Approval and Accreditation

of

Courses

Leading to

Degrees

and

Related Qualifications

2010

Contents

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 (NZQA);

- the Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics Quality (ITPQ), operating under the delegation from NZQA (for degrees to level 7 offered by 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 NZQA in terms of its evaluation, approval and accreditation functions, this also refers to any quality assurance body operating under delegation from NZQA (eg, ITPQ)

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 NZQA 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 NZQA 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, Bachelors Honours Degrees, Graduate Certificates and Diplomas, and Post-graduate Certificates and Diplomas);

- the requirements established by NZQA 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.nzqa.govt.nz).

Information on the approval of courses in universities is available from the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (www.nzvcc.ac.nz/aboutus/sc/cuap).

Terminology

The term "course" is used in the legislation and the gazetted criteria. This has been interpreted by NZQA 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. Where only components of courses are addressed, this will be specified.

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

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 NZQA may only be delivered by providers accredited to do so by NZQA.

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.

NZQA will accept applications for approval and accreditation or for accreditation to deliver a course leading to an approved degree or a related qualification from tertiary education institutions other than universities, and private or government training establishments. These organisations and others specifically recognised for this purpose by NZQA may apply for approval only of a course leading to a degree or related qualification.

In granting approval and/or accreditation, NZQA 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 2003/04. In order to assist with this evaluation, NZQA Evaluators will be asked to consider and express an opinion to NZQA 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 NZQA and the relevant professional or sector group. Where these exist, they will be published on, or linked to NZQA's website.

New Zealand Qualifications Framework

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 Qualifications Framework (www.nzqf.govt.nz).

Monitoring

The management and delivery of approved degrees is subject to on-going monitoring by NZQA. Degree providers and organisations responsible for approved degrees are required to make an annual report to NZQA. NZQA 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 page 43 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 NZQA. These guidelines set out the categories of changes to approved degrees and the level of approval required by NZQA.

Unit Standards Based Degrees

In addition to course approval and accreditation, organisations wishing to deliver degrees based on unit standards from the New Zealand 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, ongoing approval of courses and accreditation for their delivery is conditional on a provider demonstrating that the course, and its delivery, continues 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

NZQA requires all degree providers and organisations responsible for approved degrees 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 NZQA at the time of the annual report.

External Evaluation and Review

NZQA is also responsible for the external evaluation and review of all providers of tertiary education other than universities. For some providers this responsibility is delegated to a sector-specific quality assurance body (eg, ITPQ).

Special Reviews

NZQA retains the right to undertake a special review of the approval and/or accreditation of a degree. A special review will be established by NZQA 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 for Approval and Accreditation of Courses

The gazetted criteria form the basis for requirements established by NZQA. They are used by all Quality Assurance Bodies. The criteria were revised and gazetted in late 2002.

Related Publications

These criteria replace the following NZQA 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 NZQA 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:

- *Policies and Criteria for the Ongoing Registration of Private Training Establishment* www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/registration-and-accreditation/maintaining-registration/policies-and-criteria-for-ongoing-registration

- ITP Quality Academic Quality Standards www.itpq.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 NZQA in December 2002 pursuant to section 253 (3) of the Education Act 1989.

Each criterion is followed by the requirements established by NZQA 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 NZQA in terms of its evaluation, approval and accreditation functions, this also refers to any quality assurance body operating under delegation from NZQA (eg, ITPQ)

---

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.nzqf.govt.nz) 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 (www.steo.govt.nz/NZSCEDBrowse.aspx?mode=browse).

---

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 Māori, 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 NZQA in December 2002 pursuant to section 253 (3) of the Education Act 1989.

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

Where reference is made to NZQA in terms of its evaluation, approval and accreditation functions, this also refers to any quality assurance body operating under delegation from NZQA (eg ITPQ).

> **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.nzqf.govt.nz) 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 (www.steo.govt.nz/NZSCEDBrowse.aspx?mode=browse).

---

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 Māori, 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.

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

4. Gazetted Criteria 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 NZQA in December 2002 pursuant to section 253 (3) of the Education Act 1989.

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

Where reference is made to NZQA in terms of its evaluation, approval and accreditation functions, this also refers to any quality assurance body operating under delegation from NZQA (eg, ITPQ).

---

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. Gazetted Criteria and Requirements for Approval and Accreditation of Courses Leading to Doctoral Qualifications

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

Each criterion is followed by the requirements established by NZQA to assist applicants and evaluators in respect of course approval and accreditation for doctoral qualifications or other courses that are primarily research-based.

Applications will not be accepted for either approval or accreditation only.

NB   Accreditation to offer specific doctorate qualifications is only granted for a defined scope. An organisation intending to apply for a broad scope of approval and accreditation to offer doctoral qualifications should discuss its intentions with NZQA at an early stage. Practical considerations of evaluation panel size, availability and manageability may necessitate limitations of the scope for specific applications.

---

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 and the qualification(s) awarded on the basis of successful completion of the course, is consistent with the requirements on nomenclature in the general registration criteria for the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications (the Register) (www.nzqf.govt.nz) and relevant conventions (see Special Issues section).

1.2 Aim

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

(b) The aim identifies 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 requirements of the Register.

(b) The scope of the proposed doctoral qualification and its corresponding academic discipline, field of study, or creative work are clearly defined.

(c) An effective system for approving each candidate's research programmes, which includes structured processes, associated with the academic board or equivalent body, and other relevant committees, ensures that each candidate's programme meets and continues to meet the characteristics of doctoral qualifications as defined for the Register. The system involves people who have engaged in research at doctoral level, and who have experience of successful research degree supervision, and includes, for at least the first two years of provision, at least one academic peer from an established doctorate-awarding institution.

(d) **In the case of courses with coursework components,** clear learning outcomes are specified for each component part of the course.

1.4 Coherence

(a) The course is consistent with the characteristics of programmes as defined for the Register.

(b) The Course meets the minimum level and credit requirements of the Register.

(c) An appropriate New Zealand Standard For Classification of Education (NZSCED) classification is identified (www.minedu.govt.nz).

(d) In the case of courses with coursework components, appropriate levels and credits are allocated to each component of the course.

---

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 Supervision of candidates' research is supported by

- 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.

2.2 Practical, field-based or work-based components of the course which are based away from the delivery site, are integrated into the rest of the course.

2.3 **In the case of courses with coursework components**, proposed modes of delivery and delivery sites are clearly identified.

2.4 **In the case of courses with coursework components**, delivery and facilitated learning methods are appropriate to the nature of the course, the proposed modes of delivery and the likely student body.

---

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

---

3.1 The required standards for assessment are clearly specified.

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

3.3 Candidates have the opportunity to present work in progress to peer groups and other researchers.

3.4 Assessment methodology allows students to request assessment in te reo Māori.

3.5 Assessment arrangements are governed by clear regulations, criteria and approval processes.

The body of work presented by the candidate must be examined by three or more experts with international standing in the relevant field or discipline, a majority of whom will be external to the organisation, and one of whom is a reputable and recognised expert outside New Zealand. Supervisors or associate supervisors of the work of a doctoral candidate will not be examiners of that work.

3.6 In the case of courses with coursework components, assessment methodology is appropriate and effective.

3.7 In the case of courses with coursework components, moderation arrangements include pre-assessment moderation of summative assessment tasks and external post-assessment moderation of student work and marking/grading in order to ensure that assessment results are fair, valid and consistent.

---

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;

- normal progress through the course and minimum and maximum periods for completion of the course;

- requirements for the award of the qualification.

5.2 Regulations must also cover

- definition of the type of research activities acceptable;

- research project approval;

- project modification;

- supervision and reporting;

- assessment/examination conditions;

- 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.

5.3 **In the case of courses with coursework components**, regulations must also cover:

- Course structure, including specified pre- and co-requisites, mandatory and optional/elective components, practical/work-based components and alternative entry and exit points;

- Any 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);

- Assessment, including provisions for assessment in te reo Māori, reassessment and appeals;

- Provisions for dealing with instances of impaired performance (eg aegrotat passes).

> **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. At least one of the supervisors for each candidate must be a doctorate holder in the relevant field or discipline;

(b) have significant and verifiable engagement in research and have a record of publication (or production of creative work) of international standing*;*

(c) have significant and verifiable experience and expertise in the supervision of research and research programme evaluation, including at least one supervisor who has experience of successful supervision at doctoral level; and

(d) **in the case of courses with coursework components**, have experience and expertise in teaching, with regard to the proposed delivery modes.

   Experience in Māori language and culture, and appropriate knowledge, skills and tikanga will be a requirement for some courses.

   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 facilities and resources necessary for the implementation and sustained delivery of the course, 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 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 stakeholders or representatives of relevant industries, professions, academic and research communities, Māori and other communities 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

---

There is an established research culture that has the following characteristics:

(a) Staff conduct research within their area of experience which advances knowledge and understanding and supports their function as teachers and disseminate the outcomes of this research through appropriate channels.

(b) The quantity and quality of staff research outputs is monitored and the collective output is consistent with the maintenance of the established research culture.

(c) Organisational systems and facilities provide appropriate support to staff involved in research, including

- recognition of research in staff appointment and performance appraisal;

- terms and conditions of employment which support research;

- widespread dissemination of research codes of conduct;

- a formal research ethics committee;

- institutional support for dissemination of research outputs through publication and conference presentation; and

- institutional publication of annual reports on research.

---

6. Special Issues

6.1   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 NZQA.

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)
Doctor of	Education, Music (EdD or DMus) - named doctorates in a specified field or discipline
Doctor of	Science, Literature (DSc or DLitt) - Higher Doctorates

Doctorate titles do not normally include a qualifier.

6.2   Credit Recognition and Transfer

NZQA has established a policy on credit recognition and transfer (*Supporting Learning Pathways: Credit Recognition and Transfer Policy*, December 2002) (www.nzqa.govt.nz/assets/Studying-in-NZ/Tertiary/creditpolicy.pdf).

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.

NZQA 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.

6.3   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 NZQA 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.

6.4   Unit Standards Based Degrees

Degrees or related qualifications that are based primarily on unit standards from the New Zealand Qualifications Framework or that seek to meet the requirements of a National degree as registered on the New Zealand 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.

6.5   Definition of Research

Research is an intellectually controlled investigation that 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 contexts[1], 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 that is intended to generate new knowledge in an area that has not yet advanced sufficiently to enable specific applications to be identified.

 (c) Applied research: work that develops or tests existing knowledge and is primarily directed towards either specific practical objectives or towards the evaluation of policies or practices. Work that 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 that *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.

---

[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).

NZQA 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.

6.6   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 NZQA'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.

NZQA 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.

NZQA 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.

NZQA 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.

NZQA expects that in the event of any growth or turnover 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.

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

6.7a   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 registered government or private training establishment; or

- a body approved by NZQA 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 the ITPQ and NZQA.

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 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 co-operation that 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 that 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 NZQA;

- 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.

6.7b   *Where at least one of the partner organisations is a university and at least one is not a university*

These procedures have been agreed between NZQA and the New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee

Introduction

These procedures apply to those programmes where one of the providers is a university and the other is a polytechnic, wānanga 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 also 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; 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 pertain 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.

One set of documentation

Where the application involves a university and an institute of technology or polytechnic, or a private training establishment, or a wānanga, the applicant institutions should submit only one set of documentation, which in the first instance will go to the quality assurance body (QAB) of the ITP, PTE or wānanga. After an initial analysis and only if it addresses all requirements, the application will be sent to the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) by one of the due dates (see below).

One approval process

On receipt of the documentation by a QAB, a designated specialist from that QAB should do an initial analysis of the documentation to ensure that the documentation has the capability of meeting the gazetted criteria. If that does not appear to be the case, the QAB should consult with the applicant institutions and return the documents for the required improvements or amendments.

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

Should CUAP have any concerns, it should discuss these with the designated person from the QAB.

When the application meets CUAP criteria (which are the gazetted criteria) CUAP should recommend approval and notify the other QAB. If CUAP does not approve the application, it must advise the other QAB and both applicants immediately.

The rationale for leaving the approval process with CUAP is to streamline it. It is considered that two approval processes are not necessary, especially given that the same criteria are used, and that CUAP has the expertise to approve degree programmes.

Site accreditation for non-university participants

For any applicant other than a university there should be a site accreditation. It is considered that non-university applicants still need capability-building and that a site accreditation visit will assist with this growth and development.

It is not intended that this should be a full panel visit as described in the NZQA document *Approval and Accreditation of Courses leading to Degree and Related Qualifications*, as it will focus on accreditation only.

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

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

6.8   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 NZQA (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 NZQA and the process applied was adequately rigorous, NZQA may be prepared to negotiate an amended approval process. NZQA 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.

6.9   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. NZQA is concerned for the reputation of New Zealand qualifications to be maintained, regardless of whether they are delivered in New Zealand or overseas.

Accreditation requirements

Accreditation to offer any NZQA approved qualification overseas is site-specific. Any organisation considering delivering a course or courses overseas, needs to contact the Manager of Registration, Approval and Accreditation to get detailed information about what is required, email qaadmin@nzqagovt.nz or phone 0800 697 296.

6.10   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. NZQA 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.

6.11 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.

NZQA will, where appropriate, invite a representative of the professional registration body to participate in NZQA'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 NZQA do not coincide, NZQA will discuss this with the professional registration body before reaching a decision on an application.

NZQA currently has formal agreements in place with the Nursing Council of New Zealand, the New Zealand Teachers Council and the Social Workers Registration Board on the coordination of evaluation and decision-making. NZQA also involves a number of other bodies in the evaluation process.

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

7. 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. After submitting an online application, one hard copy of documentation should be sent to:

   Administration and Service
   Quality Assurance Division
   New Zealand Qualifications Authority
   PO Box 160
   Wellington 6140

2. All fees and costs incurred by NZQA in relation to an evaluation for approval and/or accreditation will be charged to the applicant.

3. Applications may be made at any time but as the evaluation process takes several months, applications should be received by NZQA at least nine months prior to the intended commencement of delivery of the degree.

4. An applicant may make a formal application prior to completion of the final application documentation. At this stage, an advisor 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.

5. Prior to submitting an application, an applicant should identify nominees for the evaluation panel. The applicant should provide NZQA with:

   - two nominations for each position on the panel including Māori stakeholder nominee (other than the positions of NZQA advisor and independent chair);

   - contact details for each nominee (address, phone, email);

   - information on the expertise each nominee will bring to the panel (CV); and

   - endorsements from relevant bodies of the industry/professional 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 NZQA.

6. The applicant will be required to provide at least ten copies of the application documents. Two of these must be submitted to NZQA, normally with the initial application. One copy must be sent to each panel member at least six weeks prior to the scheduled evaluation visit as advised by the NZQA advisor.

Definitive document

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

Evaluation Process Overview

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 NZQA advisor. The evaluation panel is chaired by an independent chairperson also appointed by NZQA.

2. The evaluation process comprises the following steps:
    (a) The NZQA advisor makes an initial evaluation of the documentation provided and advises the provider of any obvious gaps in documentation;
    (b) The NZQA advisor, in consultation with the provider, recommends to the Manager of Course Approvals and Accreditation the panel members from the nominations supplied by the provider and determine the scheduling of an evaluation visit. The panel members will be approved by the Deputy Chief Executive (DCE), Quality Assurance Division (QAD) prior to any appointments being made;
    (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 NZQA advisor 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 Manager of Course Approvals and Accreditation;
    (k) The confirmed report and the recommendation made by the Manager are considered by the DCE, QAD and the Chief Executive (CE). (NB courses leading to nursing or teacher registration must be approved by both NZQA and the relevant professional body.);
    (l) The formal decision made by the DCE and CE 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 NZQA;

- to specify one or a series of requirements that need to be met before the panel can make a recommendation to NZQA;

- to recommend one or a series of conditions that should be established by NZQA; or

- to recommend withholding of approval and/or accreditation by NZQA.

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 NZQA.

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.

(g) Where possible, the panel should include:

  a. Representatives of Māori and other relevant communities; and

  b. A gender balance.

Panel composition

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

- Independent Chairperson;

- Two university academics (from New Zealand or overseas) from a similar area;

- 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).

- NZQA advisor with overall responsibility for the evaluation process.

When making panel member nominations to NZQA be sure to include at least two nominations for each position (i.e. four nominations for the university academic positions), and include full curriculum vitae's for each nomination – for academics be sure this is a full and comprehensive academic CV. Nominations need to be from a variety of organisations.

Panels for evaluation of Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas

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

- NZQA advisor 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.

8. Post-Approval Processes

8.1 Monitoring

8.1.1 The purposes of monitoring

Monitoring of degrees and related qualifications by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) is designed to reassure NZQA and all stakeholders:

(a) that the degree 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 any minor modifications and enhancements made by the provider are broadly consistent with the intent of the programme and the ongoing development of a quality programme;

(d) that there is independent, external academic input during reviews and consideration of significant programme enhancements;

(e) that NZQA is made aware of issues affecting the satisfactory provision of the degree.

Monitoring by NZQA is not intended to replace the actions taken by providers to monitor, review and regularly improve the quality of the degree programmes for which they are responsible.

8.1.2 NZQA monitoring process

The first year's visit will be carried out by an NZQA advisor and an NZQA appointed monitor. The involvement of the advisor on future visits will be determined by NZQA following discussion with the advisor, the monitor and the provider. A provider may request the on-going participation of the NZQA advisor.

In subsequent years NZQA monitoring is by annual visit to the provider by the monitor followed by the monitors report. The NZQA appointed monitor will report directly to NZQA in terms of the purposes of monitoring as specified in Section 1 above.

When the degree is well established and is running smoothly, usually after the first cohort, the monitor may recommend that the provider apply to discontinue monitoring and to replace it with providing an Annual Programme Evaluation Report (APER) to NZQA.

8.1.3 NZQA appointed monitors

NZQA will seek to appoint monitors who are experienced in academic processes and expert in the discipline area of the degree. They will have an independent and neutral perspective on the degree and the provider.

Monitors will be appointed by NZQA following a recommendation from the degree evaluation panel, the NZQA advisor and with the agreement of the provider.

Further details of the NZQA monitoring processes are available on the NZQA webpage: www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/registration-and-accreditation/degree-approval-accreditation-and-monitoring/degree-monitoring.

8.2 Changes to NZQA Approved Courses

8.2.1 Introduction

From time to time, providers or course owners will identify the need to make modifications or enhancements to NZQA approved courses. NZQA has identified two categories of changes requiring different levels of evaluation and approval. Formal approval of changes may also be required by professional bodies.

Categories of changes

There are two categories of change: Category 1 and Category 2.

Category 1 changes can be made without any involvement of NZQA. In general, such changes relate to changes to the components of a course. They have no impact on the overall course level, credit value, or learning outcomes.

Category 2 changes require evaluation and written approval from NZQA before being implemented. These changes affect the structure of the course and may result in a change to the qualification details that appear on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework (www.nzqf.govt.nz).

Examples relating to these two categories of changes are given below. Note that the list is not exhaustive; if in doubt, contact NZQA on 0800 697 296 and ask to speak to the Registration, Approval and Accreditation team, or email qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz.

Category 1 – changes that DO NOT need prior approval from NZQA

These can include changes to the:

- content of a component
- title of a component
- learning outcomes or purpose/aim statement of a component (but not the overall outcomes or purpose/aim of the qualification)
- level of a component (while retaining the overall level of the qualification)
- credit value of components (while retaining the overall credit value of the qualification)
- purpose statement of a component
- pre- or co-requisite that does not affect the entry requirements for the course
- teaching resources of the component
- teaching/learning strategies of the component
- assessment of the component (quantitative change)
- elective components of the course (addition/deletion) while retaining the overall credit value of the qualification.

In order to effect these changes, course owners should follow the processes in their own quality management system (QMS).

Although these changes do not need to be notified to NZQA, please note that in some circumstances funding bodies may need to be notified.

Check with your TEC advisor if you are uncertain whether confirmation of the change is required from NZQA for funding approval.

Category 2 – changes that require prior approval from NZQA

Applications for Category 2 changes will be evaluated by NZQA. In some cases, evaluation by a panel will be required and may require a site visit and formal approval by the NZQA Board.

Category 2 changes can be changes to the approved course, or to the provider's accreditation to deliver the approved course, or both.

Changes to approved courses and accreditations

If there are a significant number of changes, a new course approval may be required.

The following changes include evaluation by NZQA and may include consultation with the monitor and relevant stakeholders and possibly a visit to the provider/new site:

- title and/or type of the course
- minor changes to the structure of the course
- changes to the credit value of the course
- outcome statement of the course
- changes to the regulations, including entry requirements
- length of the course
- exit qualifications (introduction of new ones).

The following changes normally require evaluation by an external panel and approval by the NZQA Board:

- introduction of a new major
- changes to the mode of delivery[2]
- change to allow for delivery at another site (including overseas sites)[3]
- significant changes to the structure of the course.

8.2.2   Documentation required

The application should included sufficient detail to enable NZQA to confirm that the criteria for approval and accreditation will continue to be met following implementation of the change.

For a new major, refer to section 2, page 8 of this booklet.
For a new site accreditation or mode of delivery, refer to Section 4, page 18 of this booklet.

For approval of a Category 2 change, documentation to NZQA should also include the details and evidence of the following:

- full details of the changes
- rationale for the changes
- internal consultation and support for the changes
- external consultation and support for the changes
- transition arrangements for existing learners (where necessary)
- internal formal approval for the changes
- resourcing

- staffing (numbers, qualifications)
- resulting changes to quality management systems.

---

[2] Where accreditation for delivery of approved courses is mode specific (for example by face-to-face, distance, or blended), providers are required to apply for accreditation even if only one component of the course/programme is to be offered via a mode not covered by the original accreditation.

[3] Providers are required to apply for an extension to deliver at each additional site, including overseas sites. Accreditation to deliver a degree course is always site specific.