staff. The expectation is that a collective view of the staff will acknowledge complementary contributions to meeting the standard.

In the case of courses with practical, field or work based components, the roles and responsibilities of the supervisory staff and the institution are formalised.

In some situations experience in Māori language and culture, and appropriate knowledge, skills and tikanga will also be necessary.

Additional staffing needs are identified where necessary and detailed recruitment and or staff development plans appropriate to the course implementation timetable are in place.

6.2 Teaching facilities and physical resources

The organisation has clearly identified the range of teaching facilities and physical resources, including library facilities, necessary for the implementation and sustained delivery of the course, in all proposed modes of delivery, and

- a put in place the necessary teaching facilities and physical resources, or
- b established detailed development and acquisition schedules appropriate to the course implementation timetable.

6.3 Support staff

There is a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and/or experienced support staff for the outcomes of the course to be met.

6.4 Student guidance and support systems

Adequate and appropriate course information and guidance and support systems are accessible to students.

6.5 Financial and administrative infrastructure

The organisation's financial infrastructure, administrative systems and resource management practices are adequate to support implementation and sustained delivery of the course.

6.6 Quality Management System

The organisation's quality management system incorporates structured processes associated with an Academic Board or equivalent (with delegations to faculty or programme committees as appropriate).

7 Evaluation and review: The adequacy and effectiveness of the provision for evaluation and review of course delivery against defined course standards and regulations and content; for monitoring improvement following evaluation and review; and for determining whether the course shall continue to be delivered.

7.1 There is an effective system for the regular monitoring, evaluation and review of courses such that the course approval and accreditation criteria and requirements continue to be met. The system includes structured processes, associated with the academic board (or equivalent), for ensuring that the views of learners and representatives of relevant industries, professions, academic and research communities, Māori and other stakeholders are taken into account.

7.2 Changes to approved courses are managed consistently with reviews of the course carried out by the course owner.

8 Research: The adequacy of provision of research facilities and support of staff involved in research, the levels of research activity of staff involved in the course and

of ways by which the research-teaching links are made in the curriculum.

8.1 Staff conduct research within their area of experience which advances knowledge and understanding and supports their function as teachers.

8.2 The quantity and quality of staff research outputs are monitored and the collective output is consistent with the development and maintenance of an on-going research culture in support of the course.

8.3 Organisational systems and facilities provide appropriate support to staff involved in research, including access to an appropriate ethics committee.

5. SPECIAL ISSUES

- 5.1 Course and Qualification Titles
- 5.2 Credit Recognition and Transfer
- 5.3 Conjoint/Double Degrees
- 5.4 Unit Standards Based Degrees
- 5.5 Research: Definition
- 5.6 Staff Engagement in Research
- 5.7 Collaborative Arrangements (Consortium / Jointly Awarded Degrees)
 - Where The Arrangement Does Not Include A University
 - Where At Least One Of The Partner Organisations Is A University And At Least One Is Not A University
- 5.8 Overseas Based Degrees in New Zealand
- 5.9 New Zealand Degrees Overseas
- 5.10 Use of Te Reo Māori in Assessment
- 5.11 Professional Accreditation

5.1 Course and Qualification Titles

Course and qualification titles should provide a concise, accurate and informative indication of the aims and outcomes of courses.

Courses will generally use the title of the qualification awarded as a result of successful completion of the course. Qualification titles should be consistent with the requirements of the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications and the following conventions for naming qualifications:

Use of the terms “National” and “New Zealand” is protected in course and qualification titles and may not be used as qualifiers without the approval of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority.

Designator

A designator should identify the principal disciplinary emphasis of the qualification.

A designator should:

- have wide national or international acceptability; or
- be necessary for national or international recognition of that qualification; or
- be a requirement of a professional body that has a formal role in the approval of the qualification.

e.g. Certificate in Computing; Diploma in Horticulture; Bachelor of Business; Master of Nursing

Qualifiers

Qualifiers may be added to the title of the course and qualification if this improves general understanding of the course and/or qualification. **A rationale will be required in order to justify the use of a qualifier.**

A discipline qualifier may be added after the title to indicate that the course and qualification has a tighter focus on a sub-field within the discipline. A discipline qualifier may also be used to indicate a pathway within a course (eg a major). This qualifier will be written in brackets following the designator. Some courses and/or qualifications may offer students the option of concentrating on a particular sub-field without formally identifying this in a qualifier.

e.g. Bachelor of Design (Computer Graphics)

A focus qualifier such as Applied may be added to indicate a particular focus of a course and/or qualification.

e.g. Diploma in Applied Theology

A level qualifier such as Advanced, Intermediate or Introductory may be added to Certificate and Diploma titles either before or after the designator.

e.g. Diploma in Advanced Electronics; Certificate in English (Intermediate)

An awarding organisation qualifier may be added to Certificate and Diploma titles before the title of the qualification.

e.g. ABC Institute Certificate in Naturopathy

Doctorates

Conventions relating to the titles for doctoral qualifications are:

Title Designator

Doctor of Philosophy	(PhD/DPhil)
<i>Doctor of Education, Music</i>	<i>(EdD or DMus) - named doctorates in a specified field or discipline</i>
Doctor of Science, Literature	(DSc or DLitt) - Higher Doctorates

Doctorate titles do not normally include a qualifier.

5.2 Credit recognition and transfer

The Qualifications Authority has established a policy on credit recognition and transfer (Supporting Learning Pathways Credit Recognition and Transfer Policy, December 2002). (<http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications/credit.html>)

The policy is based on the following principles (both overarching and operational) which are intended to apply across sectors and cultures and complement government obligations to Māori under the Treaty of Waitangi.

- Qualification, course, and programme development and design should promote and facilitate credit recognition and transfer.
- *The key focus of credit transfer decisions should be on the benefit for learners and supporting effective learning pathways.*
- *Transparency in credit recognition and transfer decision-making across the education system is a critical factor in supporting and encouraging the ongoing involvement of learners in education and training.*
- Credit transfer and recognition should be able to operate across different cultures and national borders and robust policies and procedures need to be in place to support this.
- Credit awarded as a result of either recognition of prior learning or recognition of current competency is of equal standing to credit awarded through other forms of assessment and should be able to be carried with the learner once awarded.

Provisions for the awarding of credit towards a qualification or exemptions from specific course requirements as a result of cross-crediting (from another course within the organisation), credit transfer (from a course offered by another organisation) or recognition of prior learning (credit awarded for informal or uncertificated learning) should be clearly defined in an organisation's general or course-specific regulations.

The Qualifications Authority also recognises that the integrity of a qualification should be considered in granting credit through cross-credit, credit transfer or Recognition of Prior Learning. Arrangements should recognise the distinctive characteristics of qualifications.

In order to achieve this:

- credit should be assessed against the defined objectives of specific components of courses;
- the core requirements of the final level of a qualification should be substantially completed at the organisation awarding the qualification; and
- credit granted towards a degree on the basis of knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired outside the course should take into account the legislated definition of a degree as "an award that

recognises the completion of a course of advanced learning that is taught mainly by people engaged in research”.

Where a provider of a course leading to a degree or related qualification proposes to grant credit to students where learning has not taken place supported by staff mainly involved in research, the provider must:

- be actively involved in provision of all levels of the course;
- assess all applicants in terms of both the specific requirements of each component of the course for which the granting of credit is being considered, and the distinctive characteristics of the qualification; and
- specify, in course regulations, the maximum amount of credit for which credit will be automatically recognised and procedures for ensuring that credit transfer in excess of this is consistent with the distinctive characteristics of the qualification.

5.3 Conjoint/double degrees

A conjoint or double degree is an arrangement within a single provider which “enables students to complete two qualifications 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 components or credits to be completed” (NZVCC Committee on University Academic Programmes Functions and Procedures). Entry to a conjoint or double degree course is generally restricted to students who have shown evidence of higher competence than required for entry to a single degree course. Continued enrolment in the conjoint or double degree course is generally reviewed annually.

A conjoint degree course must be specifically approved by the Qualifications Authority or a delegated Quality Assurance Body following an application either for a new course or as a change to two existing courses.

The application will need to show that the criteria and requirements for approval and accreditation are met by the conjoint or double degree course.

If the application is to offer two existing courses as a conjoint degree, the application for change will need to address the following criteria:

- Title
- Aims
- Course Outcomes
- Acceptability
- Regulations

5.4 Unit standards based degrees

Degrees or related qualifications that are based primarily on unit standards from the National Qualifications Framework or that seek to meet the requirements of a National degree as registered on the National Qualifications Framework, must meet all requirements for degree approval.

Organisations wishing to deliver these courses must meet all the requirements for accreditation to offer the course leading to the degree and, in addition, must meet the requirements of the relevant Accreditation and Moderation Action Plans for the scope of unit standards covered by the course.

5.5 Definition of Research

Research is an intellectually controlled investigation which leads to advances in knowledge through the discovery and codification of new information or the development of further understanding about existing information, and practice. It is a creative, cumulative and independent activity conducted by people with knowledge of the theories, methods and information of the principal field of inquiry and its cognate areas(s). Research typically involves either investigation of an experimental or critical nature, or artistic endeavour of the type exemplified by musical composition. The results of research must be open to scrutiny and formal evaluation by others in the field of inquiry and this may be achieved through publication in peer-reviewed books and serials, or through public presentation. Research is often characterised by the identification of fruitful new topics for investigation and unexpected uses for its findings.

Research activities play a vital role in creating an environment in which the optimum teaching and learning processes occur, and in which staff and students are stimulated by the interplay of new ideas and the spirit of enquiry. Learning, at graduate and postgraduate levels, takes place in an environment of developing and advancing knowledge, problem solving, critical evaluation, investigation and an awareness of the limits of enquiry and understanding.

Research may be found in the following contexts¹, although they are not mutually exclusive:

- a Basic or fundamental research: experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge without any particular application or use in view.
- b Strategic research: work which is intended to generate new knowledge in an area which has not yet advanced sufficiently to enable specific applications to be identified.
- c Applied research: work which develops or tests existing knowledge and is primarily directed towards either specific practical objectives or towards the evaluation of policies or practices. Work which involves the routine application of established techniques on routine problems is unlikely to constitute research.
- d Scholarship: work which is intended to expand the boundaries of knowledge and understanding within and across disciplines by the analysis, synthesis and interpretation of ideas and information, making use of a rigorous methodology.
- e Creative work: the invention and generation of ideas, hypotheses, images, performances or artefacts, including design, in any field of knowledge, leading to development of new knowledge, understanding or expertise.

Activities which *may* be equivalent to research if they meet one or more of the definitions (a-c) outlined above include:

- f Consultancy, which involves the deployment of existing knowledge and the application of analytical and investigative skills to the resolution of problems presented. by a client, usually in an industrial, commercial or professional context.
- g Professional practice, some of which overlaps with consultancy when conducted at an advanced level. In certain subject areas and professions the theorisation and effectiveness of professional practice are advanced by academic staff who practise and participate in it.

The Qualifications Authority does not regard activity mainly concerned with keeping abreast of new developments in subjects as 'research.'. It is assumed that providers will, as a matter of course, ensure that all teachers of degree courses have sufficient time to keep abreast of new developments both in their subject areas and in methods of teaching and assessment.

All research activities must be conducted in accordance with recognised ethical standards.

¹ This part of the definition draws on that developed by the United Kingdom Council for National Academic Awards, *Handbook*, 1991-92 (ISBN 0 903471 68 X).

5.6 Staff engagement in research

The Education Act 1989 defines a degree as an award that recognises the completion of a course of advanced learning that is taught mainly by people engaged in research.

Evaluating the quantity and quality of research engagement of academic staff involved in a degree course required to meet the Qualifications Authority's accreditation criteria requires judgment on the part of an evaluation panel.

Recent accreditation decisions have taken account of various factors in reaching a judgment on this issue. These have included:

- the core discipline of the degree and the current level of national and international research in this discipline;
- the state of development of a research culture within the applying institution;
- the involvement of staff in qualifications upgrading; and
- the extent of involvement of individual staff members in teaching on the degree course.

The Authority considers that at an early stage of development of a research culture, the principles underpinning the requirement for academic staff to be engaged in research may be adequately met by achieving a balance between academic staff in the following three groupings:

- staff not yet engaged in research, but engaged in research-informed study and qualifications upgrading and therefore able to offer teaching that is informed by recent research and inspired by the search for knowledge
- staff conducting research as a major component of study towards a higher degree
- staff engaged in qualification-independent research

The Authority considers that while this is acceptable in the early years of establishment of a research culture, there must be planning and projections in place which show how staff engagement in research will grow and progress to a more established pattern of research outputs. These projections should be verifiable and, in relation to the focus of the programme, significant.

The Authority acknowledges that there may be instances, within an established or developing research culture, where individual teachers are appointed for specific contributions to a component of a programme and may individually have no significant current or recent engagement in research.

The Authority expects that in the event of any growth or turn-over of academic staff, new staff appointments would consider the preparedness of applicants to be engaged in research without undertaking a significant period of qualifications upgrading.

5.7 Collaborative Arrangements for Degree Approval and Accreditation (e.g. Consortium / Jointly Awarded Degrees)

5.7a Where the arrangement does not include a university

Two or more non-university organisations may form partnerships for:

- a. the development and maintenance of a course that leads to the award of a degree qualification; and/or
- b. the delivery of a course that leads to the award of a degree qualification.

For “a”, (course development and maintenance) each of the partner organisations concerned must be:

- a polytechnic, college of education, wānanga or specialist college; or
- a secondary school; or
- a registered government or private training establishment; or
- a body approved by the Qualifications Authority for course ownership

Currently, degree courses that are developed jointly must be approved by each of the relevant Quality Assurance Bodies. For example, a course jointly developed by a polytechnic and a private training establishment will require approval from both ITP Quality and the Qualifications Authority.

For “b” (accreditation to deliver a course) each of the partner organisations concerned must be:

- a polytechnic, college of education, wānanga or specialist college; or
- a secondary school; or
- a registered government or private training establishment.

As for course approval, each of the relevant Quality Assurance Bodies must accredit the partner organisations for the delivery of the course.

In addition to documentation identified for approval and/or accreditation, the partners must provide a formal memorandum of cooperation which identifies the division of responsibilities for all relevant aspects of the course and its management and/or delivery (see below).

Memorandum of Cooperation

The purposes of the memorandum are to define the means by which the standards of the course will be maintained, to ensure that collaborative arrangements are clearly set out and operate smoothly, and that clear channels of authority, accountability and executive action are identified.

The Memorandum of Cooperation is an agreement between parties which share responsibility for different aspects or elements of the quality of a degree course. It must be signed by the legally recognised signatories of the parties to the agreement and must specify, as appropriate to the application:

- The names of the parties to the agreement;
- The allocation of responsibility for the management of quality systems to oversee and maintain standards;

- Procedures for resolving any differences which might arise between the parties to this agreement;
- Procedures and responsibilities for securing approval and accreditation;
- Procedures and responsibilities in respect of the management of the course, its ongoing monitoring, and the provision for the implementation of changes to the course;
- Assessment and moderation arrangements;
- Procedures for agreeing on all necessary financial arrangements and the provision of resources, both physical and human;
- Responsibility for communication of all necessary reports and other information to the Qualifications Authority;
- An indication of the wording which will appear on certificates awarded to students who have met all the requirements of the course;
- Responsibility for all administrative arrangements such as student enrolment; student welfare services; decisions relating to progress through the course, assessment, appeals; reporting student results; and remuneration of monitors and moderators (if applicable); and
- Procedures for the protection of students should the arrangement terminate.

5.7b Where at least one of the partner organisations is a university and at least one is not a university.

This section is taken from an agreement between the Qualifications Authority and the NZVCC for the approval and accreditation of jointly awarded qualifications

Introduction

These procedures apply to those programmes where one of the providers is a university and the other is a polytechnic, college of education, wananga or private training establishment.

1. There may be academic advantages in degree programmes developed and taught jointly by two providers of tertiary education. In some cases those providers may wish that the qualification may not only be jointly developed and taught, but jointly awarded. This paper is concerned with accreditation and approval procedures in terms of the gazetted criteria, that apply to degrees that are jointly developed and taught and jointly awarded.
2. In the case that the degree is taught jointly, but awarded in the name of only one provider, the accreditation and approval procedures that apply will be those that would apply if that provider were the sole provider. If the qualification is given solely in the name of a university, the NZVCC CUAP procedures would apply, as set out in the CUAP booklet, and if it is given solely in the name of another provider the relevant procedures would apply, as set out in the NZQA booklet. In each case, however, that a degree is awarded in the name of two providers, one of which is a university institution, an amalgam of the procedures will apply. This is set out in the following paragraphs.
3. Before putting forward their proposal, the providers would need to be sure that there was a need for the qualification they were developing, and that what they planned to offer was a coherent degree programme which met that need. They would need also to be prepared to submit their proposal to the process outlined in this paper, without requiring that any part of the proposal be regarded as secret or commercially sensitive and to judge whether, in the light of the criteria it sets out, the proposal has a reasonable chance of securing approval. Information contained in any proposal will be treated professionally by all who assess it so as to ensure that the intellectual property rights of the provider are respected.
4. If the two providers, after discussion with each other and with others, lay and professional, interested in the qualification, decide to apply for approval of a jointly-awarded degree, they will prepare documentation that covers both the quality systems and procedures that obtain in general in the two providers, and the detailed proposal for the degree. That proposal should include the rationale for the course; an outline of its content; and an indication of the respective commitment and contribution of the two providers. It would also include a statement on staffing for the course and the role of the two providers in respect of it; on the agreed funding and resources for the course, including library resources; and on procedures for staff and course evaluation.

It would cover provisions for the admission of the students and for the assessing of their work. The two providers might well be in the practice of handling some of these matters in different ways, and the proposal would need to show that agreement had been reached in respect of them. It is likely to include provision for a joint programme coordinating committee. The two providers should also prepare and forward the draft of a memorandum of understanding covering the issues the proposal raised. The memorandum of understanding between the two providers would take into consideration arrangements for the joint development of material, research and intellectual property ownership.

5. The proposal would be forwarded, by agreement of the two providers, both to the NZVCC CUAP and to NZQA. These bodies, which have the responsibility for administering the gazetted criteria for approval and accreditation, will have established a standing committee of two persons,

one nominated by CUAP, and one by NZQA, for dealing with proposals for jointly-awarded degrees. (See terms of reference below.)

6. Operating protocol

Notice of intention to submit proposal

Providers intending to submit a proposal for a jointly awarded degree should advise NZVCC and NZQA by **1 November** in the year preceding that in which the proposal will be considered for approval.

Preparation of the proposal

The proposal should be prepared so that it satisfies the requirements of the NZVCC and NZQA for the approval and accreditation of degree programmes. The specific requirements are set out in the NZVCC, *Committee on University Academic Programmes, Functions and Procedures 1998* and the NZQA, *Guidelines for Approval and Accreditation of Degrees and Related Qualifications, 2003*. In practice this will require the submission of separate and specific documentation to NZVCC and NZQA.

Submission of the proposal

The proposals are submitted to the Jointly Awarded Degrees Standing Committee (appointed as in 5 above) for initial scrutiny. The documentation should be submitted by **1 March** in the year in which approval is sought. The Standing Committee will pay particular attention to the jointly-awarded nature of the programme and the arrangements made for its support by the providers, as well as the overall level of documentation. The Standing Committee will forward a response to the providers, on issues that relate to the form of documentation in the proposals, by **1 April**.

The university provider will submit its proposal in the required format to CUAP by **1 May**. The non-university provider will submit its proposal to NZQA by **1 May** at the latest.

Approval process

The normal CUAP and NZVCC processes will proceed in parallel leading to a CUAP decision on approval and accreditation in July and finalisation of a recommendation by the NZQA Panel at about the same time. The draft recommendations should be considered by the Jointly Awarded Degrees Standing Committee which will take one of the following courses of action:

- i. Endorse the recommendations of CUAP and the NZQA Panel and seek final confirmation of approval and accreditation by CUAP and the NZQA Board.
- ii. Mediate between CUAP and the NZQA Panel over any disputed findings and recommendations. In the case of a minor difference of view the Committee will endeavour to assist in the development of a solution that is acceptable to the providers and meets the approval and accreditation requirements of CUAP and NZQA. In the case of a major difference of view it may be necessary for the Committee to recommend to CUAP, NZQA and the providers that substantial revision and re-submission is required.

Final approval and accreditation by CUAP and NZQA will require the providers to meet all the review and monitoring procedures established by CUAP and NZQA. Any future dispute over the performance of the programme or programme-specific action taken by the providers should be referred by either CUAP or NZQA to the Jointly Awarded Degrees Standing Committee, who will mediate a solution.

7. The degree programme will be reviewed by the providers concerned within an agreed period after its commencement, and the outcome reported to the NZVCC CUAP and NZQA.

8. Substantial modifications in the programme will require approval of both the NZVCC CUAP and NZQA. That will normally be secured by some replication of the initial approval process described above.
9. The process will be funded on a cost recovery basis. The cost of the regular NZVCC CUAP peer review procedure will not, however, be attributed to the process.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR JOINTLY AWARDED DEGREES STANDING COMMITTEE

1. To receive proposals for jointly-awarded qualifications, referred to it by NZQA and NZVCC;
2. To determine whether the documentation is adequate and to secure any additional documentation it considers necessary;
3. To ensure that the proposal is submitted to CUAP for consideration and to arrange any additional peer review process that it considers necessary;
4. To recommend to CUAP and NZQA whether the qualification should be approved and the provider accredited to offer it.

RESOLUTION OF DISPUTED RECOMMENDATIONS

In the event the NZVCC and NZQA approval processes result in a variation in outcome and recommendation the following approaches should be used to find a common recommendation that can be accepted both by CUAP, acting on behalf of NZVCC, and the NZQA Board.

The Jointly Awarded Degrees Standing Committee should attempt to find common ground between CUAP, the NZQA panel and the institutions. It is anticipated that in the case of minor variations in programme structure and/or minor accreditation issues a common position will be attainable and, in effect, a single recommendation can be sent to NZVCC and NZQA.

More substantial differences of opinion that are not resolvable by the Jointly Awarded Degree Standing Committee may need to go to mediation, involving an independent person appointed with the support of NZVCC and NZQA. In practical terms such an approach would most likely be used if the two approval and accreditation processes were arguing for different and perhaps opposite structural changes to a programme or had major variations in requirements for accreditation. If the mediation process does not result in a common recommendation that can be approved by NZVCC and NZQA, then the institutions will be requested to re-submit their application at a later date.

The appointment of the mediator would be on the recommendation of the members of the Jointly Awarded Degrees Standing Committee and be considered by CUAP, acting on behalf of NZVCC and NZQA.

In the most extreme situation it is possible to envisage approval and accreditation by one of the approval processes and not by the other. Unless the Jointly Awarded Degrees Standing Committee can see an opportunity for resolution, and perhaps the implementation of the process outlined in (2) above, it would be necessary for the institutions to re-submit their application at a later date.

The central role of the Jointly Awarded Degrees Standing Committee in managing individual applications is significant. The NZVCC and NZQA members on the Standing Committee will have recourse to their respective organisations, but this should not conflict with a requirement to remain relatively independent and to attempt to find an equitable and acceptable resolution to any differences of opinion that may arise during the overall approval and accreditation process.

5.8 The Delivery and Awarding of Overseas Degrees in New Zealand

All courses leading to degrees and related qualifications awarded in New Zealand must be approved by NZVCC or the Qualifications Authority (or a delegated quality assurance body). All providers of NZQA approved courses must be accredited to offer the programmes in question.

Where a course leading to an overseas degree is to be offered in New Zealand, the owner/provider will be invited to provide evidence of approval by an overseas agency and details of the approval process undertaken by that agency. If the criteria applied to the proposal are sufficiently similar to those of the Qualifications Authority and the process applied was adequately rigorous, the Qualifications Authority may be prepared to negotiate an amended approval process. The Qualifications Authority will consider the potential for legal, professional or cultural requirements and concerns to impact on the acceptability of the course for New Zealand conditions.

If the course is to be managed in conjunction with a New Zealand-based organisation, a memorandum of cooperation between the partner organisations will be required.

The same considerations will inform the accreditation process. A memorandum of cooperation must specify responsibility for the delivery, assessment, moderation, resourcing, and monitoring of the course.

5.9 The delivery and awarding of New Zealand Qualifications Overseas

Introduction

Additional information requirements apply to New Zealand providers offering approved qualifications overseas as either stand-alone or joint ventures. Such arrangements require separate, site-specific accreditation.

Background

With the demand for quality education and training outcomes outstripping supply in many overseas countries there is growing interest in New Zealand qualifications. The Qualifications Authority is concerned for the reputation of New Zealand qualifications to be maintained, regardless of whether they are delivered in New Zealand or overseas.

The additional information requirements are modelled on the requirements established by the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP). They also reflect the substance of formal agreements between overseas quality assurance and certification bodies and those in New Zealand.

Accreditation requirements

Accreditation to offer any Qualifications Authority approved qualification overseas is site-specific. The information indicated below may be provided as part of an initial application for approval and/or accreditation or may be provided as part of a proposal for an extension of an existing accreditation.

Direct delivery overseas

Any New Zealand-based provider operating overseas must provide evidence to the Qualifications Authority that the overseas operations:

- are covered by the provider's quality management system;
- are consistent with the standards of the provider's New Zealand operations;

- comply with legal requirements in the particular country; and
- are acceptable to the relevant educational authorities in the particular country.

Delivery overseas in conjunction with an overseas provider

The Qualifications Authority requires the following additional information for New Zealand providers offering approved qualifications overseas as collaborative, “twinning”, franchise or joint venture activities with an overseas provider:

- (a) A statement on the standing of the overseas provider and evidence that this organisation meets appropriate quality and programme management requirements. The requirements must essentially be equivalent to those expected of a New Zealand provider.
- (b) A formal Memorandum of Cooperation between the New Zealand provider and the overseas provider. This must include a detailed outline of processes for the management and award of the qualification for students, including the provisions for the management of students and student results should the proposed arrangement cease to operate.
- (c) Details of the quality assurance processes applying to the overseas provider, where appropriate, with respect to the approval, accreditation and monitoring of the particular qualification under consideration.

Monitoring requirements

Courses delivered overseas that lead to the award of New Zealand qualifications are subject to the same monitoring requirements as courses delivered within New Zealand, and the monitoring process may be extended to meet requirements of any relevant overseas accreditation body.

In addition, where courses are delivered in conjunction with an overseas provider, the monitoring process must include a formal evaluation of the effectiveness of the collaborative arrangements.

Bilateral Arrangements with Overseas Accreditation Authorities

The Qualifications Authority is progressively developing formal agreements between relevant overseas accreditation bodies and the Authority. Such agreements would reflect the following:

- 1 An overseas accreditation body would check with:
 - NZQA, in respect of NZQA approved qualifications and accredited providers, or
 - CUAP, in respect of New Zealand university qualifications

that the relevant quality assurance requirements and standards had been met before accrediting a new joint venture involving a New Zealand qualification or provider.

- 2 The overseas body would, at least annually, advise the Qualifications Authority and CUAP (where necessary) on the body’s perceptions of the quality of New Zealand joint ventures entered into pursuant to the formal agreements.

5.10 Use of Te Reo Māori in assessment

The recognition of te reo Māori as an official language of New Zealand is leading to increasing numbers of learners who wish to use te reo Māori in assessment. The Qualifications Authority supports this development and requires providers to develop appropriate strategies to meet learners' needs.

Providers must have policies and procedures in place to respond to requests for assessment through te reo Māori.

These should include:

- Notification to learners of their right to use te reo Māori in assessment (and of any restrictions on this for practical reasons);
- Procedures for learners to notify the provider of their request to be assessed through te reo Māori;
- Timeframes for making and dealing with requests;
- Accessing of assessors with expertise both in the subject or discipline of the programme and in te reo Māori and tikanga Māori;
- Moderation arrangements; and
- Translation services, if appropriately qualified assessors and moderators are not available.

The provision for use of te reo Māori in assessment, where appropriate, will have implications for a number of areas of the provider's quality management systems. In particular, the recruitment of staff competent in te reo Māori and tikanga Māori and the provision of staff development in those areas will be important factors in meeting the needs of learners.

Providers are encouraged to establish links with other providers to maximise learning and resources. Assessors will be available through the whakaruruhau mo te reo Māori and the Māori academic community.

5.11 Professional Accreditation

Some courses prepare students for a career as practitioners in a particular field. Where a course is a recognised or required component of professional registration, the professional body will have specific requirements relating to course content and quality.

The Qualifications Authority will, where appropriate, invite a representative of the professional registration body to participate in the Qualifications Authority's evaluation processes and will take the views of this representative into account in reaching its decisions on approval and accreditation.

In situations where the requirements or timeframes of the professional registration body and the Qualifications Authority do not coincide, the Qualifications Authority will discuss this with the professional registration body before reaching a decision on an application.

The Authority currently has formal agreements in place with the Nursing Council of New Zealand and the New Zealand Teachers Council on the coordination of evaluation and decision-making. The Qualifications Authority also involves a number of other bodies in the evaluation process.

Where the Qualifications Authority considers that a course is of interest to a particular stakeholder group outside the requirements of professional registration, the Authority may seek advice from representatives or members of that group in carrying out its evaluation of an application.

6 APPLICATION AND EVALUATION PROCESSES FOR COURSES LEADING TO DEGREES AND RELATED QUALIFICATIONS

The application should address all of the criteria and should demonstrate how the applicant's quality management system has been applied in the development of the course.

APPLICATION

1. ITP Quality requires the application documents to be submitted electronically (either as email attachments or on CDROM) and also be provided to panel members in paper form. The electronic copy and two paper copies should be submitted to ITP Quality, normally with the initial application. One copy must be sent to each panel member at least 6 weeks prior to the scheduled evaluation visit as advised by the ITP Quality appointed evaluator.
2. Applications, with supporting documentation should be sent to:
applications@itpq.ac.nz
Executive Director, ITP Quality, Level 12, St John House, 114 The Terrace, Wellington
3. All fees and costs incurred by ITP Quality in relation to an evaluation for approval and/or accreditation will be charged to the applicant.
4. Applications may be made at any time but as the evaluation process takes several months, applications should be received by ITP Quality at least nine months prior to the intended commencement of delivery of the degree.
5. An applicant may make a formal application prior to completion of the final application documentation. At this stage, an evaluator will be appointed to liaise with the applicant on timing of the evaluation process, the appointment of the evaluation panel and the provision and distribution of final documentation.
6. Prior to submitting an application, an applicant should identify nominees for the evaluation panel. The applicant should provide the Authority with:
 - two nominations for each position on the panel including Māori stakeholder nominee (other than the positions of Evaluator and Independent Chair);
 - contact details for each nominee (Address, Phone, Email);
 - supporting information as to how they contribute to the panel characteristics; and
 - endorsements from relevant bodies of the nominations.Please note that nominees should not have been involved with the development of the programme, nor should they have an association with the applicant that may constitute a potential conflict of interest. If clarification is required, please contact the Qualifications Authority.

DOCUMENTATION

An application for approval and accreditation of a course leading to a degree or related qualifications must include the following documentation:

	Degree Approval and accreditation	Degree Approval only	Degree Accreditation only	Doctoral course approval and accreditation
Nature of application				
An indication as to whether the application is for:				
• Approval and accreditation;	*			*
• Approval only; or		*		
• Accreditation only.			*	
Organisation details				
• Name of organisation;	*	*	*	*
• Postal and street address;	*	*	*	*
• Telephone and fax numbers;	*	*	*	*
• Name, position and email address of contact person.	*	*	*	*
• Details of the organisation's policies in respect of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as expressed in its Charter, Profile or Quality Management Documents	*	*	*	*
Course data				
• Title of course and proposed qualification(s);	*	*	*	*
• Level of course	*	*	*	*
• Total credits of course	*	*	*	*
• Length of the course (hours/week x weeks x years)	*		*	
• NZSCED classification	*	*	*	*
• The ratio of provider-developed components to registered unit standards	*	*		
Primary delivery mode	*	*	*	*
Course-specific information				
• Course Aims	*	*		*
• Course Outcome Statement	*	*		*
• Course Structure – including specification of mandatory and elective/optional components; pre-requisites and co-requisites	*	*		*
• Component details – including title, level and credit allocations,	*	*		*

learning outcomes, criteria or guidance as to the standards which students must meet, outline of content and proposed teaching/learning resources (Where the components are unit standards, specify the number, title, level and credit and proposed teaching/learning resources.)				
• Delivery and learning methods – an overview	*		*	*
• Assessment and moderation practices – an overview	*	*	*	*
• General and Course-specific Regulations	*	*		*
• Stakeholder acceptability – Identification of stakeholders and their interests; evidence or information as to how these interests have been addressed.	*	*	*	*
• Teaching staff – Relevant qualifications and experience of each member of the proposed teaching team; an indication of individual contribution to, and responsibilities for, the course; current and planned research engagement; planned staff: student ratio	*		*	*
• Teaching facilities and physical resources – Specification of course-specific requirements and current or scheduled provision	*		*	*
• Student guidance and support systems – an overview	*		*	*
• Financial and administrative infrastructure – an overview of financial and administrative implications of the proposed course	*		*	*
• Course Implementation Timetable and resource planning	*		*	*
Quality management systems				
• Outline of quality management systems and details of course monitoring, evaluation and review systems and schedules	*	*	*	*
• Identification of proposed changes to the organisation's Quality Management System.	*	*	*	*

Administrative requirements				
• Statement of approval for the application from the controlling authority of the provider.	*	*	*	*
• Initial payment of \$5,000 or request for an invoice.	*	*	*	*
• Nominations for evaluation panel membership and supporting information.	*	*	*	*
Additional documentation as appropriate				
e.g. Memorandum of Cooperation				

The application may also include introductory or background material on the applicant, its reasons for developing the course/qualification and/or further information or evidence in support of the application.

NB Definitive document

If the application is successful, the provider will also be required to submit one copy of a definitive document outlining the proposed course and any changes which may have been made during the evaluation process. The definitive document should be sent to ITP Quality within one month of the formal notification of the Authority's decision.

EVALUATION

1. The evaluation of proposals for approval and accreditation of courses leading to degrees and related qualifications is generally undertaken by a panel drawn as appropriate from educational establishments and industry, commerce, the professions, Māori and other communities. The process is overseen by an evaluator appointed by ITP Quality. The evaluation panel is chaired by an independent chairperson also appointed by ITP Quality.
2. The evaluation process comprises the following steps:
 - a The ITP Quality appointed evaluator makes an initial evaluation of the documentation provided and advises the provider of any obvious gaps in documentation;
 - b The ITP Quality-appointed evaluator, in consultation with the provider and ITP Quality, will establish a panel from the nominations supplied by the provider and determine the scheduling of, and course for, an evaluation visit;
 - c The panel members are sent the application documentation and undertake an initial evaluation of the documentation;
 - d A summary analysis of the panel's initial evaluation is considered by the ITP Quality-appointed evaluator and chair with a copy being sent to the applicant;
 - e An evaluation visit is undertaken by the panel;
 - f Informal feedback is given to the applicant, generally at the end of the evaluation visit, on the panel's findings and provisional conclusions;
 - g A formal report is drafted and sent to the panel for general comment, and to the provider for comment on factual accuracy;

- h If requirements have been specified, these must be met satisfactorily before the next stage can take place;
- i Following resolution of any requirements, a final report (encompassing the views of the whole panel) is prepared and sent to the panel for confirmation;
- j The confirmed report is considered by the Board of ITP Quality; (NB Courses leading to nursing or teacher registration must be approved by both the Qualifications Authority and the relevant professional body.)
- k The formal decision made by the Board is conveyed to the provider and a monitor is appointed.

The evaluation visit

The visit by the panel to evaluate a degree proposal will normally take two days and be preceded by a briefing panel meeting on the evening before the first day.

The visit will generally include:

(a) meetings with:

- Senior management, including the chief executive;
- Those responsible for developing the course;
- Members of the teaching team;
- Students from a similar field of study to that of the proposed course;
- The advisory group; and

(b) a tour of facilities.

Time will also be set aside for private meetings of the panel.

At the end of the visit, the panel will provide informal feedback on the outcome of its evaluation.

The panel may decide:

- to recommend approval and/or accreditation by ITP Quality;
- to specify one or a series of requirements that need to be met before the panel can make a recommendation to ITP Quality;
- to recommend one or a series of conditions that should be established by ITP Quality; or
- to recommend withholding of approval and/or accreditation by ITP Quality.

The panel may also make recommendations to the applicant.

In the case of the panel deciding to specify requirements to be met by the applicant, the panel will communicate or meet again following receipt of the provider's response to these requirements in order to determine its recommendation to the Board.

Criteria for the appointment of panel members

Collectively, the panel should have the following characteristics:

- a Expertise in the field or discipline which corresponds to the scope of the application;

- b Relevant experience in industry, commerce, or the professions;
- c Experience, expertise and familiarity with current practice and developments in teaching, learning, assessment and (where relevant) research supervision and examination at the level of the proposed qualification;
- d The ability to make impartial judgment on the comparability of the proposed course with similar ones offered elsewhere in New Zealand and overseas, where appropriate, and to consider the course in a national and international perspective;
- e The ability to evaluate the effectiveness of quality management systems in the context of education and relevant to the course;
- f Familiarity with good practice in quality assurance.

Where possible, the panel should include:

- g Representatives of Māori and other relevant communities; and
- h A gender balance.

Panel Composition

Normally, the composition of the panel will be as follows:

- Independent chairperson, appointed by ITP Quality;
- Two university academics (from New Zealand or overseas),
- One senior academic from the applying institution, but from a different discipline;
- One senior academic from a provider with accreditation to award a degree in a similar subject area;
- Two representatives of industry, commerce or the professions, endorsed by relevant stakeholder groups (in the case of courses leading to professional registration, one of these will be appointed by the registration body);
- At least one member endorsed by the institution's Māori stakeholders as identified in the institution's Charter (unless the stakeholders decline an invitation to do this).
- The ITP Quality-appointed Evaluator with overall responsibility for the evaluation process.

Panels for evaluation of Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas

The evaluation of graduate certificates and diplomas may involve a reduced panel, generally consisting of:

- The ITP Quality-appointed Evaluator with overall responsibility for the evaluation process;
- One senior academic from a provider with accreditation to award a degree in a similar subject area;
- One representative of industry, commerce or the professions, endorsed by relevant stakeholder groups.

7 POST-APPROVAL PROCESSES

7.1 MONITORING

7.1.1 The Purposes of Monitoring

Monitoring of courses leading to degrees and related qualifications by ITP Quality is designed to reassure ITP Quality and all stakeholders:

- a. that the course is being implemented and managed as planned and presented at the time of approval;
- b. that appropriate consideration is given to any recommendations made by the Evaluation Panel;
- c. that the course is developing in ways that are broadly consistent with the intent of the course;
- d. that there is independent, external academic input during reviews and consideration of significant course enhancements;
- e. that ITP Quality is made aware of issues affecting the satisfactory provision of the course.

Monitoring by ITP Quality is not intended to replace the actions taken by Providers to monitor, review and regularly improve the quality of the courses for which they are responsible.

7.1.2 The Monitoring Process

ITP Quality monitoring will generally be by an analysis of an annual course evaluation report from the Provider to ITP Quality and returns made by the Provider to the Ministry of Education.

During the early years of delivery of a course, ITP Quality monitoring will also include an annual visit to the Provider and a report by a Monitor appointed by ITP Quality. The ITP Quality-appointed Monitor will report directly to ITP Quality in terms of the purposes of monitoring as specified in Section 7.1.1 above.

The Monitor may be accompanied for the first year's visit by an Independent Evaluator, also appointed by ITP Quality. The involvement of the Independent Evaluator on future visits will be determined by ITP Quality following discussion with the Independent Evaluator, the Monitor and the Provider. A Provider may request the on-going participation of the Independent Evaluator.

7.1.3 ITP Quality-Appointed Monitors

ITP Quality will seek to appoint Monitors who are experienced in academic processes and expert in the discipline area of the course. They will have an independent and neutral perspective on the degree and the Provider.

Monitors will be appointed by ITP Quality following consideration of recommendations from the Provider, and consultation with the Independent Evaluator and Chairperson of the Evaluation Panel. Where appropriate ITP Quality will ensure that the monitor is acceptable to the relevant professional body.

Further details of the ITP Quality Monitoring processes are available at ([website www.itpq.ac.nz](http://www.itpq.ac.nz)).

7.2 CHANGES TO APPROVED DEGREE PROGRAMMES

Please refer to the ITP Quality's "Guidelines for Changes to ITP Quality-Approved programmes" available on the ITP Quality website.

7.2.2 Applications for Changes to ITP Quality-approved Courses

Please refer to the ITP Quality's "Application for Changes to an approved programme" available on the ITP Quality website.