

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO  
TE WHARE WĀNANGA O WAIKATO**

**GUIDELINES  
FOR  
PROGRAMME REVIEWS**

*Approved by Academic Board: 11 August 2015*

## 1. BACKGROUND

Universities New Zealand's Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) defines a programme review as a review of *"an individual programme such as a degree or a diploma, or on a major disciplinary component of a suite of qualifications. It examines the regulations, the subjects/majors and the papers which contribute to those subjects/majors, in order to establish whether the programme is achieving its objectives, is based on an appropriate curriculum, and meets the needs of students and employers."*

The University of Waikato defines four types of Programme Reviews:

- A. **Qualification Reviews**, which may involve a single qualification or a suite of qualifications (e.g. the Bachelor of Arts; all masters degrees offered by the Faculty of Management; postgraduate qualifications in Education, etc). This includes Graduating Year Reviews, as defined by CUAP.
- B. **Academic Unit Reviews**, which may be a single subject or a related collection of subjects (e.g. Anthropology; all social science subjects, etc )
- C. **Accreditation Reviews**, which are required by an external accreditation agency and are conducted in order to meet the required accreditation standards (e.g. Teacher Education, Faculty of Management triple crown)
- D. **Ad Hoc Reviews**, which will be requested and specified by a member of the senior leadership team, usually the Vice-Chancellor, Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic or Research, or a Dean.

These four types of review are referred to collectively as **Programme Reviews**, although these guidelines relate primarily to Qualification Reviews and Academic Unit Reviews.

Responsibility for the schedule and scope of Programme Reviews rests with the Deans of the Faculties, with delegation to faculty managers, heads of schools or departments where agreed.

## 2. PURPOSE

A Programme Review is an examination of an academic unit or qualification in relation to its regulations, structure, management, student profile and grade distribution data, graduate profile and graduate outcomes, and the majors and papers which contribute to the Programme.

The aim of any programme review is to consider whether, or to what extent, the structure, content and conceptual framework of that programme reflects the best of current thinking in that discipline. A review should include all delivery modes. It may comment or make recommendations on a range of matters including conceptual underpinnings of programmes, programme structures, curriculum content, delivery, organisation (including overlaps and synergies), and quality of papers and programmes.

The general purpose of a programme review is to assess and improve programme performance through evaluation of activities, processes and outcomes as they relate to objectives. As the generic Terms of Reference (Annex 1) indicate, programmes will be reviewed on:

- Overall Objectives, Priorities and Activities
- The Academic Programme
- Teaching and Learning
- The Student Experience
- Research and/or Creative Work

**Qualification Reviews** are normally focussed on the matrix of papers; assessment types and outcomes; graduate attributes, outcomes and profile; enrolments and completions etc – i.e. the curriculum and the students. These are formal, broad reviews which will normally span across one or more faculties, and will include external member(s) in the review panel.

**Academic Unit Reviews** are normally focussed on the people, strategic direction, research profile, community engagement, and fit within the wider University of a particular unit – i.e. the collective academic staff within the unit. These are less formal, narrow reviews which are primarily conducted as an internal review.

**Accreditation Reviews** will be dictated by the requirements of the relevant accreditation agency. **Ad Hoc Reviews** will be defined on a case by case basis.

### 3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. Reviews will be based on the Teaching and Learning Plan 2013 – 2016 and the Academic Plan.
2. Reviews serve a number of critical quality-related purposes:
  - ensuring and increasing quality of processes and outcomes;
  - recognising strengths, achievements and progress, and highlighting commendable and exemplary features;
  - identifying concerns and areas requiring improvement or change;
  - the development of strategies to assist in bringing about the recommended changes.
3. Programme policies, practices and performance will be examined in a comparative context by reference to internationally benchmarked universities.
4. Reviews provide objective peer assessment by a panel of internal and external colleagues, where appropriate.
5. The timeframe of a review is past, present and future.
6. Programme reviews will normally encompass some or all of the following areas:
  - teaching and learning,
  - research and creative work,
  - student experience
  - community service and professional activities,
  - management and administration, and
  - contribution to broader faculty and university objectives.

### 4. SCHEDULING

Qualifications will normally be reviewed on a seven year cycle. Academic Units may be reviewed more or less often, as agreed between the Dean and relevant Chair (or equivalent). To facilitate forward planning, the Dean will prepare a seven year rolling plan for Qualification Reviews and Academic Unit Reviews in consultation with the relevant Chairs, Programme Convenors and other staff with oversight of programmes within the Faculty.

Once the final schedule has been prepared the Faculty Board will receive the programme review schedule for comment and planning purposes. The Dean will submit the programme review plan to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for final approval.

The Dean will consult with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (DVCA) with regard to any variations to the programme review schedule. Changes of a minor nature can be approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic). Major changes to the schedule require the approval of the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor (SDVC).

Programme Reviews should be conducted in a way that is appropriate to the strategic relevance and size of the programme. Programmes with large enrolments and/or which have been identified as being of strategic importance require a more formal review process with an external review panel member (Category 1). Programmes with limited enrolments and/or which are of limited scope may be subject only to internal review (Category 2). Academic Unit Reviews will normally be categorised as Category 2.

The categorisation of programmes into the appropriate level of review will be the responsibility of the Dean.

## 5. REVIEW PANEL

A Review Panel must be appointed well in advance. The Dean and the Chair should consult with the academic staff within the Faculty regarding a possible Review Chair and other panel members. Panel composition should take account of relevant expertise and experience, appropriate gender and ethnic representation.

The Dean will be responsible for the classification of programmes into the appropriate level for review. Chairs and Review Panels for Category 1 programmes must be signed off by the relevant Dean and the DVCA. Chairs and Review Panels for Category 2 programmes and Academic Unit Reviews must be signed off by the relevant Dean and reported to the DVCA.

Qualification Reviews Panels for Category 1 programmes will normally consist of:

- Panel Chair: A senior staff member or Emeritus Professor of the University of Waikato, from outside the Programme, with experience and expertise in regard to the Terms of Reference.
- One senior academic member from the University of Waikato, representing the Programme under review (cross-disciplinary qualifications should include one staff member from each discipline/faculty),
- One senior academic staff member in a similar discipline at another New Zealand university, or an Australian or other international university
- One senior member of an appropriate industry group, professional association or society.
- One current student or recent graduate.

Qualification Review Panels for Category 2 programmes will normally consist of:

- A Panel Chair, who is an academic staff member external to the discipline under review but from within the University,
- Two academic staff members: one from within the discipline under review, and one from the same Faculty but a different discipline, and
- One current student or recent graduate.

Academic Unit Review Panels will normally consist of:

- A Panel Chair, normally a programme convener in a related discipline,
- Two academic staff members: one from within the discipline under review, and one external to the Faculty, and
- One current student or recent graduate.

The Chair is responsible for:

- ensuring that the review is conducted in accordance with its Terms of Reference and the requirements of confidentiality;
- chairing meetings of the Review Panel;
- acting as the main point of contact between the Review Panel and the DVCA (or nominee);
- ensuring that effective means of communication (e.g., email, conference calls) are arranged as necessary between Panel members before and after the site visit;
- co-ordinating requests for additional information other than the programme Portfolio;
- preparing the site visit programme in conjunction with the Programme Review Secretariat;
- inviting staff, students and others to meet with the Review Panel as per the visit programme;
- co-ordinating the drafting of the Review Panel Report, soliciting comments from the Dean and COD, finalising the report, and submitting it to the Vice-Chancellor, via the DVCA, within agreed deadlines;
- consulting with the DVCA, SDVC and/or the Vice-Chancellor if necessary at any stage in the review process.

Review Panel members will:

- evaluate the programme portfolio and written submissions
- request, if necessary, additional information through the Chair
- provide input into the site visit programme, where appropriate
- participate, as agreed with the Chair, in writing the final report.

## 6. SECRETARIAT

The Chair of School/Department should consult with academic and general staff within the programme regarding the appointment of a secretary/secretariat, who should be an appropriately experienced member of general staff. The role of the secretary is crucial to the compilation of information to populate the Self-Review Portfolio, gather written submissions and to provide administrative support to and liaise with the Review Panel.

Support and guidance for the Secretariat will be provided by the Academic Office.

## 7. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The generic Terms of Reference (see Appendix 1) outline the focus of the review. For any special aspect(s) that may require investigation, the Dean and/or Chair may vary the Terms of Reference in consultation with the DVCA and the SDVC (who has approval authority). Additional Terms of Reference may also be included by the DVCA, SDVC or Vice-Chancellor.

Review-specific Terms of Reference should be approved by the Dean, DVCA and the Faculty Board.

## 8. PROGRAMME SELF REVIEW PORTFOLIO

Following agreement on the Terms of Reference for a review, a Self-Review Portfolio will be prepared.

The Chair(s) of programme(s) under review will have lead responsibility for preparation of the Self-Review Portfolio, including co-ordination of input from other sources, although he or she may delegate this responsibility in consultation with the Dean. He or she (or nominee) will ensure the portfolio preparation process is an inclusive one, involving both staff and students. To minimise workload and duplication, the Self-Review Portfolio will utilise to the maximum extent possible existing sources of data and information. (see appendix 2)

A suggested Self-Review Portfolio structure is:

- Brief overview of the programme (including highlighting any special characteristics or factors that have influenced development since the last review, key matters that are of particular interest or concern, and plans for future development)
- Comments on each of the Terms of Reference
- Appendices (supporting material and data)

The Self-Review Portfolio should go beyond description and be based upon reflection and critical self-analysis. Among the questions that the Self-Review Portfolio should address are:

- What are we trying to do and why?
- Are our activities the best means for achieving our objectives?
- What are our current strengths (highlighting good practices, outcomes and impacts) and weaknesses?
- What mechanisms and processes do we have to ensure quality (including benchmarking activities) and tell ourselves how well we are doing?
- What strategies and activities can be used to further improve the programme and its performance?

It is expected that the Self Review Portfolio Report will be completed six to eight weeks prior to the Review Panel visit. It is confidential to the relevant academic unit(s) and the Panel. The Dean(s) will make comment (with reference to the Self-Review Portfolio) prior to the site visit, and this comment will be made available to relevant academic units prior to the site visit.

The main document of the Programme Self-Review Portfolio should not exceed 7500 words (excluding appendices).

## **9. CONFIDENTIALITY**

Review Panel members will treat all submissions and discussions as confidential. Panel members must recognise that documents or other information obtained or produced as a result of the Review may have to be provided by the University to others, including affected parties, in certain circumstances including but not limited to situations where required to by law.

A Review Panel may be exposed to or uncover sensitive material during the course of its work. Where warranted, the Review Panel should report any findings on individual staff in a separate confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor.

Issues that emerge outside of the Terms of Reference for a review may also, at the discretion of the Panel, be reported separately to the Vice-Chancellor. Panel members will treat material (both written and verbal) that is sensitive to the career or reputation of individual staff, or is commercially sensitive, with utmost care.

## **10. COMPILING INFORMATION**

In addition to its own expertise, information used by the Review Panel will come primarily from three sources:

- the Programme Self-Review Portfolio; (appendix 2)
- solicited written submissions; (appendix 3)
- interviews during the site visit, where appropriate.

The active participation of students and recent graduates is strongly encouraged at every stage of the Review Process.

## **11. SITE VISIT**

The site visit is devoted to interviews, further analysis and discussion, and progressing the draft report. Interviews of groups or individuals, either with the entire Panel or individual members, are used to validate (confirm, challenge, elaborate) the judgements made in the Portfolio, and to collect further opinions and experiences from programme staff, students, representatives of professional and other external bodies, and others who may interact with the programme/department. See Appendix 4 for details on planning the site visit.

## **12. FINAL REPORT**

Within 8 weeks of the Site Visit, the Chair of the Review Panel will send the completed draft report in confidence to the relevant Chair(s) and the Dean(s) for correction of matters of fact and wording of matters of substance. It is indicated at that stage that the report is confidential, although it may be discussed with relevant departmental staff as he/she thinks appropriate. Comments must be sent back to the Chair within three weeks.

After receiving these comments the Chair will finalise the report, consulting Panel members as necessary, and submit the final report to the Vice-Chancellor, via the DVCA.

### **13. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

The DVCA will be responsible for ongoing monitoring and periodic evaluation of all aspects of the programme review process and will report as necessary to the SDVC.

These guidelines will be evaluated by Education Committee and the Academic Board following the first year of their implementation.

**Terms of Reference for Programme Reviews (generic)**

**1. Objectives, Priorities and Activities**

To assess the appropriateness of the programmes' objectives, priorities and activities to ensure that they are internally consistent and are aligned with:

- a. student, internal stakeholder requirements/expectations;
- b. patterns of student enrolment and completion over time;
- c. where appropriate, external stakeholder requirements/expectations including employer groups, professional accreditation bodies, external research and funding bodies; and
- d. School/Faculty and University Vision and Strategic Plans.

**2. The Academic Programme**

To report on the scope, quality and any changes to the curriculum taking into account:

- a. the range, composition, balance, appropriateness and quality of undergraduate and graduate papers and qualifications offered in the light of enrolment trends;
- b. success and progression within and between qualifications;
- c. current and anticipated research trends and developments within the discipline; and
- d. where appropriate, the role and effectiveness of work placements within the programmes.

**3. Teaching and Learning**

- a. To review the effectiveness of, and means by which, the teaching and learning environment encourages academic excellence, enjoyment of learning, critical reasoning and inquiry, and international dimensions of scholarship.
- b. To assess the extent to which programmes meet the requirements of the Teaching and Learning Plan

**4. Research and/or Creative Work**

- a. To review the goals, objectives, extent and quality of research and/or creative work within the programmes, including contributions to enhancing the University's position as an internationally recognised, research-led institution.
- b. To ensure the protection of the intellectual property and moral rights related to research and/or creative work within the programmes.

### Compiling Information for the Programme Self-Review Portfolio

#### **Provided by the Programme or Department under review**

The information required for the self-review portfolio should be relatively ready to hand and would normally be required for internal planning, development and reporting requirements.

Qualification reviews are concerned with information about the papers that contribute to a qualification. The areas likely to be reviewed are: quality assurance measures, programme/qualification design and content, student enrolment/completions, student support, graduate outcomes and industry collaboration.

The University plans of most relevance to qualification reviews would be the most current

- Academic Plan
- Teaching and Learning Plan
- Student Plan
- Maori Advancement Plan
- Pacific Plan
- International Plan

#### **CATEGORY 1 QUALIFICATION REVIEWS**

##### *General:*

- Two most recent years' programme Annual Reports
- Strategic Plan or contribution to the latest faculty plan
- Current promotional material (e.g., programme handbooks)
- Previous qualification review report, the department's response(s) to it, and status of implementation of recommendations
- Reports of accrediting bodies (where appropriate)
- Benchmarking data

##### *Staff:*

- Current academic, research and general staff members - status/job title and description of current teaching, supervision, research and/or administrative responsibilities
- Professional Development activities undertaken by staff or provided by the Faculty/School/Programme/Department

##### *Teaching and Learning Assurance:*

- Identification of all of the education the programme/department offers or contributes to
- Programme/Departmental policies on teaching and learning
- Paper outlines at each teaching level (max 3)
- Examples of current assessment methods, internal and external at each teaching level (max 3)
- Current teaching evaluation plan and a statement about the plan's implementation
- Course/staff evaluations undertaken, aggregate details of evaluations, other sources of feedback or evaluation data
- Programme policies (where relevant/appropriate)

##### *Student Experience*

- Statement on student support mechanisms and initiatives provided by the faculty designed to enhance and/or improve student learning and retention.
- Statement on resources provided to postgraduate students (e.g., work space, IT, teaching/tutor/demonstrator positions, assistance for conference travel)
- Statement on support mechanisms for Māori and Pacific Island students
- Statement on the features of the qualification(s) that contribute to a distinctive Waikato experience for

students

- Statement on student support mechanisms and opportunities for participation for international students.

*Research:*

- Research income (external and internal) for the past 5 years
- A sample of recent Research and Study Leave reports (max 3)
- Evidence of international recognition of programme research
- PhD thesis titles (in progress, and completed during the past 5 years)
- List of student publications and conference presentations for the past 5 years, where appropriate

### **Provided by the University divisions, or units external to the Academic Unit under review**

Requests for information should come from the relevant Chair. The divisions or units, as appropriate, will provide their information contributions to the Chair at least three weeks before the due date for Self-Review Portfolio submission.

The types of information that could be provided include:

- Grades awarded (distribution) and pass rates for all courses for the 2 most recent examination sessions
- EFTS statistics (last 5 years) by course including ethnicity, gender and tracking of withdrawal rates
- Postgraduate enrolments for the past 5 years
- Staff/student ratios
- Profile of currently enrolled doctoral students (i.e., number of students in each year of study)
- Numbers of doctoral students graduating in each of the 5 most recent years
- Average length of time to complete a PhD (based on latest 5- year data)
- Graduate destinations
- Trends in recruitment

### **CATEGORY 2 QUALIFICATION REVIEWS**

As much of the information laid out for a Category 1 Qualification Review as is appropriate to the size and nature of the qualification(s) under review. This should be agreed in advance between the person responsible for the self review portfolio and the relevant Dean(s)

### **CATEGORY 2 ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEWS:**

Academic Unit Reviews are concerned with how one or more Academic Unit(s) contributes to the overall strategic direction of the University, or the Faculty and existing University plans.

These reviews are in the most general sense about how an Academic Unit attracts students, supports staff, engages in research and the community, and assures quality.

The most relevant University Plans to consider would be

- Strategic Plan
- Academic Plan
- Teaching and Learning Plan
- Research Plan

*General:*

- The latest Academic Unit Review Annual Report
- A summary report on the contribution made to University's or Faculty's Strategic Plan by the Academic Unit
- A report on any previous reviews undertaken and the outcomes resulting from the review.
- Reports of accrediting bodies (where appropriate)
- Benchmarking data

- Information about recruitment strategies and current promotional material (e.g., programme handbooks, linkages with secondary schools)
- Information about employer, industry and community connections
- Information about opportunities or strategies for research collaborations with hapu or iwi

*Staff:*

- Staffing plan
- Current academic, research and general staff members - status/job title and description of current teaching, supervision, research and/or administrative responsibilities
- Academic staff CVs/Portfolios in an agreed standard format
- Current staffing vacancies and changes in academic staffing (new appointments, promotions, retirements, resignations, etc) and any that have occurred since last the Unit was last reviewed (where relevant)
- Professional Development activities undertaken by staff or provided by the Academic Unit.
- Information regarding strategies to enhance the teaching and research capacity of Māori staff

*Teaching and Learning:*

- Identification of all of the education the programme/department offers or contributes to
- Paper outlines at each teaching level (max 3)
- Current teaching evaluation plan and a statement about the plan's implementation
- Course/staff evaluations undertaken, aggregate details of evaluations, other sources of feedback or evaluation data
- Programme policies (where relevant/appropriate)

*Student Experience*

- Statement on Unit-specific initiatives to enhance or improve student learning and retention.
- Information about subject committee meetings and student representation
- Statement about industry links and opportunities for work placement and/or internships
- Information regarding student support provisions for Māori and Pacific students.

*Research:*

- Research income (external and internal) for the past 5 years
- A sample of recent Research and Study Leave reports (max 3)
- Evidence of international recognition of programme research
- PhD thesis titles (in progress, and completed during the past 5 years)
- List of student publications and conference presentations for the past 5 years, where appropriate

*Administration and Support:*

- Academic Unit administrative and committee structures, including Faculty-level links
- Statement on physical resources (e.g., space, library, equipment) and plans for their development
- Statement on resources provided to postgraduate students (e.g., work space, IT, teaching/tutor/demonstrator positions, assistance for conference travel)
- Statement on student support and learning initiatives

**Provided by the University divisions, or units external to the Academic Unit under review**

Requests for information should come from the relevant Chair. The divisions or units, as appropriate, will provide their information contributions to the Chair at least three weeks before the due date for Self-Review Portfolio submission.

The types of information that could be provided include:

- Grades awarded (distribution) and pass rates for all courses for the 2 most recent examination sessions
- EFTS statistics (last 5 years) by course including ethnicity, gender and tracking of withdrawal rates
- Postgraduate enrolments for the past 5 years
- Staff/student ratios

- Profile of currently enrolled doctoral students (i.e., number of students in each year of study)
- Numbers of doctoral students graduating in each of the 5 most recent years
- Average length of time to complete a PhD (based on latest 5- year data)
- Graduate destinations
- Trends in recruitment

### Compiling Information for the Review Panel

#### Written Submissions:

1. At the initial meeting, the DVCA, the Panel Chair, Dean(s), Chairs and internal panel members will discuss the list of people or groups to be invited to make submissions. Submissions could be solicited from the following categories:
  - Dean(s) of the relevant Faculty/ies
  - Other Deans (purposive choice, maximum of 2)
  - Specific Chairs (purposive choice, maximum of 10)
  - All programme staff: academic, general, technical
  - Student representatives
  - Currently-enrolled undergraduate and postgraduate students
  - Members of the Senior Leadership Team
  - Centre for Tertiary Teaching and Learning
  - University Librarian
  - Dean of the School of Graduate Research
  - Recent graduates (purposive choice, max of 6 representing various degrees)
  - Employers of graduates (purposive choice, maximum of 3)
  - Programme visitors within the past 5 years (purposive choice, maximum of 3)
  - Other organisations/community groups with which the programme has links (purposive choice, maximum of 3)
  
2. Requests for submissions should:
  - enclose a copy of the Terms of Reference
  - be specific concerning matters about which comment is being sought
  - indicate that the review is not a review of individual staff performance
  - advise respondents that they may designate part or all of their submission as confidential to the Review Panel
  - consider enclosing a brief summary of background data about the programme/department
  
3. The Review Panel may request other materials from the programme/department prior to the site visit. A Review Panel may also consider other means of gathering information, may consult with any other party they choose, or refer to recommendations made in previous review reports of the programme/department.

**Planning the Site Visit**

1. Prior to the formal site visit, the Panel Chair and internal member should meet informally with the department to discuss the process and any particular concerns.
2. Meetings with students should occur towards the beginning of the visit; this is critical in terms of understanding the context, formulating specific questions and identifying the key issues that can be discussed subsequently with staff.
3. Relevant external stakeholders should be invited to meet with the Review Panel.
4. The Vice-Chancellor, SDVC, DVCA and other members of the Senior Leadership Team may be invited to meet with the Review Panel.
5. Following the panel's deliberations, on the afternoon of the final day of the site visit, the Panel should meet with the relevant Chair and staff to provide a brief verbal summary of the review findings. The Chair of Programme/Department may also attend if acceptable to all parties.
6. A separate meeting with the Chair of Department/Programme may be held if the Panel wishes.

### Review Timetable

The review timetable for a Category 1 programme review would normally be as follows:

PRIOR TO/AFTER SITE VISIT	ACTION
-5 months	Dean and Chair(s) consult regarding appointment of Chair, panel and secretary
-4 months	DVCA and Dean sign off on Review Chair and Panel appointments
	Chair(s) and/or nominee begin compiling Self Review Portfolio and related documents
-3 months	Review Chair meets with other panel member(s) from the University of Waikato, the Dean(s), the Chair(s) and Review Secretary to plan the review
<b>-2 months</b>	<b>Self-Review Portfolio submitted</b>
-1 month	Review Chair summarises the key points raised in the submissions and consults with the panel to determine list of additional information required and proposed schedule for site visit, including interviews.
-2-3 weeks	Preliminary meeting of the Panel, if desired
<b>0 weeks</b>	<b>Site Visit: 4-5 days with final day devoted to analysis, formulation of recommendations and report drafting</b>
+1-5 weeks	Review Chair and Secretary co-ordinate the drafting of the Panel's report
+5-6 weeks	Draft Review Report circulated to Panel members for comment
+8 weeks	Chair(s) and Dean(s) receive completed draft report
+11 weeks	Comments must be sent back to the Chair; the Chair will then finalise the report, consulting Panel members as necessary, and submit the final report to the Vice-Chancellor, via the DVCA.

### **Finalisation, Implementation and Publication of the Report**

The Review Panel may take confidential statements and recommendations separately from its main report, if it wishes to do so. Any such statements or recommendations may be addressed to the relevant Dean(s), the DVC(Academic) and/or the Vice-Chancellor. Grounds for making confidential statements or recommendations, or for withholding any details from the final report, must be consistent with the provisions of the Official Information Act 1982 or the Privacy Act 1993.

At the Vice-Chancellor's agreement, the final report of the Review Panel will be submitted to the relevant Dean(s). The relevant Dean(s) have collective authority to determine the processes and timelines for publishing and addressing the Review Report and for determining which recommendations should be supported. In order to protect its integrity, the Review Panel's Report must remain in its final form as submitted unless the Dean(s) determine, in consultation with the Director of Human Resources and the University's Official Information Officer, that any parts should be withheld under the provisions of the Official Information Act 1982 or the Privacy Act 1993. Any deletions should be arranged within two weeks of receiving the final report.

After any parts are deleted under the provisions of the Official Information and Privacy Acts, the report will be treated as an *internal* document (internal circulation version), accessible only to members of the university community – that is, staff, students and members of university committees.

In considering the final report and its recommendations, Dean(s) must keep in mind the following principles:

- If the relevant Dean(s) do not support a particular recommendation, then they will communicate that decision as appropriate, and no further action is necessary in relation to that recommendation.
- If the Dean(s) decide to support a recommendation which is within their authority as Dean(s) to implement, and subject to appropriate consultation, they may take and implement that decision at their own discretion, while keeping the Vice-Chancellor and others informed as appropriate.
- If the Dean(s) support a recommendation which is beyond their authority as Dean(s), then they are required to consult with others as appropriate about the consultation and decision-making process that should apply.
- In cases where the Dean(s) and/or Vice-Chancellor have received confidential statements or recommendations from the review panel, separately from the main report, they have authority to determine how they should be addressed.
- In cases where the review panel's final report includes recommendations which have significant strategic and/or resource implications beyond the School/Faculty(s) concerned, the Vice-Chancellor has discretion to commission a management response and will determine the process and timeline for its preparation.
- When a management response has been prepared, the Vice-Chancellor will determine a process and timeline for associated consultation and decisions.

Once the report and its recommendations have been considered the relevant Dean(s) will:

- Prepare an Executive Summary of the report, including the key recommendations, specifically for the purposes of general distribution and publication on the staff intranet. The Executive Summary will be made available by the Academic Office to any committee of the University at the request of its Chair.
- Report to the Vice-Chancellor (and, through the VC, Academic Board and all staff within their Faculty) details of the intended processes and timelines for firstly: considering panel report recommendations to determine which should be supported; and secondly, for taking supported recommendations forward.
- Arrange for the Executive Summary of the report to be published on the staff intranet, together with the details of the processes and timeline

- Arrange for a notice to be published in the Official Circular advising University staff that the Executive Summary of the report and process and timeline information are available on the staff intranet.
- Report to the Education Committee, Faculty Boards and the Academic Board on the details of the intended processes and timelines for considering panel report recommendations, determining which recommendations should be supported, and for taking supported recommendations forward. The Review Secretariat can assist with this reporting requirement if required.

The Vice-Chancellor and the DVC (Academic) have the discretion to determine whether the internal circulation version of the report should be provided on a confidential basis to any other committees of the university whose terms of reference are relevant to the findings and recommendations of the particular review.

The relevant Dean(s) will include progress on implementation as part of the Chair's annual performance review.

In special circumstances the Vice-Chancellor may vary these procedures and advise the Academic Board of the variation and the reasons for it.