



University
of Otago
ŌTĀKOU WHAKAIHU WAKA

2026 Graduating Year Review (GYR) Handbook

For Self-Review Co-ordinators and
GYR Panel Members

| TABLE OF CONTENTS | | PAGE |
|--------------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. | Introduction | 1 |
| 2. | Handbook..... | 4 |
| 3. | Key Contacts..... | 5 |
| 4. | Role of the Division | 6 |
| 5. | Role of the Self-Review Coordinator..... | 7 |
| 6. | Role of the Panel..... | 8 |
| 7. | Timeline and Tasks..... | 9 |
| 8. | Self-Review Report..... | 12 |
| 9. | Self-Review Evidence (Supporting Documents)..... | 13 |
| 10. | GYR Report | 14 |
| APPENDICES | | |
| | APPENDIX A: CUAP Criteria for assessing GYR Reports..... | 15 |
| | APPENDIX B: Information for Discipline Specialists | 16 |
| | APPENDIX C: Self-Review Report Template | 17 |
| | APPENDIX D: University of Otago Graduating Year Review (GYR) Report Template..... | 21 |
| | APPENDIX E: University of Otago Internal Reviews: Payment Policy..... | 20 |

1. Introduction

Context

New Zealand universities are required by the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) to undertake a follow-up review of all successful (conditionally approved) proposals involving the introduction of new qualifications and major subjects and endorsements comprising 40% or more of a qualification (collectively referred to as 'programme/s' in this Handbook). Where a cluster of related programmes has been approved, the GYR review report may cover all those programmes. CUAP has given the name **Graduating Year Review** (GYR) to this moderation process. GYR is the final stage in confirming approval of a new programme.

Sanctions

If a university fails to provide a GYR report when requested, CUAP may suspend approval pending receipt of the report. The effect of such a decision would be that no new students could be enrolled in the programme until CUAP lifts the approval suspension.

Purpose

The GYR is intended to assure CUAP that a new programme is meeting its original aims and objectives with an acceptable standard of delivery.

Timeframes

A GYR is normally completed within three years of the graduation of the first cohort of students from a programme, (i.e. Year 6 for a three-year degree programme and Year 4 for a one-year diploma programme). Lower than expected graduate numbers may reduce the quantity of data available to the review but the process remains an essential part of CUAP's overall quality assurance function. Once new programmes are conditionally approved, the University of Otago requires Annual Programme Reports (APR) each year following the year of introduction up until the GYR. This APR process formalises the gathering of relevant information in preparation for, and to feed into, the GYR process.

Process

CUAP expects a formal review to be undertaken by the University and has a prescribed reporting format (called the GYR Report) and set criteria for assessment¹ and consideration of the GYR report. The GYR Report submitted to CUAP must stand-alone and cover the topics outlined in the format for reporting.² Within these parameters, the University may establish its own internal processes for self-evaluation, conduct of the formal review, report writing and endorsement of the review outcomes.

¹ Appendix A: CUAP Criteria for Assessing GYR Reports

² Appendix D: GYR Report Template

Outcomes

CUAP subjects each GYR report to scrutiny after which it may:

- Accept the report, thereby confirming approval
- Accept the report with specified changes
- Require a further report by a specified time
- Withdraw approval.

Deferral³

Universities may request deferral of a GYR if:

- The programme either has not yet been offered or was first offered at a later date than first envisaged;
- All or most enrolments are part-time and there have been no completions by the time the report is due; or
- The due date for the GYR precedes or coincides with a scheduled departmental or programme review.

Deferrals will be granted for a maximum of two years from the first due date of a GYR.

If a programme has not been offered, or has attracted no enrolments, in the five years following its introduction, it must be re-submitted to CUAP for re-evaluation (i.e. in the form of a new proposal progressing through the entirety of the University's and CUAP's approval processes) or formally deleted.

Where a University has deleted a programme and notified CUAP of this deletion, no GYR is required. Where a University has discontinued a programme with an intention to delete, it may submit an abbreviated GYR and should advise CUAP of the round in which it intends to delete the qualification.

Additional Information

For further information about Graduating Year Review, see the *CUAP Handbook* on the [Universities New Zealand website](#)

³ To request a deferral for a specific programme, please contact Academic Committees and Services (academic.committees@otago.ac.nz)

2. This Handbook

The University of Otago has put in place a formal internal process to enact CUAP's GYR requirements. The University's process is described in this *Graduating Year Review (GYR) Handbook*, which outlines key contacts and roles, provides advice and guidance on how to complete the required paperwork, and indicates key tasks and dates.

The primary audience for the *Graduating Year Review (GYR) Handbook* is:

- Staff delegated responsibility for undertaking the self-evaluation (self-review) and completing the required paperwork in the form of a Self-Review Report and supporting evidence
- Members of the GYR Panel appointed to carry out the formal review of the programme and prepare the GYR Report
- Those with Divisional responsibilities (e.g., Associate Deans, Academic and/or Specialists, Academic Committees and Services who are well placed to support the GYR process as it relates to both the Divisional Board and Departments).

3. Key Contacts

Academic Committees and Services (ACS)

ACS administers the University's [Academic Committee](#) (which has replaced the Boards of Undergraduate Studies (BUGS) and Graduate Studies (BoGS)) and Divisional Boards' committee processes; supports the University's relationship with CUAP; and oversees the CUAP approval process for academic proposals and the process for external accreditation of new academic programmes through CUAP. This responsibility includes advising relevant parties of CUAP decisions, such as conditional approvals of academic proposals, and preparing an overview summary that front ends the University's collation and submission of GYR Reports⁴ to CUAP.

Staff in ACS work closely with the University of Otago's representative on CUAP, Professor Tim Cooper.

For further information on policy matters in relation to GYRs, please contact:

- Matt Angel, Specialist, Academic Committees and Services
(03) 479 4852 matt.angel@otago.ac.nz or academic.committees@otago.ac.nz

The Quality Advancement Unit (QAU)

The QAU coordinates the University's ongoing cycle of academic and administrative reviews and administers the internal GYR process, including liaison with those staff responsible for preparing the self-review paperwork (Self-Review Report and supporting evidence), servicing of the GYR Panels and submitting the Panel's GYR Report to the relevant Divisional Specialist, ACS who supports the CUAP relationship.

For information or queries about GYR administration, please contact

- Megan Wilson, Reviews Manager
021 279 1778 m.wilson@otago.ac.nz
- Juliet Anderson, QAU Review Coordinator
021 279 0166 juliet.anderson@otago.ac.nz
- Dr Megan Gollop, QAU Review Coordinator
027 445 5474 megan.gollop@otago.ac.nz

⁴ The summary comprises: a list of the GYRs submitted; any features of a particular programme that are not evident from the GYR Report; a description of the overall internal GYR process undertaken by the University; overview of guidance given to the Self-Review Coordinators and GYR Panels; a brief summary of the GYR outcomes.

4. Role of the Division

At the beginning of the academic year, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (PVC) receives a memo from QAU detailing the forthcoming GYRs for that year and requesting the names of the Self-Review Coordinators and Divisional Representatives.

Appointments to GYR Roles

The PVC appoints both the Self-Review Coordinator and the Divisional Representative.⁵

- The Self-Review Coordinator is appointed in consultation with the relevant Dean or Head of Department (HOD). It is usually the current Programme Coordinator, as this person will be responsible for preparing the GYR Self-Review Report and will have been responsible for providing the APR each year prior to the GYR.
- The Divisional Representative is usually a Divisional Associate Dean, Academic (or similar). The Divisional Representative will sit on the GYR Panel to provide information and guidance about how the programme fits within the teaching and research of the Division. Additionally, this person may be required to source additional information from the department/Division as appropriate.

Once these appointments are made, the PVC's office will advise QAU of the names, job titles and contact details of the appointments for both roles.

Academic Boards

Divisional Boards receive the GYR Panels' completed reports from the Divisional Specialist, ACS for the August meeting of their Boards. Reports are discussed by the Boards, who may suggest minor amendments; signed by the PVCs; and sent to the [Academic Committee](#) where they are discussed and who may require additional minor amendments, and then sent to CUAP via Academic Committees and Services following the next meeting of Senate.

Following the submission of GYR Reports to CUAP by 1 October, Academic Committees and Services receive a Scrutineers' Report. Feedback from that Report is then communicated to QAU to liaise with the PVC, Divisional Representative and Self-Review Coordinator. That report should be tabled for discussion at the relevant Divisional Board. It is expected that any recommendations are carefully considered, with changes implemented at the Divisional and/or departmental level where necessary.

⁵ See sections 5 and 6 of this Handbook for more information about these two roles.

5. Role of the Self-Review Coordinator

The Divisional PVC, on receipt of advice from QAU that a GYR for a new programme is due, will appoint a member of staff to carry out the self-review of the programme. The appointment is usually made in consultation with the relevant Dean or HOD and is often the current Programme Coordinator.

This role is called the **Self-Review Coordinator** and key responsibilities include:

- Coordinating the self-evaluation (self-review) of the programme
- Completing the Self-Review Report using the Self-Review Report template (Appendix C)
- Collating the supporting documents, including APRs,⁶ which provide evidence and context for statements made in the Self-Review Report
- Appointing, in consultation with the Dean or HOD, the person who will serve as Discipline Specialist on the GYR Panel (refer to *Appendix B: Information for Discipline Specialists* for an explanation of this role)
- Sending the Discipline Specialist's name, contact details (and, if the appointee is external to the University, a brief description of their expertise) to the QAU Reviews Coordinator who is servicing the Review Panel
- Submitting the Self-Review Report and supporting evidence to the GYR Panel via the QAU Reviews Coordinator by the date requested
- Meeting with the GYR Panel to discuss the Self-Review Report, provide further clarification and answer any queries
- Fact checking the GYR Report, which is produced by the Review Panel and is the outcome of its deliberations.

The responsibilities of the Self-Review Coordinator will be so much easier to fulfill if the department that hosts the new programme has put in place monitoring and data-gathering procedures from Year 1 of the programme's commencement. The University's APR process is one mechanism put in place to encourage these processes. Departments may also have other mechanisms that might provide relevant data (e.g. external accreditation).

It is important to appreciate that the Self-Review Coordinator does not own the GYR report. They have the opportunity to check the report for factual accuracy, but the GYR report itself is made by the University and ultimately owned by the University.

⁶ Copies of any previously submitted APRs may also be obtained from Academic Committees and Services (academic.committees@otago.ac.nz).

6. Role of the Panel

The Review Panel consists of four people with the following roles and responsibilities as prescribed by CUAP:

1. Convenor

The Convenor leads the Review Panel in consideration of the Self-Review Report and supporting evidence and, based on the findings of the Review, writes the GYR Report. The Convenor is a senior academic (current or retired) appointed by the Quality Advancement Unit and independent of the programme.

2. Divisional Representative

This role provides the Panel with information and guidance about how the programme fits within the teaching and research of the Division and is responsible for sourcing further information from the department/Division as appropriate. This information may take the form of data clarification, enrolment strategies, staffing matters etc. The Divisional Representative is normally a Divisional Associate Dean, Academic (or similar) appointed by the PVC, provided that they are from another disciplinary area to the programme.

3. Discipline Specialist

This role provides the Panel with an external perspective. The person selected should be external to the programme but familiar with the programme and the subject area under review. The Discipline Specialist provides expertise from an industry/professional perspective (e.g., a clinical practitioner or an employer of graduates from the programme). This person may be a guest lecturer or external moderator for the programme, but would not be someone with academic oversight of, or involvement in, teaching the programme. The Discipline Specialist is appointed by the Self-Review Coordinator in consultation with the Dean or HOD.

4. QAU Review Coordinator

This role provides administrative and secretarial support to the Panel and is responsible for liaison with the Self-Review Coordinator. The Review Co-ordinator is appointed by the Quality Advancement Unit.

7. Timeline and Tasks

December

- The Academic Committees and Services Specialists (ACS) confirm the CUAP list of programmes scheduled for GYR to the Quality Advancement Unit (QAU).
- ACS contact the Strategy, Analytics and Reporting Office to provide Enrolment and Completion data for each GYR.

January/February

- ACS send the original academic proposals (including notes on approval from CUAP along with any conditions), completed APRs and current Enrolment and Completion data for each GYR to QAU
- The Reviews Manager, QAU contacts each academic PVC to:
 - i) Advise the number and names of programmes scheduled for GYR in their Division
 - ii) Request the appointment of, and return of, the name and contact details for the Self-Review Coordinator (or Self-Review Coordinators if more than one programme is due for review); and, in the same memo,
 - iii) Request the appointment of, and return of, the name and contact details for the role of Divisional Representative on the GYR Panel.
- The Reviews Manager, QAU writes to each Self-Review Coordinator to initiate the self-review activity and provides them with copies of:
 - i) This *Graduating Year Review (GYR) Handbook* as an information resource
 - ii) The original academic proposal sent to and conditionally approved by CUAP as well as any completed APRs
 - iii) An Excel spreadsheet of Enrolment and Completion data.⁷
- Divisional Boards receive and discuss a copy of the outcome letter sent in December to each Self-Review Coordinator in their Division.
- The QAU assigns a Convenor and a QAU Review Coordinator to each GYR Panel.
- Staff from ACS and QAU meet with the CUAP representative and GYR Convenors to consider CUAP feedback, debrief, and make improvements to the internal process for the coming GYR round.
- QAU invite Self-Review Coordinators to a workshop led by the CUAP representative, on how to complete the Self-Review document. It is helpful if an experienced GYR Convenor can also attend and be on-hand to answer questions.

⁷ This data is sourced from the Strategy, Analytics and Reporting Office, which supplies the data from their records. Self-Review Coordinators will need to assess this data against Departmental/Programme records and note/comment on any anomalies in the Self-Review Report.

February – April

- The Dean, Learning and Teaching, and QAU facilitate an annual GYR Workshop, to advise academic staff about the GYR processes and on how to complete the Self-Review document.

The Self-Review Coordinator will:

- Gather/collate all relevant data, starting with the APRs, EFTS data and other supporting evidence (refer to Section 9 of this Handbook)
- write the Self-Review document
- in consultation with the HOD or Head of Programme, will seek and appoint a Discipline Specialist to the GYR Panel
- The QAU Review Coordinator liaises with the Convenor and Panel Members about the process and schedules the GYR Panel meetings to take place in May/June.

By 30 April

- The Self-Review Coordinator sends to the QAU Review Coordinator:
 - i) The completed Self-Review Report and evidence (supporting documents)
 - ii) The name and contact details of the Discipline Specialist (and, if the appointee is external to the University, a brief description outlining their expertise).

May/June

- GYR Panel meetings take place.

June/July

- The GYR Panel Convenor drafts the GYR Report, with Panel input and approval
- The CUAP representative also receives a copy of the draft report at this stage
- The Self-Review Coordinator is sent the GYR Report to correct errors of fact
- The Convenor finalises the content of the GYR Report, including the coversheet.

By end July

- The Reviews Manager, QAU, submits the completed GYRs to the relevant Divisional Specialist, ACS for consideration at the August Divisional Board meeting
- QAU involvement in the process concludes at this point.

August

- The Divisional Boards consider GYR Reports
- The PVCs:
 - i) Following consideration at Divisional Boards, make a recommendation for continuation or discontinuation of each programme and complete what is known as a *GYR Assessment Form*
 - ii) Return the completed *GYR Assessment Forms* and the GYR Reports to ACS by the deadline for the September Academic Committee meeting.

September

- The *GYR Assessment Forms* and GYR Reports are considered by the Academic Committee
- Following the Academic Committee meeting, any consequential amendments to the GYR Reports are made by the CUAP Representative
- As the University submits several GYRs to CUAP each year, ACS, on behalf of the Academic Committee, writes an overview summary that front-ends the GYR reports
- ACS submits the completed reports to CUAP by 1 October.

October/November

- Scrutineers from two other NZ universities review Otago's GYR Reports and produce a Scrutineers' Report, which the University receives by mid-October
- CUAP meets in October and discusses and confirms the outcomes of the GYR Reports and Scrutineers' Reports
- The Scrutineers' Report, including GYR outcomes and any recommendations for the following year's GYR process, is discussed at the November meetings of the Academic Committee
- ACS advises the outcome of CUAP's deliberations to the Self-Review Coordinator, HOD, PVC, GYR Convener and QAU and provides a copy of the final GYR Report (as submitted to CUAP) for information.

8. Self-Review Report

Self-Review

The GYR self-review is the internal evaluation, led by the Self-Review Coordinator of the new programme's performance against its formal course objectives (as articulated in the original academic proposal) and the CUAP criteria for assessment (Appendix A).

The Self-Review Coordinator, in consultation with the relevant HOD or Head of Programme, may carry out the self-review in whichever way they deem most appropriate for ensuring the successful writing of the Self-Review Report and collation of the supporting evidence.

Self-Review Report

The outcome of the self-evaluation is presented in the form of a Self-Review Report (using the template provided as Appendix C). The Self-Review Report Template covers the topics that comprise the CUAP criteria for assessment. Instructions for writing the Self-Review Report are included on the Self-Review Report Template. Six pages of text should suffice (note that the GYR Panel are required to submit a four-page report).⁸ Examples of good practice Self-Review Reports can be requested from QAU.

The Self-Review Report must be supported by documents that provide evidence and/or context for the statements made and conclusions reached in the Self-Review Report (see Section 8 for more information about data gathering and types of evidence).

The GYR Panel uses the information in the Self-Review Report validated by the accompanying supporting evidence to produce the GYR Report.

⁸ Where a cluster of related programmes have been approved the GYR Report may cover all those programmes, and up to one extra page per programme is allowed in such cases.

9. Self-Review Evidence (Supporting Documents)

The Self-Review Report is accompanied by a selection of supporting documents that provide evidence and/or context for the statements made and conclusions reached in the Self-Review Report. CUAP takes a particular interest in evidence, and a key role of the GYR panel is to confirm and summarise the existence of evidence.

To facilitate the Panel's task, it is important that the statements made in the Self-Review Report clearly identify and reference the supporting evidence. The evidence should be provided to the Review Panel (via the QAU Review Coordinator), preferably in electronic form. Anecdotal evidence is valid, but it should be made clear that it is anecdotal when citing it in the Self-Review Report. Similarly, if the quality of the evidence available is fragmented or patchy, say so. Supply the most recent evidence in order to assure the Panel (and therefore CUAP) of the validity of any reported statement.

Data gathering and record keeping

The data gathering exercise is easier to manage and more robust in form if the department that hosts the new programme has been record keeping from Year 1 of the programme's commencement. A department is encouraged to gather evidence that graduate attributes are being met⁹ and learning outcomes achieved; keep programme meeting notes, seek student feedback on the papers and programme; undertake evaluations to identify strengths and weaknesses of the programme and to track the destination of its graduates, etc.

Annual Programme Reports (APRs)

The University's APR process, required for all new conditionally approved programmes, was designed to collate data annually from the year of introduction to feed into the Self-Review document.

The University's [Guidelines for Teaching at Otago](#) provides guidance on evaluative practice and identifies a range of sources of evaluative data.

Types of Evidence

The evidence can take a variety of forms (for example, paper evaluations, student feedback and/or survey data, notes of meetings with class representatives; programme meeting notes; review reports and details of any progress to date on relevant recommendations; APRs; external examiner and/or external moderator reports; letters of support from employers, accrediting bodies or other institutions; graduate destination information, etc.).

⁹ See [Evidence for the Achievement of the Graduate Profile: Best Practice Guidelines](#).

10. The GYR Report

The GYR Report is a report prepared by the Convenor of the GYR Panel with input from fellow Panel Members. The Report is the outcome of the Panel's deliberations, and it builds on, verifies and summarises the content of the Self-Review Report and evidence provided in the supporting documentation.

The GYR Report is completed using the GYR Report Template (Appendix D) and with reference to the criteria that CUAP uses for assessing GYR Reports (Appendix A).

Format of the GYR Report

- Instructions for writing the GYR Report are included in the GYR Report Template (Appendix D)
- The GYR Template covers all the topics that comprise the CUAP criteria (Appendix A)
- The final Report, prepared by the Convenor, should be no more than four pages in length¹⁰ once the instructions are deleted from the Template. While the QAU Review Coordinator is responsible for formatting of the final Report, including deletion of the instructions, the Convenor is asked to keep this requirement in mind when drafting the Report
- Care should be taken when presenting data, so that no individual student is identified in any part of the Report
- The GYR coversheet should be filled in and attached to the GYR report. This coversheet will be removed when the report is submitted to CUAP

The Convenor is responsible for sending a near-final draft of the GYR Report, including the coversheet, to the Self-Review Coordinator for a fact check. Once the Convenor has finalised the Report, the completed document is forwarded to the QAU Reviews Manager who will submit the GYR Report (on behalf of the Panel) to the relevant Divisional Specialist, ACS for discussion at the August Divisional Board meeting.¹¹

Submission of the GYR Report to the Divisional Specialist, ACS concludes the formal role of the Review Panel in the GYR exercise.

¹⁰ Where a cluster of related programmes have been approved the GYR Report may cover all those programmes, and up to one extra page per programme is allowed in such cases.

¹¹ See Section 6 of this Handbook for an overview of the tasks and timeline for the next steps in the process.

Appendix A: CUAP Criteria for Assessing Graduating Year Review Reports

In assessing Graduating Year Review reports, the committee will use the criteria for programme approval set out in section 3 of the CUAP Handbook. Particular attention will be paid in this peer review process to approval criteria 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

The committee will be concerned mainly to verify that:

- a. it has on its files a full and up-to-date statement of the institution's own review, monitoring and evaluation procedures
- b. appropriate institutional review processes have been followed to an acceptable standard
- c. approval criteria 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 have been met satisfactorily, namely the adequacy of:
 - i. the title, aims, stated learning outcomes and coherence
 - ii. the acceptability of the programme and consultation
 - iii. regulations
 - iv. assessment and moderation
 - v. evaluation and review
- d. any concerns raised by CUAP at the point of approval, and any required changes, have been adequately addressed
- e. the University has provided an intention to continue or discontinue the programme.

Appendix B: Information for Discipline Specialists

Background

Graduating Year Review (GYR) is the final phase of the Committee on University Academic Programmes' (CUAP's) formal approval process. Universities are required to review all proposals involving the introduction of new qualifications and major subjects and endorsements comprising 40% or more of a qualification to assure CUAP that programmes are delivered to an acceptable standard.

The Role of the Discipline Specialist

The GYR Panel at the University of Otago consists of four members: Convenor, Divisional representative, Discipline Specialist and QAU Review Coordinator. The role of the Discipline Specialist is to provide the Panel with a perspective that is external to the programme; that can critically evaluate whether the programme is meeting its aims and objectives, and how it contributes to the discipline. This person should be familiar with the programme and the subject area under review (but not a contributor to the programme) and could be either a University of Otago staff member or an external Panel Member from another university (or profession) as appropriate. Where a programme is specific to a profession e.g. Physiotherapy, Social Work, Performing Arts, it may be beneficial to appoint a practitioner to the Panel.

The Review Process and Timeframe

Preparation involves reading the original proposal submitted to CUAP, the Self-Review Report, and supporting evidence. All documentation is usually available by 30 April.

The GYR Panel meets in May/June with the date and time to be confirmed by the QAU Review Coordinator. The GYR Panel meets on the University's Dunedin campus; videoconference is often used for those outside of Dunedin. The meeting may take up to two hours.

A four-page GYR Report is drafted by the Convenor and you will be asked to read and approve this. The Report must be completed by end of July for submission to Divisional Boards. It is then considered, possibly amended, and endorsed by relevant University Boards before submission to CUAP by 1 October.

Appendix C: Graduating Year Review Self-Review Template (2026)

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Current year | 2026 |
| Name of programme | e.g. Master of Higher Education |
| Identifier for the original proposal | e.g. 05.UO-13.MHEd |
| Name of Self-Review Coordinator and position held | |

1. Programme Statement

(a) Description

Provide a brief description of the programme structure and levels and its papers as approved by CUAP (include required or compulsory components, paper titles, credit points, NZQCF Level) and how it has been introduced and consolidated. Describe succinctly, but in sufficient detail, so that the Review Panel can understand the programme structure without reference to the original proposal, the Calendar or websites.

(b) Purpose

Set out the stated goals in the original proposal and provide a brief statement on the extent to which these goals have been achieved. Note: This section is intended to focus on the goals of the programme itself. The Graduate Profile and Learning Outcomes are better discussed in Section 3(a).

The 'goals' should be presented as a summary of the stated goals of the programme in the original proposal (that is, with reference to those described under the 'Justification and Relationship to Strategic Planning Goals' heading).

The 'extent to which the stated goals have been achieved' should be demonstrated by including examples of how each of the goals has been met (examples and other supporting material to be included as part of the Supporting Evidence, see Section 4 of this Template).

(c) Changes

Mention (and explain) any significant changes (from the original proposal) that have been made to the programme since approval, such as deletion of papers, introduction of new papers, changes to the programme structure, changes to regulations etc. Have any changes affected the goals of the programme? If there have been no changes, please make this clear. Changes to assessment may be described here or later in section 3(b). Any supporting information to be included as part of the Supporting Evidence (Section 4 of this template).

(d) Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Provide data and information showing how the programme is meeting its obligations to the University's commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi (as stated in the original proposal).

2. Review Processes

Provide a brief account of the internal evaluation (self-review) processes that have been applied (to monitor or review) this specific programme since its introduction. This could include student evaluations of papers (but don't give the results of the evaluations that belong in section 3(a), meetings with class representatives, annual programme reporting, programme meeting notes,

surveys, feedback to staff and consequential adjustments, other stakeholder feedback, any internal or external reviews etc. and references to available documentation.

Briefly describe how the GYR Self-Review was undertaken, including production of the GYR Self-Review Report and collation of the Supporting Evidence.

3. Review Outcomes

Summarise the outcomes of the review (internal evaluation) processes under the following headings:

(a) Adequacy and Appropriateness

Provide a statement of the ongoing adequacy and appropriateness of the title, aims, graduate outcomes, and coherence of the whole programme. If possible, indicate how these aspects benchmark against practice at other universities or within your discipline.

Provide a statement of the ongoing adequacy and appropriateness of the regulations for admission, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning, structure, integration of practical/work-based components and progression within the programme of study.

(b) Acceptability

Provide a statement of the ongoing acceptability of the programme to the relevant academic, student, industrial and professional communities. Include supporting examples e.g. letters from academic colleagues, employers, relevant surveys, etc.) as Supporting Evidence (see Section 4 of this template). If the evidence is anecdotal only and therefore not documented, say so.

Provide a statement about student feedback on the acceptability/appropriateness of the programme, and, include any documentary evidence on graduate destinations, subsequent jobs or enrolment in further qualifications as Supporting Evidence (Section 4). Note: CUAP consider student feedback as an important component.

Provide evidence that the Graduate Profile is being achieved.¹² Explain how the Graduate Attributes (as in the original proposal plus any subsequent or intended amendments) have been achieved and comment on whether the graduate attributes are being met fully or partially – include supporting examples/documents as Supporting Evidence (Section 4). Similarly, provide evidence that the stated learning outcomes of the papers comprising the programme have been achieved and are acceptable (include this as part of Supporting Evidence, Section 4).

If applicable, comment on how any concerns raised by CUAP at the point of approval have been addressed (this refers only to a formal instruction from CUAP at the point of approval and is very rare).

(c) Assessment procedures and student performance

Provide a statement on the ongoing appropriateness of methods of assessment including any procedures for external assessment or moderation. Provide a summary of the assessment procedures that are being used currently (type: internal (formative and summative); final exams (give balance/weighting); external examiners or moderators for 400-level and above). Explain any changes to assessment procedures from those in the original proposal (if not already covered in Section 1(c)). Data and details should be included in Section 4 as Supporting Evidence.

¹² For helpful advice, refer to the document [Evidence for the Achievement of the Graduate Profile: Best Practice Guidelines](#) on the University website.

Comment on the overall student achievement in the programme (e.g. key papers). Provide data and a short commentary on recent student performance noting relativity with previous years, assessment feedback given to students (and their evaluation of that feedback) and comments from external examiners/moderators. Data and details should be included in Section 4 Supporting Evidence.

(d) Data

Provide information on student numbers actually enrolling and completing. This should be provided in an easily interpreted format with a commentary. Use the data supplied by the Strategy, Analytics and Reporting Office (cut and paste is fine but delete the coding numbers of 1, 2 etc. from column headings) and provide a brief commentary on any anomalies or trends and likely reasons. Note: the University reports against the original student numbers predicted. If departmental/programme records differ from the Strategy, Analytics and Reporting Office's data, state this and provide documentary evidence of the conflicting data in Section 4 Supporting Evidence.

| Cohort [1] | Year 1 20XX | Year 2 20XX | Year 3 20XX | Year 4 20XX | Year 5 20XX | Year 6 20XX | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| Enrolment numbers | | | | | | | |
| Total initial enrolment (head count) | | | | | | | |
| Full-time/Part-time (%) | | | | | | | |
| Demographic information [2] | | | | | | | |
| Progress at time of review (head count and % of initial intake) [3] | | | | | | | |
| Completion of qualification | | | | | | | |
| Withdrawn (including shift to other quals) | | | | | | | |
| Currently enrolled | | | | | | | |
| Completion % | | | | | | | |
| Completion % | | | | | | | |

[1] A cohort refers to the group of students enrolling at any point in a specific academic year. Columns to be added for the appropriate number of years.

[2] Where relevant to the goals of the programme the demographic data (by headcount) may include, for example, enrolments by Māori and Pacific, international and domestic, other ethnicities, gender groups, international. Rows to be added as needed.

[3] Include completion and withdrawal data by demographic group where appropriate.

(e) External Reviews

Provide a statement about any other reviews of the programme. If the programme has been subject to any external reviews e.g. by professional or accreditation bodies, include, where relevant, a statement of intention, or revisions, to address any recommendations identified in an external review. Report any relevant review recommendations and progress on these recommendations – include a copy of the relevant review with key sections highlighted in Section 4 Supporting Evidence.

(f) Summary Statement

Provide a summary evaluation of the overall effectiveness and value of the programme from your point of view. This is your opportunity to state how you see the strengths, weaknesses, and future of the programme.

State when the programme is intended to be next reviewed (include both internal and external reviews, if appropriate).

Provide a statement on whether or not the programme should continue or be discontinued. Describe any changes or actions that are necessary to improve the performance of the programme if it is to be continued.

Note: The GYR Panel and the PVC, Academic Committee may reach a different conclusion as to whether the programme should be continued or discontinued.

4. Supporting Evidence

*Please submit this Report and copies of all the supporting evidence to the GYR Administrator in the Quality Advancement Unit (QAU) by **30 April**.*

Please ensure that the supporting evidence can be readily linked to the relevant sections of the Self-Review Report, and if a piece of evidence (such as a survey or review report) supports more than one section make this clear.

For further information, refer to Section 8 of the 'University of Otago Graduating Year Review (GYR) Handbook'.

If you have any queries about this aspect of the Self-Review, please contact one of the QAU Review Coordinators:

Dr Megan (Meg) Gollop 027 445 5474 megan.gollop@otago.ac.nz

Juliet Anderson: 021 279 0166, juliet.anderson@otago.ac.nz

Appendix D:**University of Otago Graduating Year Review (GYR) Report 2026
(report should not be more than four pages)**

| | |
|--|--|
| Current year: | |
| Name of programme: | |
| Identifier for original proposal (e.g. MU13-BBS/R2): | |
| Name and position of independent GYR Convenor: | |
| Name of other Panel Members and position held: | |

1. Programme statement:

- a. Description:** Provide a brief description of the programme structure (include required or compulsory components and credit points) and NZQCF levels as approved by CUAP, and how it has been introduced and consolidated.

Note: if the programme has been or is to be discontinued summarise the key reasons for this decision.

- b. Purpose:** Set out the stated goals from the original proposal and provide a brief statement on the extent to which these have been achieved.
- c. Changes:** Describe any significant changes that have been made to the programme since approval, including specification of any changes to regulations.
- d. Te Tiriti o Waitangi:** Provide a brief reflection on the extent to the programme meets the university's commitment to te Tiriti o Waitangi, as stated in the original proposal.

2. Review processes:

Provide a brief overview of GYR processes as they are applied in the university. If more than one GYR is being submitted, this overview may be provided as a covering statement. Provide a brief account of the GYR processes that have been applied to this specific programme. (Criterion b)

3. Review outcomes:

Summarise the outcomes of the review processes under the following headings:

- a. Adequacy and Appropriateness:** Provide a statement of the ongoing adequacy and appropriateness of the:
- i. Title, aims, graduate outcomes and coherence of the whole programme. (Criterion c.i)
 - ii. Regulations for admission, credit for previous study, recognition of prior learning, structure, integration of practical/work-based components and progression within the programme of study. (Criterion c.iii)
- b. Acceptability:** Provide a statement of the ongoing acceptability of the programme to the relevant academic, student, industrial and professional communities. (Criterion c.ii)

Include a statement on:

- i. how student feedback is sought and responded to with specific regard to the programme.
- ii. whether the graduate profile is being achieved and the evidence for this assessment (for example curriculum mapping, graduate destination or opinion surveys, employer feedback).

If applicable, comment on how any concerns raised by CUAP at the point of approval have been addressed. (Criterion d)

c. Assessment procedures and student performance:

- i. Provide a statement on the ongoing appropriateness of methods of assessment, including (if relevant) any procedures for external assessment and/or moderation. (Criterion c.iv).
- ii. Provide a statement on the overall achievement of students in the programme, for example through grade distribution.

d. Data: Provide information on student numbers enrolling and completing. Provide commentary on:

- i. The extent to which the enrolment numbers (and, where relevant, the enrolment numbers of particular student groups) reflect the original goals of the programme. Any salient issues of quality assurance related to the demographics of the students enrolling and completing.
- ii. Whether reasons have been established for any unexpected numbers in enrolments, completions or withdrawals. (Include data and definitions as required).

| <i>Cohort [1]</i> | Year 1 20XX | Year 2 20XX | Year 3 20XX | Year 4 20XX | Year 5 20XX | Year 6 20XX | |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| <i>Enrolment numbers</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Total initial enrolment (head count)</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Full-time/Part-time (%)</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Demographic information [2]</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Progress at time of review (head count and % of initial intake) [3]</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Completion of qualification</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Withdrawn (including shift to other quals)</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Currently enrolled</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Completion %</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Completion %</i> | | | | | | | |

[1] A cohort refers to the group of students enrolling at any point in a specific academic year. Columns to be added for the appropriate number of years.

[2] Where relevant to the goals of the programme the demographic data (by headcount) may include, for example, enrolments by Māori and Pacific, international and domestic, other ethnicities, gender groups, international. Rows to be added as needed.

[3] Include completion and withdrawal data by demographic group where appropriate.

e. External reviews:

If the programme has been subject to any external reviews e.g. academic reviews or by professional or accreditation bodies, include, where relevant, a statement of intention, or revisions, to address any recommendations identified in an external review. (Criterion c.ii)

f. Summary statement

- i. Provide a summary evaluation of the outcomes of the GYR review panel, including the decision on continuation, and a summary of actions that are being put in place to address any recommendations identified by the GYR panel and that support the continuation of the programme. (Criterion c.v)
- ii. Provide a date when the programme will next be reviewed. (Criteria a and b)

Appendix E: University of Otago Internal Reviews: Payment Policy

Introduction

The programme of internal reviews forms the basis of the University of Otago's quality assurance framework. The University is committed to the transparency of the processes surrounding the reviews and wishes to recognise formally the work of Convenors and Secretaries of Review Panels and Panel members.

Objective

This policy has been developed to provide a framework for the recognition of the expertise provided by review panel members through an appropriate scale of remuneration across the University.

Levels of Remuneration

Internal Otago Staff Members (excluding review secretary)

The University recognises the work undertaken by staff who serve on review panels through the Academic Promotion and Progression criteria for academic staff and the Performance Development Review for general staff, so there is no remuneration.

Staff Members of Other Tertiary Institutions

Service on a review panel by staff members of other tertiary institutions is generally recognised by their home institution, and therefore there is no remuneration.

University of Otago Graduates enrolled at another tertiary institution¹³

For graduate panel members who are enrolled at another tertiary institution the University of Otago provides an honorarium of \$2000.

Retired Staff from Otago and Other Tertiary Institutions

The University of Otago recognises that the expertise of retired staff members can make a valuable contribution to the reviews process. Retired staff will be paid an honorarium of \$2000 for panel members and \$5000 for panel convenors for a standard three day review; panel convenors will receive an additional \$1000 per day for reviews that exceed three days.

Panel Members from Outside Tertiary Education

For panel members from outside Tertiary Education, including former students, the University of Otago provides an honorarium of \$2000.

Review Secretaries

¹³ For Otago postgraduates your role is seen as Professional development, therefore there is no remuneration.

- You will be working with specialists in your field from New Zealand and overseas and you will have excellent networking opportunities.
- You will be able to include in your CV the fact that you have participated in a formal University committee.
- Being a review panel member is an excellent opportunity for you to find out more about the University and how it works.

The University of Otago recognises that review secretaries provide invaluable support to convenors and other panel members. Staff who take on this role in addition to other employment within the University are provided with a one-off payment of \$750 for each full review they undertake.

Review secretaries are not eligible for time off in lieu or overtime for the work of the review. (This section does not apply to the permanent review secretaries within the Quality Advancement Unit.)

Graduating Year Reviews

For Graduating Year Reviews (GYRs) the levels of remuneration are as detailed above. However, as the amount of work is less than in a full review, the honorarium for retired staff acting as panel members is \$250 per GYR and for retired staff acting as convenors is \$500 per GYR. External discipline specialists will be paid an honorarium of \$250 for each GYR.

Process and Taxing of Remuneration

Remuneration of panel members and secretaries is managed and administered by the Quality Advancement Unit. Like all review expenses, this remuneration is funded by the Divisions.* Payment to convenors and panel members is via the “Schedular Payment Request form” and payment to secretaries is via the “Review Secretary Payment Recommendation Form”. All reviews remuneration is subject to tax: honoraria are schedular payments subject to withholding tax and review secretary remuneration is subject to PAYE. NZ payees must submit (or have on file with Payroll Services) an IR330 Tax Code Declaration. Questions regarding remuneration should be directed to the Quality Advancement Unit.

Variations

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) may, in exceptional circumstances, approve a payment arrangement which does not comply with this policy.

* Some exceptions apply.