



REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE, FACULTY OF MEDICINE – WELLINGTON 2 – 4 SEPTEMBER 2026

Written submissions to be received by: Wednesday 19 August 2026

As part of the University's quality assurance programme a Panel has been convened to review, evaluate and report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) on matters pertaining to the Department of Medicine | Te Tari Whaiora, Faculty of Medicine – Wellington.

Convenor: Professor Fiona McDonald, Department of Physiology
Ōtākou Whakaihu Waka | University of Otago

Panel Members:

International: Professor Richard Lindley, School of Medicine, University of Sydney
Internal: Professor Richard Greatbanks, Department of Management
Internal: Dr Amanda Landers, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine – Christchurch
Internal: Associate Professor Tania Huria, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Māori
Graduate: Brett Sumner, PhD Graduand
Secretary: [Dr Meg Gollop](#), Quality Advancement Unit

Scroll down for the Reviews Framework and Terms of Reference below.

Written submissions

Interested parties are invited to make submissions relevant to the Terms of Reference to the Review Panel. The University wants its reviews to be based on all relevant information and accordingly assures you that submissions are treated in the strictest confidence.

Such submissions should be sent to the Review Secretary, [Dr Meg Gollop](#), by **Wednesday 19 August**. Emails (PDF format preferred) should be marked "Confidential: Submission for the Review of the Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine – Wellington."

Oral submissions

Interested parties are invited to make oral submissions relevant to the Terms of Reference to the Review Panel. Please contact the [Review Secretary](#).

Framework

A review is an opportunity to critically analyse the goals and objectives of a Department¹ and to receive affirmation that current plans and priorities will have long term benefits for students and staff, and to ensure that Department strategy is aligned with University strategy. It is designed to help the area being reviewed plan its future direction, set strategic goals and identify the challenges it will face.

The key part of the review is the Self Review, in which the Department is expected to address the following questions in the context of the Terms of Reference:

Current State

- What is the current situation of the Department?
- What does the Department do well?
- How does the Department contribute to the wider goals of the Division (and School when applicable) of which it is a part?
- How do the activities of the Department support the University in the delivery of its strategic goals, as outlined in *Vision 2040*, *Pae Tata*, and in the University's *Māori Strategic Framework*, *Pacific Strategic Framework*, and *Sustainability Strategic Framework*?

Future State

- Where does the Department want to be in five to ten years time?
- What does the Department need to do to get there?
- What challenges face the future development of the Department?
- What changes might be required to strengthen the Department's contribution to University and Divisional goals and priorities?
- What can the University and Division do to support the Department to achieve its goals?

Alignment with the University's Strategic Imperatives

The core activities of university departments are grouped under four broad headings: (1) Teaching and Student Support, (2) Research, (3) External Engagement and (4) Organisational Resources, which in turn are aligned to the University's Strategic Imperatives from *Vision 2040*.

¹ The term 'Department' covers all academic units, Centres and Schools; a departmental review will also include named degrees as applicable).

A. Teaching

We hope this review will place particular emphasis on the Department's role within a distributed clinical teaching environment, the sustainability of academic-clinical roles, and the effectiveness of our people in delivering teaching, research, and service.

In relation to Teaching, to review, evaluate and identify opportunities for development over the next five years, aligned to the Standards for Assessment and Accreditation of Primary Medical Programmes (AMC standards) and other related education best practices:

1. Teaching Strategy

- To what extent does the Department's teaching governance structure effectively support delivery, coordination, and continuous improvement of the medical programme?
- How effectively does the Department deliver a consistent, high-quality student learning experience across geographically distributed clinical settings?
- How the learning environment of the Department meets the accreditation standards outlined in the AMC Standards in terms of facilities; staff resources; continuous review; evaluation and improvement; outcome evaluation; and feedback and reporting.
- How does the Department's teaching load, governance, and student experience compare with other clinical schools, and what explains any variation?
- What is the impact, and effectiveness of key educational leadership positions (e.g. module convenors) in ensuring programme quality and coordination.
- Determine whether the Department's current teaching methodologies are fit for purpose and is aligned to Standard 2.3 of the AMC Standards.
- The state of the current processes and capacity in the Department to receive and respond to evaluative feedback on the quality of teaching and learning in modules and papers (across a range of sources including teacher and course evaluations, support from the FOM-W Teaching and Learning Support Unit, the Staff Student Liaison Committee and the Curriculum Sub-Committee).

2. Resourcing and Infrastructure

- To what extent does the Department have the educational facilities and infrastructure educational facilities and infrastructure to deliver the medical programme and achieve the medical programme outcomes.
- To what extent does the Department have the appropriate distribution and fairness of teaching allocation across staff and subspecialties, including the balance between University-employed and Health New Zealand clinicians.
- Is the current teaching workforce profile sufficient and sustainable to deliver the programme over the next 5 years?
- Recognition and reward for teaching – Review how teaching contributions are acknowledged in career progression and workload models and the capacity of the

Department to meet AMC Standards 5.2 and 5.3.

- Evaluate the effectiveness of current processes and frameworks that provide career development opportunities.
- Professional and academic staff sustainability – burnout, retention, protected teaching time, and the impact of service pressures on teaching quality (with particular reference to Standard 5 (Learning Environment) of AMC Accreditation Standards).
- Processes for ensuring appropriate standards of professional and academic supervision, support and services, and professional registration and maintenance of clinical competencies of staff.

3. Teaching Activity and student wellbeing

- How well are MBChB medicine modules assessment systems aligned with learning activities and programme outcomes in Standard 3.1 of the AMC Standards?
- Comment on how well the clinical learning environments provide sufficiently high-quality clinical placements for students to achieve the outcomes of the medical programme, including community and regional placements.
- Comment on student wellbeing on placements – supervision quality, learning environment, and adverse event reporting pathways.
- Evaluate the availability and appropriateness of simulation-based teaching and interprofessional learning opportunities in delivery of student success and graduate outcomes.

4. Capacity Building

- Is the Department equipped to scale teaching delivery for increasing student numbers and evolving models of care (e.g. ambulatory, community-based learning)?
- How well placed is the Department for recruiting, training, and retaining kaimahi Māori staff in medical education activities?
- What are the opportunities for the Department in exposing undergraduate and postgraduate students and medical officers (non-contracted) to teaching and assessment opportunities to gain experience?
- How well do Department activities address staff training for teaching and assessment activities, including clinical supervisors?
- Does the Department provide sufficient opportunities for cultural safety training and professional development to support its teaching activities?

5. Teaching Opportunities and Collaborations

- How effectively does the Department promote curriculum (including assessment) integration and collaboration with other departments, schools, and campuses?
- What are the opportunities for the Department to enhance the involvement of Health New Zealand clinical staff in teaching and how to recognise this appropriately including succession planning, supervisor training, and remuneration?
- How should the Department ensure that teaching of medicine and evaluations are harmonised and opportunities for sharing teaching is maximised between the three FoM campi?

6. Postgraduate Programmes

- The current and future states of postgraduate programmes including range and scope, relevance to students and employers, quality of teaching and learning and assessments, and appropriateness and adequacy of resourcing.

7. How do the teaching activities of the Department support the University in the delivery of its strategic goals as outlined in [Vision 2040](#), and in the University's [Māori Strategic Framework](#), [Pacific Strategic Framework](#), and [Sustainability Strategic Framework](#)?

B. RESEARCH

In relation to Research, can the panel evaluate the success of the current research activities of the Department and comment on the opportunities for development over the next five years in the following areas:

1. Research Strategy

- Adequacy, structure, and strategic role of the Research Committee, including clarity of remit, membership, processes, and impact across clinical and non-clinical research streams.
- Alignment of departmental research priorities with University and Division strategies, including alignment with national research priorities.
- Does the panel consider that the Department should have a clearly defined set of priority research areas and work towards sufficient critical mass to be sustainable and nationally/internationally competitive?

2. Resourcing and Infrastructure

- Adequacy of research support (administrative, statistical, data management, grant development and submission support), for clinical and non-clinical research.
- Access to space, equipment, software, laboratory facilities, data platforms, and specialist support needed for diverse types of research (clinical, biomedical, public health, behavioural, qualitative, kaupapa Māori, data science).

3. Research Activity and Workforce Development

- How effectively does the Department generate high-quality research outputs and impact, including publications, external grants, supervision, student completions, knowledge translation, community-engaged outputs, and impact.
- Evaluate the success of external research funding by the Department, benchmarked against national trends - and comment on how the department is best positioned to increase success in the next 5 years.
- Appropriateness of expectations for staff regarding research involvement and outputs, and mechanisms for fair and equitable assessment that recognise diverse research paradigms.
- What are the key opportunities and constraints for increasing research productivity across clinical and non-clinical domains?
- How sustainable is the current clinical academic model in supporting research activity?
- Support for both postgraduate students and postdoctoral researchers (Masters, PhD, postdocs), including supervision capacity, mentoring, access to funding, and pathways into research careers.

- Attracting and developing Māori researchers and supporting Māori staff and students across all fields.
- Opportunities to increase research into Māori health, including kaupapa Māori research.
- Equity, diversity, and inclusion, including how the department supports women, ECRs, clinical staff with split roles, part-time staff.

4. Capacity Building

- Teaching of research methodology (quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, kaupapa Māori, lab-based methods, clinical trials, implementation science, and data science).
- Support for clinical staff to develop research capability, including mentorship.

5. Research Opportunities and Collaborations

- Role of the department in creating and enabling research opportunities, including interdisciplinary and cross-department collaborations.
- Opportunities for partnership with external stakeholders.
- Opportunities for commercial research and how this could be incentivised under the University umbrella.

6. Postgraduate Research

- How does the Department perform in attracting and supporting research activities for postgraduate students wanting to pursue higher degrees e.g. Masters, PhD.
- How does the Department perform in terms of completion rates and research outputs by postgraduate students.
- How attractive and supportive is the Department as an environment for postgraduate research training?

7. How does the Department's research contribute to the wider goals of the Faculty of Medicine (see <https://www.otago.ac.nz/faculty-medicine/about/strategic-plan/>)?

8. How do the research activities of the Department support the University in the delivery of its strategic goals, as outlined in [Vision 2040](#), and in the University's [Māori Strategic Framework](#), [Pacific Strategic Framework](#), and [Sustainability Strategic Framework](#)?

C. SERVICE

In relation to Service, to evaluate the Department's contribution to institutional, professional, and societal roles, and identify opportunities...over the next five years of:

- Involvement of staff in service to the Department and University.
- Involvement in staff in activities related to professional societies and associations.
- Involvement of staff in regional and national government activities.
- Opportunities for collaboration with iwi.
- Involvement of staff in attracting, promoting and developing Māori staff and students across all fields.
- Opportunities to collaborate with Health New Zealand.

D. JOINT CAMPUS/HEALTH NEW ZEALAND ENTITIES

In relation to Clinical Practice, and Joint Campus/Health New Zealand (HNZ) entities, to review, evaluate and identify opportunities for development over the next five years of:

- To what extent are the contributions of clinicians to academic activities appropriately recognised and supported?
- Appropriate responsibility for and oversight of facilities which are shared with other entities e.g. Hospitals/Health New Zealand.
- Staffing processes which ensure appropriate balances of academic and professional contributions to the health system where appropriate.
- Are clinical workload expectations aligned with academic FTE allocations, and are these arrangements sustainable? Is the current academic–clinical model sustainable over the next 5–10 years?
- Reviewing the adequacy of clinical specialty coverage by current academic staff – are there gaps?
- Recognising the impact of clinical workload and teaching on research productivity.

E. ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

In relation to Organisational Culture, to review, evaluate and identify opportunities for development over the next five years of:

- To what extent does the Department demonstrate a positive, inclusive, and high-performing culture in terms of its core and individual values, collegiality, atmosphere, equity, recognition of Te Tiriti principles?
- Is the Department a sustainable and attractive environment for long-term academic careers?
- How effective is departmental leadership in providing strategic direction, communication, and accountability?
- Structure of the department in terms of its leadership, committee representation, procedures, and policies.
- Adequacy of department resources e.g. space, administrative assistance.
- Workload balance.
- Health and Safety protocols.

F. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

In relation to Administrative Support, to review, evaluate and identify opportunities for development over the next five years of:

- Adequacy and effectiveness of administrative support in enabling teaching, research, and service activities?
- Does the current administrative model adequately support the complexity of the Department's clinical, teaching, and research interfaces?
- Relationship with broader administrative support (Faculty/Division based).