



## Academic Policy and Procedures Manual

# 5b Review, Re-Approval or Reaccreditation Guidelines for Teacher Education Programmes

<b>Policy name:</b>	Review, Re-Approval or Reaccreditation Guidelines for Teacher Education Programmes
<b>Number:</b>	5b
<b>Date of first approval:</b>	May 2003
<b>Date of last amendment:</b>	May 2006
<b>Date of previous amendment:</b>	February 2004
<b>Approval body:</b>	Academic Board

### Table of Contents

Linkages to Unitec's Quality Management System .....	2
1.0 The Aim of Programme Review, Reapproval or Reaccreditation .....	3
2.0 The Function of Programme Review .....	3
3.0 The Policy .....	3
3.1 Category E Changes .....	4
3.2 Category D Changes .....	4
3.3 Category P Changes .....	4
4.0 The Review Process .....	4
4.1 Selection of Programmes for Review .....	4
4.2 Production of the Self-Evaluation Report .....	4
4.3 Selection of the Review Panel .....	5
4.4 Panel Composition .....	5
4.5 Information to the Panel .....	5
4.6 Preparation for and Organisation of the Review Visit .....	5
4.7 Panel Member Feedback to Panel Chair .....	6
4.8 Role of the Panel Chair .....	6
5.0 Structure of the Programme Review Visit .....	6
6.0 The Written Report .....	7
6.1 Initial Feedback .....	7
6.2 The Criteria for the Panel's Evaluation of the Programme .....	7
6.3 The Review Panel's Recommendations and Suggestions .....	9
7.0 Consideration of the Report .....	10
7.1 Programme Committee Response .....	10
7.2 Check by Review Panel Chair .....	10
7.3 Board of Studies/Academic Board .....	10
7.4 Submission of report to NZTC .....	10

---

## Linkages to Unitec's Quality Management System

The aim of this policy is to support Unitec's mission and the principles that govern the Unitec Quality Management System. The principles that primarily underpin this policy are those from the following areas of activity:

### *Programme Design, Development and Review*

- Programmes satisfy all legal requirements and meet the demands of the relevant professional bodies
- Unitec programmes are without unnecessary barriers to student access
- There exist appropriate, transparent and collaborative processes of design, development and review
- The primary aim of the review process is ongoing improvement
- Stakeholders are intimately involved in design, development and review
- Peer review is undertaken by people who are both independent and informed

### *Monitoring and Audit*

- Unitec gathers and actively uses evidence to improve practice
- Each group provides evidence that it is achieving its specific goals and objectives, the Unitec mission statement and values, and the principles of the QMS

---

## 1.0 The Aim of Programme Review, Reapproval or Reaccreditation

Unitec policy requires that all its programmes are reviewed at least every five years. For pre-service teacher education this cycle coincides with the NZ Teachers Council (NZTC) programme reapproval requirements. The purpose of this document is to outline the approach to be taken when combining Unitec's programme review with NZTC reapproval.

This approach to programme review is based on the belief that the people who manage the programme should play a major role in the review process. Therefore, programme review begins with a self evaluation of the programme that is produced by the Programme Committee. An independent panel then has the task of validating the self evaluation and making recommendations to the appropriate bodies. The validation is carried out by a review panel who visit Unitec after having studied the self evaluation document. The panel has internal and external membership.

Programme Review is an essential part of programme delivery because it enables all major stakeholders to reflect on and be constructively critical of the changes that have been made as a result of on-going evaluation, and the effects of these changes.

The programme review process outlined in this document applies only to programmes in pre-service teacher education. **The *Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes*<sup>1</sup> (prepared by the NZ Teachers Council) must be read in conjunction with these guidelines.**

[http://www.teacherscouncil.govt.nz/pdf/200502\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_Approval\\_Feb05.pdf](http://www.teacherscouncil.govt.nz/pdf/200502_Guidelines_for_Approval_Feb05.pdf)

---

## 2.0 The Function of Programme Review

Programme Review is an essential part of Unitec's quality assurance processes. In the case of teacher education programmes it has three functions. First, it supports self improvement by examining the outcomes of previous evaluations and clarifying the focus for future development. Secondly, it has a monitoring function. It allows the Academic Board to be assured that appropriate programme evaluation processes are in place and are operating effectively, and that the programme continues to deliver quality education to its students. Finally it is designed to assure the NZTC of the quality of the programme to allow them to reapprove the programme so that programme graduates will be eligible for teacher registration.

---

## 3.0 The Policy

All programmes will be reviewed by Unitec within five years of their last approval, or when directed by Academic Board.

This process gives significant responsibilities to Boards of Studies in the nomination of programmes for review and in the implementation of the review's recommendations. The responsibility for developing criteria for Programme Review lies with the Academic Board.

---

<sup>1</sup> These guidelines are updated from time-to-time. Users should ensure that they have the most up-to-date version. References to the guidelines made in this document are based on the July 2005 version of the NZTC guidelines.

Programme changes that come about during review or evaluation are subject to the following approval processes (See the Policy and Guidelines for Making Changes to Unitec Programmes, Section 6a, Academic Policy and Procedures Manual).

### **3.1 Category E Changes**

These changes affect the predominant character of the programme and require approval by the Academic Board. They include the addition of a new endorsement; change to the name of the programme or endorsement or exit qualification or significant change to the compulsory/elective mix of the programme; the introduction of an exit qualification or changing an exit qualification to a stand alone qualification. (Note: in many cases category E changes require external approval; for example, by NZQA and/or NZTC).

### **3.2 Category D Changes**

These changes include modifications to the programme that do not affect its predominant character - for example the addition or deletion of courses, the change in a course name, aim, objective, credit value or level. Such changes require the approval of the relevant Board of Studies.

### **3.3 Category P Changes**

These include changes to course components (e.g. learning outcomes or assessment schedule) and require approval by the Programme Committee.

---

## **4.0 The Review Process**

### **4.1 Selection of Programmes for Review**

The Academic Quality Office, in consultation with the divisions, develops a proposed annual schedule of programmes identified for review. This is approved by the Academic Board at its first meeting each year.

### **4.2 Production of the Self-Evaluation Report**

The Programme Committee produces a document in which it evaluates its programme and assembles appropriate evidence. This should be completed and sent to panel members at least six weeks prior to the panel visit. The document will include a significant amount of information on the programme and its support systems, and on students and staff. In order for the document to qualify as a 'self-evaluation', the Programme Committee must also take a summary position on their achievements and the future of the programme. This can be done by asking self-critical questions such as:

What are we doing well? \*  
Why?  
What are we not doing well?  
Why?  
What are our options for improvement?  
What is our preferred option?  
Why?  
How might we do this?

\*An answer to the question 'how do we know?' should lie inside the evidence that forms the basis of the document, therefore it does not need to be readdressed in a summary statement.

### 4.3 Selection of the Review Panel

A review panel of up to seven members is expected to visit Unitec during the year to evaluate the programme. In some circumstances the NZTC and Unitec may agree to the addition of other members to the panel.

It is the responsibility of the Programme Director to liaise with the NZTC in order to confirm the name of its representative. The Manager of the Academic Quality Office will appoint the independent chairperson (in consultation with the NZTC). The Programme Director will consult with the Manager of the Academic Quality Office in order to determine a list of possible names for the remaining panellists. The Manager of the Academic Quality Office will consult with the Division Dean to decide the representative of the Board of Studies.

The Manager of the Academic Quality Office will approve the final composition of the review panel following consultation with the NZTC.

The date for the visit is decided by the Division in consultation with Academic Quality Office, the Programme Committee and in response to the availability of prospective panel members. It is the responsibility of the school to co-ordinate the visit organisation.

### 4.4 Panel Composition

For pre-service teacher education programmes the panel is comprised of six members:

- An independent chairperson
- A representative of the NZTC
- A member of the profession from a partner centre or school
- A student from a programme within the Division, but not from the School of Education, who is not and has not been enrolled in the programme
- One member of the Board of Studies
- An academic staff member from another tertiary institution
- The programme's monitor.

### 4.5 Information to the Panel

The Programme Director must ensure that at least six weeks before the review date the relevant documentation is sent to the panel members. The documentation must include:

- the programme evaluation report;
- the relevant definitive programme document;
- a copy of the CVs of the staff teaching on the programme;
- a copy of these Programme Review Guidelines and the current *Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes*
- the most recent programme viability report

### 4.6 Preparation for and Organisation of the Review Visit

The Panel Chair and Programme Director liaise at least four weeks before the review date to organise a timetable for the panel visit. Prior to the panel visit the Panel Chair may identify additional material which the panel may require. The Chair and the Programme Director will decide whether this material should be sent to panel members prior to the visit or to the panel when they arrive for the visit.

It is the responsibility of the Programme Director to organise venue, travel, accommodation, car parking, Unitec maps, catering, name tags and the payment of any professional fees. He/she must ensure that all people meeting the panel are available at the agreed times.

## 4.7 Panel Member Feedback to Panel Chair

Panel members are asked to read the programme evaluation document and to consider its content in relation to the review criteria. Before the visit, the Chair should make contact with the panel members and briefly address the issues that they feel will arise in the panel visit. This helps the Chair to focus on the range of issues that needs to be covered during the visit.

## 4.8 Role of the Panel Chair

The Panel Chair is responsible for ensuring that:

- panel members are informed of the process and are comfortable with their roles prior to the review visit;
- the panel identifies, at the beginning of the visit, the key issues to be explored;
- the panel remains focussed during the visit;
- the timetable is strictly adhered to;
- open questions form the basis of the panel's discussions with other groups;
- possible recommendations and suggestions are noted throughout the visit and focussed on;
- all of the key issues identified before the visit are dealt with;
- the panel's findings are verbally reported to the institution;
- the report is written promptly and forwarded to panel members for comment and agreement;
- the final agreed report is forwarded to the Manager of the Academic Quality Office and to the NZTC.

---

## 5.0 Structure of the Programme Review Visit

The length of the visit and the visit timetable will vary depending on the programme and the issues to be addressed. Generally, the review panel will spend approximately two days on-site, meeting with key people from the division/school(s) and those involved in the programme and its quality management.

The visit will include the opportunity to meet with key teaching staff, associate teachers from partner schools and centres, the Programme Committee, the Dean of the Division and Head of School, the students of the programme and members of the Advisory Committee including principals or managers from partner schools or centres. The visit needs to be organised so that the panel achieves objectivity in its consideration of evidence. For example, staff should not be present during the meeting with students, and teaching staff should have an opportunity to meet the panel without managers present.

The visit must include:

- an initial meeting of the panel to highlight the major issues for clarification during the day;
- a meeting with the HoS and Programme Director to outline the major areas for clarification, and to discuss general support and resource issues, threats and opportunities, and future developments;
- a substantial meeting with staff involved in the delivery of the programme – the Dean and HoS will not be present;
- a visit to the library and a meeting with the library staff to discuss library resource issues;
- a substantial meeting with students in the programme – staff will not be present;
- a meeting with external representatives of the Advisory Committee - staff and students (including those on the Advisory Committee) will not be present;

- a meeting with the Dean, Associate Deans (where applicable) and the Dean of Teaching and Learning;
- a meeting with associate teachers;
- a panel meeting time towards the end of the visit to collate and summarise findings (including formulating recommendations and suggestions) and decide on the overall conclusion and any conditions;
- a feedback session at the end of the day to review with staff the panel's findings and discuss any major matters that will be included in the report.

The visit should include

- a meeting with Te Tari Awhina and Maia to discuss learning issues – teaching staff will not be present. When the timetable is being developed, the Panel Chair will ask the Heads of Te Tari Awhina and Maia whether or not they wish to participate;
- a visit to teaching spaces.

The visit may include:

- a meeting with the Unitec Conciliator if requested by the Conciliator (the Chair will ask the Conciliator if he/she wishes to meet with the panel);
- a meeting with the Programme Committee to discuss approved changes, moderation reports, likely future developments and other quality management aspects – this could be combined with another meeting;
- a meeting with graduates of the programme where the Panel Chair believes there would be benefits in this and it would not be difficult to organise – this could combine with the meeting with students.

---

## 6.0 The Written Report

### 6.1 Initial Feedback

The Panel Chair provides the Programme Director and the other participants of the review day with an overview of the panel's findings at the end of the visit. This report and the feedback session must address each of the criteria stated in 6.2. A full detail of the Panel Chair's role in writing and presenting the subsequent written report is given in 7.0.

### 6.2 The Criteria for the Panel's Evaluation of the Programme

#### Overview of Programme

The programme's conceptual framework, rationale, aims and graduate profile and standards continue to be responsive to the market; they are supported by the NZ Teachers Council and the major industry groups which employ the graduates of the programme. The majority of graduates are employed in programme related occupations or are pursuing further study. The programme continues to attract suitable applicants who complete the programme within expected timeframes.

Refer section 3.1 to 3.3 of Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes for further guidance.

#### Major and Minor Changes since Programme Approval

Any major and minor changes made since approval have led to improvement of the programme in achieving its aims.

The recommendations of the programme's monitor are tracked and the actions taken to action recommendations have led to improvement.

#### Structure of the Programme

Any structural changes to the programme arising from annual programme evaluation have been justified, approved by Academic Board (where relevant), and have been successful in achieving their purpose. This includes attention to the balance of compulsory and elective components, balance of theory, practice and work-placements.

### **Curriculum Development, Programme Delivery and Evaluation**

The academic outcomes, skills development, teaching and learning methods are constantly monitored for effectiveness and achievement of the aims and objectives of the programme.

In particular, the teaching delivery and learning methods and resources allow for flexible learning, maximise appropriate technological learning opportunities and enhance the skills development of students. Practicum courses are integrated into the programme's curriculum and provide an appropriate range of learning experiences for students. The staff's research enriches the student learning.

There is an emphasis on self directed learning appropriate to the level of the course and programme. Student research is supported by appropriate systems and supervision.

The programme's graduate profile is being met.

An appropriate bicultural dimension is incorporated into the programme and its practicum courses.

*Refer section 3.7, 3.9 and 3.10 of Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes for further guidance.*

### **Assessment and Moderation**

Assessment methodology is appropriate, does not overburden the student and achieves the appropriate outcomes of fairness, validity and reliability.

There is a consistent assessment philosophy throughout all courses which is understood by students.

Recommendations arising from internal and external moderation of assessment are implemented to strengthen current practices.

Refer section 3.8 of Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes for further guidance.

### **Programme Regulations**

Programme regulations, particularly those pertaining to admission and selection criteria, and cross crediting and APL, are constantly monitored, and where necessary modified, to enhance student success on the programme.

Refer section 3.11 to 3.12 of Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes for further guidance.

### **Staff and Research**

The qualities of existing staff, together with the staff development plan and research interests continue to support and enhance the philosophy and delivery of the programme. The staff research informs the teaching of the various elements of the programme.



Adequate provisions are made to ensure that staff in partner schools and centres are able to fully meet their responsibilities with respect to the programme's students.

*Refer section 3.5, 3.9, 3.14 and 3.15 of Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes for further guidance.*

### **Programme Quality Management**

There are appropriate division and school mechanisms for ensuring the approved programme has been implemented as described in the documentation.

There are sound mechanisms, including provision for external peer critique and resource appraisal that will lead to the ongoing quality and relevance of the programme for the student cohort.

Where relevant, the reports of Monitor/s indicate that the programme has integrity, appropriate systems are in place and standards are achieved. The reports endorse the external credibility of the programme.

*Refer section 3.6 of Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes for further guidance.*

## **6.3 The Review Panel's Recommendations and Suggestions**

Within the report, the review panel should comment on each of the eight criteria listed above. In addition, the panel should highlight the overall strengths and weaknesses of the current programme, and may make recommendations and/or suggestions for improvement.

### **Definitions**

A *Condition* is a demand that must be met within a given timeframe if the programme is to continue.

A *Recommendation* is a statement of significance which the Programme Committee must respond to and which will be monitored by the Board of Studies during the ongoing life of the programme.

A *Suggestion* is an idea the panel wishes to communicate to strengthen the programme during its ongoing delivery, but which is not binding on the Programme Committee to implement.

Finally, there must be an overall conclusion which is either:

- unconditional continuation of the programme; or
- continuation of the programme subject to specified conditions, with timelines given for meeting the conditions.

---

## 7.0 Consideration of the Report

### 7.1 Programme Committee Response

The Manager of the Academic Quality Office will forward the report to the Programme Committee with a request that they provide a written response to the report and that the report and approved programme committee response is forwarded to the Board of Studies. This response must be completed within two months of receipt of the panel report. The Programme Committee response will include reference to any suggestions and recommendations, how they will be acted upon, and a timeline and allocation of responsibilities for actions to be taken. Before sending the response to the Board of Studies, the programme committee will forward the response to the panel chair for sign-off (email is acceptable) that the report. A template for the Programme Response is contained in Appendix 9 to this policy. A template for the programme committee response is available [Forms/05a Programme Response](#)

### 7.2 Check by Review Panel Chair

The Chair checks that the Programme Committee response matches the intent of the panel's recommendations and suggestions and signals this acceptance, via email, to the Programme Director, the relevant Division Academic Administrator and the Academic Quality Office ([academicquality@unitec.ac.nz](mailto:academicquality@unitec.ac.nz)). If the Panel Chair does not believe that the programme committee response is appropriate, and agreement cannot be reached, then the panel chair will advise the Division Dean and the Manager of the Academic Quality Office accordingly.

### 7.3 Board of Studies/Academic Board

The Board of Studies approves the response, and determines a mechanism for ensuring attention to the agreed actions. Boards of Studies have responsibility for addressing the review panel's conditions and recommendations. Programme changes that result from the review process are subject to the approval processes contained in Academic Policy [06a Making Changes to Unitec Programmes](#). Once approved by the Board of Studies, the programme committee response will be forwarded to the Academic Quality Office by the relevant Division Academic Administrator. The Academic Quality Office will ensure that the report and programme committee response is tabled at Academic Board.

### 7.4 Submission of report to NZTC

Following endorsement by Academic Board, the report and the programme committee response is forwarded to the NZTC by the Manager of the Academic Quality Office.