

University of Otago Departmental Review

Guidelines (internal): 2026

Contents

Six things you need to action.....	1
Ten tips for a successful review.....	1
1 Overview.....	2
2 The Review Proposal and Terms of Reference.....	6
3 Key participants in the Review Process: roles and responsibilities.....	8
4 Confidentiality	10
5 The Self-Review	12
6 The Review.....	13
7 Post Review	14
DOCUMENT A	17
Duties of a Review Convenor	17
Role of Review Panel Members.....	17
DOCUMENT B	18
Role of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	18
Role of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor	19
Division of Health Sciences: Role of the Head of Faculty (when applicable, BMS and HPP) ...	19
Role of the University Quality Advancement Unit	20
DOCUMENT C: Supporting documentation.....	21
DOCUMENT D: Quality Advancement report distribution	25
DOCUMENT E: Resources and key contacts list	26
DOCUMENT F: Post-review status reports	32

Six things you need to action

1. Select your Panel Members and contact them to confirm availability (see section 2, The Review Proposal).
2. Set the Review dates and confirm with your Panel Members – they will need to arrive in time for a Panel dinner the evening before the review. (The Review Secretary will contact Panel Members to arrange travel). Consider whether any Panel Members will need to join by Zoom and if so, what the implications are for any time zone differences. Panel Members joining by Zoom must have the appropriate working environment to ensure effective participation.
3. Confirm the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Review.
4. Complete the Review Proposal form.
5. Write the Self-Review document.
6. Using the Excel Contact List provided by the Review Secretary compile a list of interested parties (staff, students, internal and external links, and others) who you think should be informed about, or would be interested in contributing to, the Review.

Ten tips for a successful review

1. A Review is your opportunity to make progress, effect change or consolidate.
2. Success is all in the preparation – this is the only bit of the process over which you have control.
3. Start with a careful stocktake.
4. Choose people you and your staff respect for the Panel.
5. Involve all staff (academic, research, technical and professional) in the process and provide different avenues for staff to buy into the process.
6. Develop clear aspirations.
7. Familiarise yourself with the University's strategic documents and frameworks.
8. Make sure your strategic plan is real, meaningful and useful to you.
9. Bare your soul in the Self-Review document.
10. Make sure you work with the Convenor of the Panel in advance.

1 Overview

1.1 [Quality Advancement Reviews Policy](#)

Category	Administration and Management
Type	Policy
Approved by	Council, 13 June 1995
Date Policy Took Effect	1 July 1995
Last Approved Revision	2 November 2021
Sponsor	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Responsible Officer	Director, University Quality Advancement

Purpose

The primary purpose of quality assurance is to review and to effect improvement in the University's teaching, research and service activities. This Policy outlines the principles which underpin the University's rolling programme of formal reviews.

Organisational Scope

This Policy applies University-wide.

Definitions

<i>Reviews</i>	In the context of this Policy, Review involves reviews of teaching and research programmes, as well as academic and administrative units and services. Reviews may be of a department, academic unit, school, division, centre, residential college or a policy, system or special topic. Some may concern the entire University.
<i>Review Panel</i>	A panel with an appointed convener comprising an approved mix of University staff, colleagues external to the University, a recent graduate and members of relevant employer/industry groups and professional bodies.
<i>Self-Review</i>	The process of reflecting on and gathering information about the area being reviewed by the area being reviewed and then presenting it in the form of a foundation document for the review panel.

Content


- Each aspect of the University's operations will be reviewed at least once every 10 years with earlier interim and targeted reviews being undertaken as appropriate with the process initiated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or upon the request of a particular person or group and managed by the Quality Advancement Unit.
- The Quality Advancement Unit will maintain a rolling programme of reviews with the focus on the next three years to ensure areas due for review have sufficient time to prepare.
- A review provides an opportunity to critically analyse goals, objectives and activities, receive affirmation that current plans and priorities will have long term benefits for students, staff and other stakeholders, identify challenges, and plan for the future and set strategic goals in alignment with the University's wider strategic imperatives.

- d) Before a review begins, a budget will be determined, staff will receive process guidance, terms of reference and membership of the review panel will be approved, and access to useful sources of information and support will be provided.
- e) The starting point for any review is the self-review and preparation of a self-review document in accordance with the terms of reference for the review.
- f) The review panel will conduct its enquiries on-campus using e-conferencing where necessary, and submit a written report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), who will discuss any recommendations with the Vice-Chancellor and area head, who should normally be a member of the Senior Leadership Team or delegate as appropriate, and authorise release of the review report.
- g) The University will give serious consideration to a review panel's recommendations. Implementation of any recommendations will be at discretion of the University, and subject to any resource constraints.

Related Policies, Procedures and Forms

- [Payment of Review Panel Members Procedure](#)(see Appendices).

1.2 Review Cycle




HSD = Head of Service Division

1.3 How are the Review Principles implemented?

The Review Principles are implemented through a variety of internal review types, over which the University has control, each with different foci and objectives. A Reviews Framework has been developed to articulate and clarify the different review types and the inter-relationships between them.

Departmental Review	• A Review of an academic department. The foci are the activities, goals and objectives of the Department. It includes an examination of the Department's Teaching and Student Support, Research, External Engagement and Organisational Resources. • The Division of Health Sciences has a Clinical Insert as a required inclusion in the Terms of Reference for any department or programme with a clinical component.
Programme Review	• A Review of an entire academic programme (degree or diploma) in the context of; Programme Objectives, Curriculum Design, External Engagement, and Organisational Resource. The primary focus of a Programme Review is the manner in which the range of majors and papers offered (often by many departments) contribute to that Programme.
Combined Departmental/Programme Review	• When a Programme is exclusive to a single Department or School, the Review of that Programme is undertaken in conjunction with the Departmental Review. The standard Terms of Reference for Departmental and Programme Reviews are combined and customised as appropriate.
Administrative Review	• An Administrative Review is a review of a non-academic Division, department, section, unit, or area. The foci are the goals, objectives, core activities and services of the Administrative Unit under Review. It includes an examination of the administrative unit's structure and management, core services and activities, and physical, IT resources and health and safety issues.
Combined Administrative/Programme Review	• Occasionally a programme of study is housed in an academic unit, or a Research Centre. The Review of that Programme is undertaken in conjunction with an Administrative Review. The standard Terms of Reference for Administrative and Programme Reviews are combined and customised as appropriate.



NB: The University is also subject to external reviews (i.e. accreditation reviews) owned by an external body, such as a professional association, and carried out by a group that is largely or entirely external to the institution (e.g. AMC Review, Academic Audit, CUAP Graduating Year Reviews). These external reviews are taken into account when the University formulates its review programme each year.

1.4 How are Reviews scheduled?

In its Review Principles, the University made a commitment to review each aspect of its operations at least once every ten years (as of 2015). In order to monitor this commitment, a rolling schedule of reviews has been developed. Called the Review Schedule, it serves as advance notice of those areas due for review. You can find a link [here](#) to the schedule for different types of review (department, administrative, college etc.).

1.5 How much will it cost?

The QAU is funded for all scheduled reviews using a per-review fixed rate.

Excluded from the central funding:

- the costs of preparing the Self-Review which are to be paid for by the unit under review.

Air travel and Panel size can be the most significant factor in overall review costs. The Quality Advancement Unit will monitor expenses and advise if budget limits are being approached.

2 The Review Proposal and Terms of Reference

2.1 What is the Review Proposal?

The Review Proposal outlines the Review's purpose, Terms of Reference, and membership of the Review Panel. The Review Proposal (see Appendices) is prepared by the Head of the Department (HOD) concerned, in consultation with the appropriate Pro-Vice-Chancellor (PVC) and Dean or Head of Division. The Review Proposal is submitted to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (DVC) (Academic) for approval, usually **5 – 7 months before the Review**.

2.2 What are the Terms of Reference?

The Terms of Reference are submitted with the Review Proposal. The purpose of the Terms of Reference is to give context and focus to the Panel's investigations. Standard Terms of Reference have been developed to ensure consistency of approach and investigation across Academic and Non-Academic reviews and to align the Review Process with the University's key strategic documents. Nevertheless, additional amended or bespoke Terms of Reference may be used to take into account a special feature or features requiring investigation.

2.2.1 Health Sciences Clinical Insert

The Division of Health Sciences has a Clinical Insert as a required inclusion in the Terms of Reference for any department or programme with a clinical component.

2.3 What is the composition and membership of the Panel?

The Panel is selected by the HOD under Review in consultation with the Division Head or the PVC and Dean (as appropriate) and confirmed by the DVC (Academic). Formal letters of invitation and thanks to Panel Members are issued by the DVC (Academic). The aim of the Panel selection is to involve people with relevant experience and expertise, and who are representative of a cross-section of the Department's community and interested parties.

The number of Panel Members will vary depending on the nature, size and scope of the Review and whether the Review will need to allow for any Panel Members to attend remotely. Generally, the composition of a Panel will include as appropriate:

Convenor	A senior staff member or Emeriti Professor of the University of Otago, from outside the unit under review and preferably from a different division, with experience and expertise in regard to the Terms of Reference.
International	A senior university staff member or similar level counterpart from a relevant area, and/or a senior member of an appropriate industry group, professional association or society.
A maximum of four appointments which should include representatives for the Tertiary or industry/sector (NZ External), Otago staff from the same and/or a different Division, and mana whenua and/or tangata whenua. Note that one person might represent more than one of these positions e.g. External and Mana Whenua	
External	One or two individuals: Normally a senior staff member of a New Zealand university or similar level counterpart from a relevant area external to the University of Otago, and/or a senior member of an appropriate industry group, professional association or society.
Internal	Up to two staff members from the University of Otago can be appointed. They can be from any area of the University, as long as they are not employed by, or closely associated with, the area being reviewed.
Graduate*	A recent (maximum of three years) graduate* is preferred but if appropriate a current senior student may be appointed.
Review Secretary	Either one of the Quality Advancement Unit's Review Coordinators or an appropriately experienced University of Otago professional staff member from outside the unit under review. This person will be appointed by the Reviews Manager, Quality Advancement Unit.
Contact Person	A member of the unit under review who has knowledge of the Review and who is the first point of contact for the Panel via the Review Secretary.

*The Graduate must not be employed by the Department under review e.g. as a tutor/demonstrator/PPF/TF.

2.3.1 Conflict of interest

Panel Members deemed to have a conflict of interest will need to be carefully considered. Panel Members should declare any perceived and/or potential conflict of interest to the rest of the Panel.

2.3.2 External Panel Members

The QAU has prepared an information sheet for units under review to send to prospective external Panel Members that outlines the process, their responsibilities and time commitment should they choose to take on the role. This sheet is available, as a PDF, on the QAU website and is included in the Appendices. Refer also to the Policy on Payment for Review Panel Members in the Appendices.

2.3.3 Graduate Panel Members

The QAU has also prepared an information sheet for units under review to send to prospective graduate Panel Members that outlines the process, their responsibilities and time commitment should they choose to take on the role. This sheet is available, as a PDF, on the QAU website and included in the Appendices. Refer also to the Policy on Payment for Review Panel Members in the Appendices.

3 Key participants in the Review Process: roles and responsibilities

3.1 The Panel

3.1.1 Convenor

The Convenor is the primary point of contact between members of the Review Panel and the PVC. For a key task list, please refer to **Document A** (see page 17) .

3.1.2 Panel Members

Panel Members are expected to serve on the Panel for the duration of the Review (normally three full days) and to assist the Convenor in the drafting of the Report. Following the receipt of the Self-Review, Panel Members may request additional information and provide input into the Review Meeting Programme. For a key task list, see **Document A** (see page 17).

3.1.3 Review Secretary

The Review Secretary will work with the Convenor, providing organisational, administrative, and secretarial assistance before, during and after the Review. Duties include arranging travel and accommodation for external Panel Members, booking a venue for the Review, publicising the Review, calling for submissions, collating submissions, drafting invitations to meet with the Panel, distributing all documents to the Panel, catering arrangements, attending Panel meetings and interviews, and taking notes during the Review. The Secretary will also provide any other administrative support as required by the Convenor and Panel Members after the Review such as assisting with the Report.

3.2 The Department

3.2.1 Heads of Department (HODs)

HODs are the immediate leaders of the area under review and will be expected to consult with their PVC on the Review Panel composition and the Terms of Reference for the Review.

HODs also have responsibility for:

- selecting the Panel and confirming availability;
- confirming dates of the Review;
- facilitating the preparation of the Self-Review to the Panel (via the Review Secretary, **at least four weeks prior to the Review**);
- identifying key groups and individuals (internal and external to the University) who might appreciate an invitation to make a submission to the Review;
- liaising with the Review Secretary on administrative arrangements as required.

Post Review, the HOD will be expected to consider and implement the recommendations of the Panel and to report on progress as required.

3.3 The University

3.3.1 Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

The Vice-Chancellor (VC) has delegated authority for the overall direction of the University's rolling programme of formal reviews to the DVC (Academic) as articulated in the Guiding Principles for the Conduct of Reviews approved by the Senate in May 1995 and the University Council in June 1995. For an overview of the role of the DVC (Academic), refer to **Document B** (see page 18).

3.3.2 Pro-Vice-Chancellors (PVCs)

PVCs have responsibility for consulting with the HOD over the coordination of the Review Process – **Document B** (see page 19). They play a central role in facilitating and documenting progress made towards the implementation of recommendations made by the Panel.

Depending on the Divisional structure, the PVC may delegate responsibility for many of these tasks to a Dean, HOD or Divisional Administrator as appropriate.

3.4 The Quality Advancement Unit

The Quality Advancement Unit is responsible for managing and monitoring the overall Review Process (see **Document B**, page 20).

QAU staff are available to provide advice on any aspect of the Review Process and to liaise with University staff as required.

3.4.1 Review Secretary, Quality Advancement Unit

This person will be appointed by the Reviews Manager, QAU. The QAU has two Dunedin-based Review Coordinators who normally carry out the role of Review Secretary. Adjunct Review Secretaries are appointed as required.

3.4.2 Reviews Manager, Quality Advancement Unit

The Reviews Manager, QAU is the main point of contact between QAU and the Department under review and is responsible for the coordination of the Review Process and advising the Department under review and the Panel, as required. The Reviews Manager is responsible for appointing the Review Secretary, provides the DVC (Academic) with an executive analysis of the final Review Report and attends the Report Approval Meeting.

3.4.3 Director, University Quality Advancement

The Director, University Quality Advancement, is responsible for the overall monitoring of the University's Review Process.

4 Confidentiality

Members of a Panel have access to a great deal of material during a Review. The Panel must treat as confidential any personal information, commercially sensitive material and intellectual property provided to it.

Beyond the production of the Self-Review, all aspects of the Review Process are confidential to the Members of the Panel. The only documents that can be viewed by others, before and during the process, are the Terms of Reference and the list of Panel Members.

Departments under review can assist in maintaining this confidentiality by declining or redirecting any communications about the Review to the Review Convenor or Secretary.

4.1 Submissions

Departments under review are asked to supply the names of individuals or organisations that have an interest in the Department and that may be invited by the Panel to make a submission. However, all written and oral submissions to the Panel are confidential to the Panel. This includes the submissions, names of those who have made submissions, and any other information about such submissions.

All written submissions and notes from oral submissions will be destroyed at the end of the Review Process.

4.2 Review Meeting Programme and Interviews

The Review Meeting Programme is confidential to the Panel. Departments under review are not entitled to this information. Enquiries made during the Review are to be directed to the Review Secretary or Convenor.

4.3 Self-Review

The Self-Review is confidential to the Department who produced it, and to the Review Panel. The Department may wish to share the Self-Review with the PVC (and Dean if appropriate); however, this is not an expectation. Neither QAU nor the Review Panel will share this information with others without prior permission from the Department who produced it.

4.4 Review Report

The final Report will become a public document within the University community. The Report is confidential to the Panel until finalised, approved by the entire Panel, checked for factual accuracy by the HOD under review and then released to the DVC (Academic). Following consultation with the Convenor, PVC and the QAU Reviews Manager, the DVC (Academic) will authorise distribution of the Report to the University. At this point, the Report is no longer confidential except it is for internal University use only. Any external use or distribution requires the authorisation of the DVC (Academic).

As the Report is about an organisation, it will not normally identify individuals. It is expected that every effort will be made to ensure that, whenever possible, concerns shall be framed in terms of the system – not the individual.

Where an individual is identifiable (due to their position), the Panel should provide the individual with an opportunity to discuss the matter with a member of the Panel and ensure that issues in contention are resolved before publication of the Report.

4.5 Confidential Matters - Beyond the Scope of the Review

Panels can be challenged by matters of a confidential and/or personal nature or financial concerns which are generally beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference and the Review Panel's brief. The Panel have the authority to submit a confidential letter to the DVC (Academic) so that such issues can be dealt with under a separate process.

4.6 Confidential Disposal of Review Documentation

All material generated by the Review (i.e. submissions, the Review Meeting Programme, drafts of the Report, notes taken during the Review, digital files) are confidential and should be securely disposed of, or returned to the Secretary, upon the completion of the Review, for secure disposal.

5 The Self-Review

5.1 What is the Self-Review?

The Self-Review exercise is one of gathering information about the Department in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference and presenting this information in the form of a Self-Review. The responsibility for preparing the Self-Review material may be delegated by the HOD to a Self-Review Committee, led by a Self-Review Manager (often the Head of the Department under review). Garnering input from staff is strongly encouraged and staff should have the opportunity to access the final document prior to the Review.

It is expected that the Self-Review document will be completed at least **four weeks prior to the Review**. This information is confidential to the Department and to the Review Panel.

5.2 What is the Self-Review document?

QAU has examples of Self-Review documents available.

The Self-Review document forms the basis of the Department's submission to the Panel. The Self-Review needs to include factual information that contextualises the Department, outlines its structure and management, current status, and anticipated future developments; it should also be considered, thoughtful and analytical. The document should highlight strengths and identify areas for improvement.

Key questions that you might consider are:

- Where is the Department now?
- Where do you want to be in five years' time?
- What do you need to do to get there?
- How can the University help you to get there?
- What do you do well?
- What are the risks and challenges?

5.2.1 Format

The structure of the Self-Review document should reflect the Terms of Reference of the Review with the addition of a brief preamble which provides background information relating to the Department and highlights any special characteristics or factors that have influenced development. Major headings for the Self-Review are generally taken from the Terms of Reference.

As a general guide, the main document should be approximately 20 – 30 pages in length (including diagrams and flow charts). Additional appendices should support the main document. Refer to **Document C** (see page 21) for suggested content.

5.2.2 Copies of the Self-Review for the Panel

A PDF version of the Self-Review, Appendices, and supporting documents must be provided to the Review Secretary who will circulate to the Panel.

6 The Review

6.1 What is the Review Meeting Programme?

Reviews are normally held over three days at an appropriate venue booked by the Review Secretary. The Review Meeting Programme is prepared by the Review Secretary in consultation with the Convenor and Panel Members. In addition to their individual meeting with the Panel, the HOD should be available for the duration of the Review to provide additional information and answer questions as required. The Review Meeting programme includes meetings with staff, students and other interested parties. A site visit is usually required, and a senior member of staff will need to be available for this.

On the final day of the Review, the Panel will present their preliminary findings to the HOD. Whenever possible, the Panel should also hold a second presentation open to all the Department's staff. This session is often brief, and it is not usually a forum for discussion.

6.2 Individual submissions

Interested parties may make confidential written submissions to the Convenor (via the Secretary) and/or request a personal interview with the Panel during the Review. This includes staff and students of the Department.

It is the responsibility of the Secretary to publicise the Review, call for and collect submissions for distribution to the Panel.

All staff, including the HOD, are encouraged to make personal submissions to the Panel prior to their interviews. These may be as simple as several bullet points in an email or a lengthier document outlining any concerns or observations staff may have. Submissions are confidential to the Review Panel and destroyed at the end of the Review Process.

6.3 What is the Review Report?

The Review Report is a public document within the University of Otago community including students and can be obtained from the Quality Advancement Unit by any member of the University. It outlines the Panel's findings in accordance with its Terms of Reference and provides sufficient detail to enable a good understanding of the issues leading to the subsequent recommendations. It is also expected to include commendations and may highlight areas of good practice.

Preparation of the Review Report is coordinated by the Convenor and Review Secretary and written in collaboration with other Panel Members. It is expected to be completed 6-8 weeks after the Review.

7 Post Review

7.1 What happens to the Review Report?

The Review Secretary will send a copy of the Review Report to the HOD to check for factual inaccuracies. The HOD has two weeks from receipt of the Report to reply with any factual corrections. If no corrections are received within the two weeks, it will be assumed that the Report is factually correct.

Upon final approval from the Convenor, the Report is sent by the Secretary to the QAU Reviews Manager, who provides the DVC (Academic) with an executive analysis and a copy of the Report.

The DVC (Academic) convenes a Report Approval Meeting and discusses the Report's key findings with the PVC, Dean (if appropriate), the Convenor and the QAU Reviews Manager to reflect on the Review, the Report and the outcomes. Any confidential matters may also be discussed at this meeting. The DVC (Academic) also discusses the Report's key findings with the Vice-Chancellor as appropriate.

Depending on schedules, this stage can take up to several weeks.

7.1.1 When will the Review Report be released?

The DVC (Academic) generally authorises release of the final Review Report at the conclusion of the Report Approval Meeting. QAU then distributes the Report, first to those directly involved in the Review, then broadly across the University, as per QAU distribution procedures (see **Document D**, page 25).

QAU advises release of Review Reports on the QAU website and via the Communications newsletter.

7.1.2 How are the recommendations implemented?

Following receipt of the Report it is suggested that an "Implementation Plan" is prepared by the Head of the Unit (and/or the PVC or Divisional Head) for their own use; this will provide a framework for action to be taken in response to the recommendations in the Review Report. For example, the Plan may:

- prioritise the recommendations
- identify steps to be taken on each recommendation
- delegate responsibility for action
- provide a timeline for implementation.

Where recommendations are targeted to areas or individuals outside the remit of the Unit reviewed (e.g. Property and Campus Development Division, Digital Services Division, etc.), it is the responsibility of the Head of the Unit to liaise with the relevant parties to discuss what steps or actions are required and develop a timeframe that ensures implementation of the recommendations.

Time Frame: An Implementation Plan should be developed within a month of receipt of the Report.

7.2 How is implementation monitored?

Progress towards implementation of the Review recommendations is monitored through the submission of two Status Reports to the DVC (Academic) by the PVC or Divisional Head and the Head of Department.

The Status Report is a detailed report on the progress made towards implementation of each recommendation in the Review Report. It reports on those recommendations implemented successfully as well as those not yet implemented, and the reasons for this. The preferred reporting format is for the Head of the Unit to submit a full Status Report to their PVC or Divisional Head, and then for the PVC or Divisional Head, and Dean where appropriate, to prepare their own Report(s); all reports are then submitted to the DVC (Academic).

For those recommendations targeted to areas or individuals other than the area reviewed, such as Property Services or ITS, it is expected that the Head of Unit will contact the relevant group to obtain an update in order that they can report on progress.

7.2.1 What format should the Status Report take?

There is no standardised style for reporting on review recommendations; however, the document should record action taken and outcomes to date with respect to each recommendation. It can be useful to produce this report in tabulated form in order to record who or which roles are responsible for oversight of activity related to the recommendation and the timeframe in which action is expected. If a recommendation has not been addressed or has been rejected, then a brief explanation of why should be included along with a timeline for any action planned (see **Document F**, page 31).

7.2.2 When are the Status Reports due?

Two formal reports are required during the follow-up phase:

- the first Status Report: to be submitted to the DVC (Academic) after one year; and,
- the second Status Report: to be submitted to the DVC (Academic) after two years.

Official requests for the Status Report will be sent by the DVC (Academic) to the PVC or Divisional Head approximately six weeks prior to the due date.

7.2.3 What happens to the Status Report?

The DVC (Academic) responds to the Status Reports via the PVC/Head of Division on progress as appropriate. The DVC (Academic) response will comment on the progress made on each recommendation and may request that further action be taken and/or that further information be supplied. A copy of the first Status Report will be supplied to the Convenor for their information.

7.3 Mid-Cycle Assessment

An additional formal report, known as the Mid-Cycle Assessment, is now required at four years. This task is undertaken by the relevant PVC/Divisional Head in consultation with the Head of Unit.

The University norm for departmental, programme, or area review is once every 8-10 years, but the University's Quality Advancement Reviews Policy allows for earlier interim and targeted reviews to be undertaken as appropriate. The primary purpose of this Mid-Cycle Assessment is to confirm the next review date for the Unit concerned.

In conducting this exercise, consideration is to be given to any outstanding recommendations and an assessment of the level of commitment to the recommendations; the current status of the area

including significant changes; commentary on whether the review has added value to the department/Division; a re-evaluation of the categorisation allocated at the time of the Review Report's release (see below); and, either a recommendation for an earlier review date, a targeted topic review to address particular outstanding issues, or confirmation of the 8-10 year review date will be required.

DOCUMENT A

Duties of a Review Convenor

The duties of the Convenor include:

- meeting with the PVC and separately, the HOD to discuss issues, in the early stages of the Review Process;
- meeting informally with all staff of the area under review, before the Review, to introduce themselves, outline the Review Process, encourage participation and address any concerns (ideally this would take place at a regularly scheduled staff meeting);
- co-ordinating requests for information additional to the Self-Review documentation and forwarding these to the HOD, via the Review Secretary;
- formally inviting staff and students to meet with the Review Panel as per the Review Meeting Programme and inviting written submissions, via the Review Secretary;
- submitting the Report to the DVC (Academic) within a reasonable time frame (generally 6 – 8 weeks after the Review);
- meeting with the DVC, (Academic) and the sponsoring PVC to discuss the Review findings following submission of the Review Report.

The Convenor may also request the DVC (Academic) to augment the Review Panel by the appointment of an additional member should it become clear that this step is necessary to ensure a thorough review of the Department.

Role of Review Panel Members

Review Panel Members have responsibility for:

- where appropriate, conducting themselves throughout the Review as independently representing their profession/discipline/area of expertise rather than their university or employer;
- familiarising themselves with the Self-Review and related documentation, and Review Guidelines in preparation for the Review;
- providing feedback on drafts of the Review Report, and assisting with its writing as required;
- endorsing the final Review Report before its submission to the DVC (Academic).

DOCUMENT B

Role of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Pre-review

- Approve the Review Proposal prior to issuing official letters of invitation to members of the Review Panel.
- Augment the Review Panel by the appointment of an additional member should it become clear that this step is necessary to ensure a thorough review of the unit.

Post-review

- At the Report Approval Meeting, discuss the Review findings with the Review Convenor and PVC/Head of Division/Chief Operating Officer and suggest possible amendments or clarification as required.
- Acknowledge the contribution of members of the Review Panel following approval of the Review Panel Report.
- Take the lead on matters of a confidential nature beyond the scope of the Review.
- Discuss the outcomes of the Review with the VC, recognising that in some cases it may be more appropriate for the PVC/Head of Division to meet directly with the VC.
- Authorise the release of the Review Report.
- Report, where appropriate, key findings of the Review to various University Committees and individuals.
- Request two Status Reports on progress towards meeting implementation targets from the PVC; one year following the official release of the Review Report and then two years after that same date.
- Respond to the Status Reports in consultation with the VC as appropriate.
- Receive the completed Four-Year Mid-Cycle Assessment prior to its submission to the Quality Advancement Committee.

Role of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor

Pre-review

- Advise HODs of the Review Schedule.
- In consultation with the HOD of the Department under review agree and approve the Panel Members.
- In consultation with the HOD of the Department under review, agree and approve the Terms of Reference for the Review.
- Meet with the Review Convenor to discuss issues, in the early stages of the Review Process.

Review

- Meet with the Review Panel.

Post-review

- At the Report Approval Meeting, discuss the Review Report with the Review Convenor and DVC (Academic) and suggest possible amendments or clarification as required.
- In consultation with the HOD, consider the development of an implementation plan based on the recommendations of the Review Report.
- In consultation with the HOD, document progress towards implementation of the recommendations made in the Review Report.
- In consultation with the HOD, prepare Status Reports at one year and two years for submission to the DVC (Academic)
- Complete the Four-Year Mid-Cycle Assessment to confirm the next scheduled review date or propose intermediary actions to satisfy any outstanding recommendations.

Division of Health Sciences: Role of the Head of Faculty (when applicable, BMS and HPP)

Pre-review

- Approve the Review Proposal Form following discussion with the HOD, before submission to the PVC Health Sciences and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).
- Meet with the Review Convenor to discuss issues, in the early stages of the Review Process.

Review

- Meet with the Review Panel.

Post-review

- At the Report Approval Meeting, discuss the Review Report with the Review Convenor, DVC (Academic) and PVC and suggest possible amendments or clarification as required.
- Contribute to the status reports.

Role of the University Quality Advancement Unit

The QAU Reviews Manager, is responsible for the management and monitoring of the Review Process.

- Advise PVCs of the Review Schedule.
- Send annual reminders of forthcoming reviews (covering the next 3 years) to the PVCs.
- Provide information and guidance to University staff on all aspects of the Review Process.
- Follow up on all aspects of the Review Process as required including Status Reports and the Four-Year Mid-Cycle Assessment.
- Draft letters, prepare reports and provide advice to the DVC (Academic) on all aspects of the Review Process.
- Maintain the Reviews web page on the Quality Advancement website from which information and documents relating to the Review Process can be accessed.

DOCUMENT C: Supporting documentation

Refer also to the relevant Review Guidelines available [here](#).

The Self-Review document forms the basis of the Department's submission to the Panel. The Self-Review needs to include factual information that contextualises the Department, outlines its structure and management, current status, and anticipated future developments; it should also be considered, thoughtful and analytical. The document should highlight strengths and identify areas for improvement. The structure of the Self-Review document should reflect the Terms of Reference of the Review.

A [range of frameworks](#) and reports are available to support the Review Process and to enable alignment with the University's Strategic Direction. The list below outlines what is currently offered to units under review. **Reports** are provided from some University offices to include as appendices. These are listed below, and you may wish to comment on these in the Self-Review. **Prompt sheets** suggest points for you to consider in relation to a particular strategy, imperative or focus, whilst writing the Self-Review (see Appendices).

Pae Tata	• Prompt sheet (see Appendices)
Māori Strategic Framework	• Self-review guide (see Appendices)
Pacific Strategic Framework	• Prompt sheet (see Appendices)
Sustainability Office	• Prompt sheet (see Appendices)
Equity and Diversity	• Prompt sheet (see Appendices)
Internationalisation	• Prompt sheet (see Appendices)
Distance Learning	• Prompt sheet (see Appendices)
Disability Action Plan	• Prompt sheet (see Appendices)
Health, Safety & Wellbeing	• Health & Safety Audit
Asset Management, Property and Campus Development	• Space & Facilities Report
Strategy, Analytics and Reporting Office (SARO)	• EFTS and Headcount data
Research Integrity Office	• Research outputs, citation lists and statistics
Library Research Services Unit	• Bibliometrics
Surveys & Evaluations (QAU)	• A range of student/graduate survey reports and evaluations
Divisional Finance - FSD	• Annual Trend Report

For consideration and/or inclusion in the Self-Review document:

- Succession planning
- Workload
- Funding environment
- Resources
- Internal and external collaboration
- Promotion
- Enrolments – both undergraduate and postgraduate.

The Self-Review document should also include discussion of:

- Challenges, concerns
- Successes
- Wants and limitations
- Realities.

Introduction:

- Provide a short history/evolution of the Department and highlight any special factors that have influenced development.
- What does the Department want from the Review Process e.g. Panel ideas, endorsements?

Management/Organisational Structure/Resources:

- Outline the management structure and describe the processes for decision making.
- Academic and professional staff profile and comments on the adequacy of the level of support.
- Describe committee structures and key roles e.g. Research Committee.
- Information on opportunities for staff training, development initiatives and associated procedures.
- How is communication handled e.g. to staff/students/wider University/external links?
- Overview of basic financial position, forecasts and future expectations – including any constraints and/or access to additional resources.
- How is marketing undertaken?
- Discuss Health and Safety aspects.
- Discuss space aspects including, research space, labs, shared spaces, equipment maintenance, etc.

Appendices might include:

- Workload model – including: information relating to the distribution of teaching, research and administrative responsibilities.
- Diagrams, charts or descriptions of the Departmental organisational structure (academic and professional staff), details of committee membership and Terms of Reference.
- Details of uptake of training, list of conferences attended.
- Biosketches for academic and professional staff. **NOTE: CVs are not usually required but staff should be aware that a Panel may request these.**
- Current Health & Safety Report (Health, Safety and Wellbeing Office).
- Space Register.
- Marketing material.

Strategic Focus:

- Detail the key areas that directly support the University's strategic aims.
- Discuss compatibility between the University's and Division's strategic aims and those of the Department/Programme.
- Discuss how to best achieve all strategic aims.
- Discuss staff-related issues. For example: recruitment; current and future staff profile in relation to the strategic direction.
- How is strategic success measured and/or demonstrated?
- Can this be maintained or improved upon?

Appendices might include:

- Copies of Divisional Plan and any other relevant planning documents.

Teaching:

- Give an overview of the curriculum for which the Department is responsible and the rationale for the focus of the curriculum. Is it relevant? Consider the staff profile in relation to the curriculum. Does the curriculum meet industry needs?
- How is the curriculum structured, e.g. Foundation courses? Co/Pre-Requisites? Summer School?
- Who does the teaching (Teaching Fellows Professional Practice Fellows?). How is that organised? Is it shared with other units/campuses? Are guest lecturers utilised? How is international expertise captured? Student placements? Tutorials? Team Teaching or another system? Ensuring teaching is research-informed?
- Consider technological advances, innovative teaching methods and the resources required to deliver and maintain quality teaching, professional development, e.g. HEDC support, IT training. (This may be further covered in a section on IT resources).
- Consider the value of and acknowledgement of student feedback and support, e.g. survey data and Class reps. Comment on the most recent survey data noting both positive and negative outcomes.
- Discuss matters relating to external accreditation.
- Discuss departmental relationships with external individuals/groups, e.g. industry links, employers (internships, advisory boards etc.)

Appendices might include:

- Information on papers and majors offered – including the corresponding coordinators and contributors. Examples of paper profiles, teaching and assessment methods, examples of external examiners reports, distance-taught papers and details about the programmes to which they contribute.
- EFTS and Headcount Data – including: enrolment patterns, completion rates, numbers of graduates, postgraduates, international and exchange students, student-to-staff ratios, and academic-to-general staff ratios.
- Information on, and an evaluation of, graduate profiles and attributes for programmes: adherence to University Key Performance Indicators.
- If available, initial proposals for new programmes and final Graduating Year Reviews submitted to CUAP.
- Note that QAU will provide the Graduate and Student Opinion Surveys for the Panel along with a summary of Q5 (effectiveness of teaching) from the teaching evaluations. You might wish to include any other informal surveys undertaken by the Department e.g. employer surveys.

Research:

- What are the primary areas of research conducted within the Department/Programme?
Describe the research profile and future research directions.
- Access to grants and funding? What is the support for academic staff working on grant applications (particularly for junior staff)?
- Consider research space and access and availability of up-to-date resources.
- Discuss laboratories and standards, if relevant.
- Discuss teaching buy-out and what impact this has and any other methods of meeting research expectations.
- Discuss support for research students including supervision, funding, conference attendance, symposia etc.
- How do research students contribute to the Department/Programme?
- Discuss collaboration e.g. internal/external research centre/cluster/groups?

Appendices might include:

- Evidence of the Department's national and international research standing, including collaborative research and funding, PBRF rating, list of publications (available from Publications/Outputs, Research Integrity Office).
- Journal contributions – are the appropriate journals being targeted?
- List conference attendances and symposia held.
- Information on any inter- and intra-departmental collaboration across the University.
- Information on departmental relationships with external individuals/groups e.g. industry links, commercialisation, employers.

Community Service/Outreach:

- Outline staff contributions to University service on committees/Boards/etc. and consider the pros and cons of this service.
- Discuss Department/Programme outreach to the wider community e.g. media coverage; expertise provided to businesses or the City Council, national or international groups.
- Discuss the profile of the Department/Programme locally/nationally/internationally.
- Discuss vocational links/expectations with relevant industry and the response to industry needs.
- Discuss commercialisation.

Appendices might include:

- Information on professional, consultancy and community service contributions by staff.
- Information on departmental relationships with external individuals/groups, e.g. MoUs, industry links, employers.

DOCUMENT D: Quality Advancement report distribution

General Information

Upon authorisation for release by the DVC (Academic), a Review Report is a public document within the University and will be distributed by the Quality Advancement Unit as below. Notice of release will be placed on the QAU Website and via the Communications newsletter. Further distribution by those receiving Reports from QAU is expected. Released Reports can be requested from the Quality Advancement Unit by any staff at any time. Permission must be obtained from the DVC (Academic) to circulate a Review Report outside the University.

Standard distribution: Two-part process

Review Reports will be released in two separate distributions, the Initial Distribution and the General Distribution, to ensure that parties directly involved receive the Report prior to circulation University-wide.

i) Initial distribution:

Upon release by the DVC (Academic), hard copies of the Review Report will be sent to the Head of the Department reviewed, their Divisional Head (and Dean or other Director where applicable) and members of the Review Panel. It is the responsibility of those Department, Unit and Divisional Heads to distribute the Report to relevant staff within their section. The Initial Distribution list will be approved by the DVC, PVC/Head of Division and Convenor prior to release.

ii) General Distribution:

One week following the Initial Distribution, the Report will be distributed to the wider University community. This General Distribution will be by email from QAU (with the Report as a pdf attachment). This list cuts across the University at top levels seeking to disseminate the Report as broadly, equitably and efficiently as possible. It is the responsibility of each recipient to further distribute the Report to staff within their area as appropriate.

For further information please contact [Megan Wilson](#), QAU Reviews Manager.

DOCUMENT E: Resources and key contacts list

Quality Advancement Unit

[Review guidelines and processes](#)

Megan Wilson (Reviews): m.wilson@otago.ac.nz, 021 279 1778

[Student/Graduate Opinion Surveys](#)

Romain Mirosa (Surveys): romain.mirosa@otago.ac.nz

[Student Evaluations](#)

The Evaluation team maintains student evaluation of teaching and course data, collected from staff-requested evaluations, from 2004 to the present. This dataset provides a long-term record of feedback on courses and teaching.

The team can aggregate ratings for standard evaluation questions at department and divisional levels to highlight multi-year patterns in student feedback. These evaluations support course and teaching enhancement and may also be used as evidence in staff appraisal and promotion processes

Contact: Allen Goodchild or Julie Samson evaluation@otago.ac.nz

[University of Otago Staff Values and Behaviours Survey](#)

The University of Otago Staff Values and Behaviours Survey, data collection, analysis and reporting is coordinated through the University of Otago Quality Advancement Unit on behalf of the Senior Leadership Team. The results of the survey are intended to support decision making or policy settings related to the University of Otago staff culture and experience. Targeted reports are produced for areas with a sufficient number of answers at the Divisional, School and Departmental level. An overall university-wide report and reports based on socio-demographic characteristics are also produced.

Contact: Romain Mirosa (Surveys): romain.mirosa@otago.ac.nz

Strategy, Analytics and Reporting Office (SARO)

SARO provide standard data-packs to inform QAU reviews, and guidance on issues relating to Pae Tata and the strategic planning framework. Requests for clarification or further information should be emailed to SARO@otago.ac.nz, or in the case of Pae Tata, paetata@otago.ac.nz

Outside of the primary mailbox, the contacts for QAU Panels are:

- Kevin Maley (Senior Manager) kevin.maley@otago.ac.nz
- David Thomson (Director) david.thomson@otago.ac.nz

[Pae Tata](#)

The primary contacts on Pae Tata and related strategic planning matters are:

- Chris Hale (Whakamana i a Pae Tata Manager) chris.hale@otago.ac.nz
- David Turner (Senior Analyst) david.turner@otago.ac.nz

The core tasks of this Office include:

Strategy and Advisory

- Manage and facilitate the development and application of the University Strategic Plan and associated frameworks that support and underpin University operations and decision making.
- Undertake and manage the provision of consistent and integrated strategic and operational planning and monitor strategic initiatives throughout the University. Manage or be actively involved in selected initiatives where required.
- Engage with University committees, divisions and departments to facilitate analysis, reporting and advice to assist in the development and achievement of plans.
- Dealing with government departments and agencies and other third parties in regard to strategy, regulations, policy and other matters.

Analytics and Insights

- Conduct institutional research (analysis to inform University operations).
- Gather and analyse marketing intelligence and market research.
- Forecasting of student load (EFTS) and other indicators.
- Combine internal and external information to inform and develop computational models and calculations.
- Coordinate institutional benchmarking (e.g., UniForum and Tribal) and international rankings (e.g., QS, Time Higher Education).
- Coordinate surveys related to SAR operations, in collaboration with the Quality Advancement Unit and other stakeholders.

Reporting and Compliance

- Responsible for the University's compliance with statutory student reporting to the Tertiary Education Commission, including the Single Data Return, and maintenance of relevant components of eVision.
- Monitoring funding-related student performance.
- Coordinate Government compliance change projects such as the evolution of Fees-Free policy, and a new Single Data Return.
- Provide student numbers (headcount and EFTS) and related reporting for all parts of the University.
- Responsible for, or participate in, the development of other regular reports such as the Council Non-Financial Reporting and the University's Annual Report.

Business Intelligence

- Working collaboratively with Information Technology and other subject matter experts to develop a new data and Business Intelligence environment.
- Business Intelligence is a broad term that encompasses the software, systems, tools, and infrastructure used to facilitate dissemination and analysis of data and information to inform data-driven decision making. BI topics include data governance, data warehouses, online dashboards, predictive analytics, and many other topics.
- In the University of Otago context, this programme of works is envisioned to bring together disparate sources of data, to allow staff throughout the university to easily access a consistent suite of data via an online-self-service dashboard, and to aid analytics teams in conducting more complex analytics.
- Once developed, the University BI capability will help the SAR Office deliver its core operational tasks and will support data-driven decision making to achieve the University's strategic goals.

Research Integrity Office – Publications Team

Contact:

Research Integrity Office – Publications Team: publications@otago.ac.nz

Dr Donna Hendry: donna.hendry@otago.ac.nz

Raewyn Keane: raewyn.keane@otago.ac.nz

The Research Integrity Office – Publications Team collects, verifies, and records research outputs to showcase the University's achievements and provide relevant and timely information for a variety of essential reporting requirements such as annual reports, department reviews, accreditation requirements, and funding applications.

Citation lists and statistics in various styles and for various time periods can be provided by the Office for use in reviews and accreditation processes. We will contact you about report options ahead of your self-review document deadline or you can contact us at any time. Reports are also sent directly to the QAU Review Panel prior to each review.

The publications/research outputs are also available for viewing in MyResearch:

<https://www.otago.ac.nz/myresearch>

For information about publications/outputs see:

<https://www.otago.ac.nz/research/research-integrity-office/publications-outputs>

Bibliometric Reports – University of Otago Library Research Services Unit

Contact: Research Services Unit: library.research@otago.ac.nz

Background

To support QAU reviews, the Library Research Services Unit (RSU) prepares bibliometric reports for departments, schools, faculties, some centres and programmes, and other research-active units that produce scholarly outputs.

These reports are intended to support self-review by providing an evidence-based overview of publication activity, citation performance, research visibility, collaboration patterns, and publishing profile. As bibliometric data can offer useful contextual indicators of research activity and influence, the reports can help units identify strengths, patterns, areas of growth, and topics for further reflection alongside other qualitative and discipline-specific evidence.

It should be noted that these reports are generally most useful when there is a clear relationship between the researchers included and the research activity of the unit under review. In some cases, particularly for centres, programmes, or other cross-unit entities, staff publication data may only partially reflect the work of that entity. For this reason, the report should be interpreted as a contextual source of evidence rather than a complete representation of the unit's activity.

Process

In advance of the QAU review, the RSU will contact the Head of Department or the relevant unit representative to confirm the list of researchers to be included. The report is then generated from SciVal, using Scopus-indexed publications and citation data in the last full five years - please note that Scopus-indexed publications may not cover all of a researcher's outputs. We normally supply the completed report 2 to 3 months before the QAU review. A copy is also provided to the QAU Reviews Manager and the relevant Subject Librarian.

The Report

The report is available in two formats: an Excel spreadsheet and a PDF report. The Excel spreadsheet contains the underlying data across multiple sheets, including an overview of the report context and data source, definitions of the metrics used, summary indicators, collaboration data, publication and citation metrics, subject area analysis, publication sources, Scopus views, and a full publication list. The full publication list presents detailed publication-level information, including title, authors, year, source title, citations, field-weighted citation impact, open access status, DOI, institutions, countries, subject classifications, and related topic information. The format and layout of the spreadsheet is adjusted by the RSU to improve clarity and readability. We recommend reading the Overview and Metrics Defined sheets first before interpreting the other tabs. As with any bibliometric dataset, the report should also be checked carefully for researcher coverage, publication attribution, and disciplinary fit.

The PDF report provides a visual summary of key indicators from the dataset. It presents overall research performance at a glance, including scholarly output, researcher numbers, citation counts, citations per publication, field-weighted citation impact, and open access share. It also summarises collaboration patterns, annual output trends, outputs in top citation and views percentiles, publication share by subject area, leading publication sources, journal quality indicators such as CiteScore percentiles and quartiles, and publication visibility through Scopus views.

Together, the Excel and PDF versions provide both the detailed underlying data and an accessible overview of the main trends, making the report useful for self-review, strategic reflection, highlighting successful research outputs, and identifying areas for further investigation.

Additional analyses or alternative metrics may be available on request. This may include further exploration of publication sets, topic clusters, subject classifications, or other available indicators. Please allow at least two weeks for any additional requests. The RSU is also happy to answer questions about the report, the metrics used, and the appropriate interpretation of the findings.

Sustainability Office

Contact: Ray O'Brien, Tumuaki o Toitū te Taiao/Head of Sustainability, sustainability@otago.ac.nz

The Sustainability Office is responsible for Tī Kōuka 2030: The Sustainability Strategic Framework. Tī Kōuka provides direction so that sustainability principles and practices are integrated across all our campuses and throughout all our activities based on seven themes: education, research, leadership and governance, operations, a regenerative approach, regional and global impact, and innovation.

While a lot of focus is rightly upon environmental issues, sustainability is seen as a much broader and more complex concept that embraces environmental, social, and cultural concerns. This is best seen in our commitment to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDGs). The QS sustainability ranking is one measure of that commitment, and we maintain a position around the top 5% globally. This ranking significantly contributes to our overall global ranking with QS (top 200).

The Sustainability Office provides a range of opportunities to engage with sustainability. This includes student events, a Tī Kōuka Ora staff engagement programme, living lab research initiatives, Wānaka Taiao, the sustainability neighbourhood (part of Uniflats), Te Oraka (reuse store), Pūhau ana te rā (summer scholarships and journal), staff excellence awards, and bespoke workshops. We are currently focussed on reducing and offsetting our greenhouse gas emissions to meet our objective of net carbon zero by 2030.

The implementation of Tī Kōuka into all departmental plans is a critical piece of work, so if you would like to discuss how sustainability relates to your department or programme, please do not hesitate to get in touch. We are happy to meet over a coffee (fair trade of course!) or take a more structured workshop approach to help integrate sustainability into your strategy and planning.

Refer also [Sustainability at Otago](#), [Sustainability Strategic Framework](#) and [United Nations Sustainable Development Goals](#) and the Sustainability prompt sheet (see Appendices).

Property & Campus Development Division

Contact: Doug Rodgers, Head of Asset Management, doug.rodgers@otago.ac.nz; assetmanagement@otago.ac.nz

The Property & Campus Development Division is the custodian of the University's property portfolio and works across the full spectrum of property-related activities, from strategic planning to waste management and changing light bulbs. The Division is responsible for developing and delivering strategic space and facility plans, while ensuring that the built environment supports core activities and provides a safe, welcoming and flexible experience for our students, staff and visitors. The Division includes trades and grounds staff, architects and draughts people, compliance specialists, space planners, project managers, property managers and more.

The Division provides a high-level space and facilities report to the review subject and Panel, to help inform their review activities. The report includes a summary of the facilities used and identifies issues Property & Campus Development are aware of and any plans to address those issues. Issues may relate to building condition, accessibility, location and whether spaces are fit-for-purpose as they are used now or will be used in the future. The report also outlines any relevant strategic plans that will impact the review subject, such as divisional master plans. Where appropriate, the report provides recommendations from an asset management viewpoint.

Disability Information and Support

The vision of Disability Information and Support (DI&S) is to work in partnership to promote an inclusive environment that celebrates diversity, promotes comprehensive academic support, and empowers individuals with impairments to achieve their full potential. DI&S provides learning support, advice, advocacy and information to students who have a disability, impairment, injury or medical condition that affects their study.

Departments seeking advice on supporting disabled students are encouraged to get in contact with DI&S. Additionally, departments can either refer students to DI&S or advise them of the support available so they can self-refer.

Contact:

T: 03 479 8235

E: disabilites@otago.ac.nz

W: www.otago.ac.nz/disabilities

Refer to the Disability Action Plan prompt sheet (see Appendices)

Equity and Diversity

The University of Otago's Equity and Diversity Strategic Framework, Action Plan, and Policy commit the University to actions that support a campus-wide culture of equity and diversity in which all individuals are valued and different ways of thinking are embraced. It aims to enable all members of the University community to achieve to their fullest potential.

Refer to the Equity and Diversity prompt sheet (see Appendices).

For further information contact:

[Joe Llewellyn](#), Adviser, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Human Resources

[Professor Christina Hulbe](#), Chair, Equity Advisory Committee

Health, Safety and Wellbeing

Nevan Trotter: nevan.trotter@otago.ac.nz

Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Māori | Te Tari o te Pou Koko Māori

The Office of the DVC, Māori leads the strategic direction of Ōtākou Whakaihu Waka in relation to the Pae Tata domain, Whakamana i te Tiriti o Waitangi, and Te Aka Matua | Māori Strategic Framework 2030. It is also responsible for coordinating relationships with mana whenua and other iwi, hapū and Māori entities with whom the University partners, including pursuant to Te Kaha Uia Te Kaha | the Mana-to-Mana Agreement.

Contacts:

DVC Māori, Distinguished Professor Jacinta Ruru: dvc.maori@otago.ac.nz

Director Māori Strategy, Janine Kapa: janine.kapa@otago.ac.nz

Refer to the Māori Strategic Framework Self-Review Guide (see Appendices).

Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Pacific

Contacts:

DVC Pacific, Professor Dianne Sika-Paotonu: dvc.pacific@otago.ac.nz

Senior Analyst Research and Policy, Pacific, Amanda Taia: amanda.taia@otago.ac.nz

Refer to the Pacific Strategic Framework Guide (see Appendices).

Financial Services Division

Annual Trend reports for whole cost centres within academic divisions can be obtained from the Divisional Finance Managers where applicable. For other units, some form of custom report may be able to be produced on request.

Contact:

Divisions of Humanities and Commerce: Quentin Johnson, quentin.johnson@otago.ac.nz

Division of Science: Fraser Hunter, fraser.hunter@otago.ac.nz

Division of Health Science: Andrea Wolf, andrea.wolf@otago.ac.nz

For non-academic units contact:

Operations: Katherine Hendry, katherine.hendry@otago.ac.nz

Other Service Divisions: Delia Bonner, delia.bonner@otago.ac.nz

DOCUMENT F: Post-review status reports

QAU suggest that the Head of Department prepares an “Implementation Plan” for your own use, within two weeks of receipt of the Review Report, to:

- prioritise the recommendations;
- identify steps to be taken on each recommendation;
- delegate responsibility for action;
- and provide a time-line for implementation.

NOTE: The Head is also responsible for following up and reporting on recommendations made external to their unit.

QAU will ask for your Status Reports at the 1-year and 2-year marks, to monitor progress of the implementation plan. There is no standardised format for the status reports but a template is available on request.

Status Reports should include:

- **detailed feedback on the progress of each recommendation;**
- **feedback on those recommendations successfully completed; and**
- **the reasons/details as to why recommendations are NOT yet implemented.**

PVC (and Dean for Health Sciences) comment is required before the Status Report is returned to QAU; this may be embedded in the HOD’s Status Report or added in a separate document.

BE PREPARED – the DVC (Academic) will comment on your progress, report to the Vice-Chancellor as necessary, and may request further action or ask for additional information.

Mid-Cycle Assessment

An additional formal report, known as the Mid-Cycle Assessment, is now required at four years. This task is undertaken by the relevant PVC/Divisional Head in consultation with the Head of Unit and a template will be provided. Upon completion this will be submitted to the DVC (A) and the Quality Advancement Committee.