WORKFLOW FOR PROPOSALS FOR NEW MAJOR SUBJECTS, QUALIFICATIONS, ENDORSEMENTS OR NEW MINORS WHERE THERE IS NO EXISTING MAJOR

Indicative Proposal (Form 1S)

- Development and consultation with Department/School/Faculty and Division; and other departments and Divisions. Request Strategic Assessment from Planning and Funding* and develop a Business Plan or Sustainability Statement* (if required).

- Submit to Division – attach Strategic Assessment* and Business Plan or Sustainability Statement* (if required)

- Once approved, Division submits proposal to BUGS or BoGS (with Strategic Assessment)

- Once approved by BUGS/BoGS and DVCs/PVCs’ Advisory Group– the Form 1 can now be developed

Form 1 – Developed Proposal

- Final development and consultation with internal and external stakeholders

- Submit to Division – attach Strategic Assessment (updated if required), Business Plan or Sustainability statement, and evidence of consultation and support

- Once approved, Division submits proposal to BUGS or BoGS

- Once approved at BUGS / BoGS, approved proposal is recommended to Senate

- Once approved, Senate recommends approval to the University Council

- Once approved by the University Council, proposal is submitted to CUAP

* A “Strategic Assessment” is obtained from the Planning and Funding Office. A Business Plan or Sustainability Statement may be required by your Division (see page 3).

For timeframes, please refer to page 5.
CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT – THE INDICATIVE PROPOSAL (FORM 1S)

1. If you are considering developing a new major subject, qualification, endorsement or new minor where there is no existing major, you need to outline your proposal formally on the Form 1S. The full set of Proposal Forms or “Proformas” and their guiding notes, in particular the Form 1S and Form 1 Important Notes document, is found on the Proformas for New Proposals web page.

2. The first step is to formulate clearly the idea you are proposing so you can provide enough detail on the forms and during the consultation. A one-page summary document is recommended for preliminary consultation. Preliminary discussion should occur within your Department and School/Faculty to ensure there is broad support from your internal colleagues and within your Academic Division. Key things to consider during the concept phase include:

- How would this proposal benefit the Department/School/Faculty?
- Are there any opportunities for collaboration with other staff, departments or Divisions?
- Would this proposal be duplicating content covered in other papers or qualifications offered at University of Otago?
- Does your Department/School/Faculty have the resources and demand to sustain this? (Your Division may require a Business Plan or “Sustainability Statement”).

3. Please consult your Specialist, Academic Committees and Services or Associate Deans (Humanities, Sciences, Health Sciences, or Commerce) to ensure you fulfil your Division’s requirements. Please also view the University of Otago’s Strategic Direction to 2020. Health Sciences staff should refer to their Division’s Academic Administration Information. New ideas need to show clearly how they align with the strategic direction of the Department, School/Faculty, Division and the wider University.

4. The strategic alignment section should also provide a brief analysis of national/international demand to show how the proposed initiative will make a unique contribution within New Zealand’s tertiary sector.

5. It may pay to consider at this point how the proposed paper(s) or qualification fulfils the University of Otago’s commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi (see Form 1S and Form 1 Important Notes). The Form 1 will ask for comment in this regard. Do you need to undertake consultation with the Office of Maori Development or Iwi? Or is your proposal “neutral” and relies on the background context of the University’s overall commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi?

6. It is important to seek feedback from all relevant internal and external stakeholders who may be impacted by your proposal, within and outside of your own area. When consulting, key considerations should include:

- Does the idea fit within your Department, School of Faculty and the Divisional Strategic Plans?
- Is there already similar paper(s) or qualification(s) being taught within the School/Faculty, or elsewhere within the Division or University?
- What resourcing will be required to develop and deliver the new paper(s), endorsement or qualification?
- What are the key benefits to the Division and/or profession?
- What are potential barriers to success?
- What activities, if any, will be reduced as a result of this new initiative (e.g. would this just shift EFTS from one area to another)?
- Comments from key stakeholders such as professional organisations, regulatory bodies, government and health agencies, criteria set out by external funding agencies, along with alignment with any internal University strategy. Please request formal letters from external agencies in particular professional and regulatory organisations, joint partners etc, to attach to the proposal.
Key people to consult include:

- [ ] Head of Department/Dean
- [ ] Department Financial Manager/Administrator
- [ ] Undergraduate or Postgraduate Associate Dean
- [ ] Undergraduate or Postgraduate Curriculum or Research Committees
- [ ] Divisional Associate Dean (Academic) or Divisional Associate Dean (Postgraduate) (strategic alignment)
- [ ] Specialist, Academic Committees and Services (process)
- [ ] Planning and Funding Office (funding implications and Strategic Assessment)
- [ ] Student Management Systems Support Office (formerly the Academic Services Project Office), for potential impact on the Student Management System (eVision)
- [ ] Professional associations, health boards, community organisations and other relevant external stakeholders.

7. Before your Indicative Proposal Form is submitted to your Division for formal approval, you must contact the Planning and Funding Office to obtain a Strategic Assessment. Please discuss the timing of this step with your Specialist, Academic Committees and Services. Please do not ask for the Strategic Assessment before your Indicative Proposal Form is finalised. Any suggestions for amendments arising from comments in the Strategic Assessment should be included in the full proposal (Form 1). For more information please read the Form 1S and Form 1 Important Notes document found on the Proformas’ web page listed at item 1.

8. All proposal forms need to be approved by your Department (and where applicable, Dean) before proceeding for consideration by the Division.

9. Before submitting your Indicative Proposal to the Divisional Board for approval, please attach:
   - [ ] your Business Plan or Sustainability Statement (and/or whatever is required by your Division),
   - [ ] the Strategic Assessment from the Planning and Funding office, and
   - [ ] evidence of consultation.

   The preferred format is a table outlining who was consulted, the issues raised, and the changes that resulted. Please see the Consultation Record template (Under Forms for Academic Proposals).

Approval from Boards of Undergraduate Studies (BUGS) or Board of Graduate Studies (BoGS)

10. Once approved by the Division, the proposal is submitted to BUGS or BoGS. In addition, the proposal is considered by the DVCs/PVCs’ Advisory Group. Approval may or may not be given to go to the next stage of developing the full proposal (Form 1).

   Staff who are responsible for the Indicative Proposal need to be prepared to be available to attend Divisional, BUGS or BoGs meetings.

DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF THE FORM 1

1. The Form 1 contains more detail, and includes the requirements of the Committee on University Academic Proposals (CUAP), the external approving body. Please refer to the current CUAP Handbook for more information. At each step of the Indicative Proposal (Form 1S) process, feedback may have been provided and will need to be addressed when developing the full proposal (Form 1). The revisions requested may be quite extensive and could involve additional consultation which should be added to the consultation table.

2. The Form 1 should be provided for consultation to your identified internal and external stakeholders. Letters from key stakeholders are required by CUAP.
Approval from the Division and BUGS/BoGS

3. All proposal forms need to be approved by your Department/School/Faculty (as required) before proceeding for consideration by the Division. Once approved by the Division, the proposal is submitted to either BUGS or BoGS. Please note the Strategic Assessment from the Planning & Funding Office and the Business Plan or Sustainability Assessment or equivalent required by each Division for the Indicative Proposal is NOT required to accompany the Form 1.

It is important to consider the tight timeframes for revision of proposals in between Divisional Boards and BUGS and BoGs, and then Senate and CUAP deadlines. Staff who are responsible for the full proposal (Form 1) need to be prepared to be available to attend meetings and work on revisions as required.

Approval from Senate, Council and CUAP

4. Following detailed consideration and review by BUGS and BoGS, the proposal is recommended for approval at Senate.

5. Senate then recommends that the University Council approve the proposal.

6. All proposals for new programmes, qualifications, major subjects, minor subjects where there is no existing major, and significant amendments to regulations (refer to the CUAP Handbook for guidance) must proceed to CUAP for approval. There are two meetings each year, in July and November. The CUAP process involves an intense period of peer review and correspondence with reviewers at the other eight New Zealand Universities (see detail on page 5).

7. Following “Conditional approval” by CUAP, the Tertiary Education Commission then gives final funding approval.

8. The new programme will be included in the University Calendar and will normally be offered to students in the following year. However proposals considered in CUAP’s November round will not be able to be published in the Guide to Enrolment or University Calendar for the next year. Any advertising of the new programme cannot occur until after CUAP approval, unless it is accompanied by the clause "Subject to CUAP approval".

Note: Proposals for new papers do not normally require CUAP approval, unless they are submitted as part of a new programme.

9. New programmes are then subject to a Graduating Year Review (GYR) within three years after the first cohort of students complete the course. Only after a successful GYR can the new programme be considered fully approved. It is important that a monitoring group be established for the new programme as early as possible to start gathering data from course and paper evaluations, feedback from examination boards and external examiners, graduate opinion surveys and so on from the first year the programme is offered. An Annual Programme Report is required each year (reporting to the Division and BUGS/BoGS), up until the GYR. CUAP sends notification of which new programmes are due to have their GYR each year. The Review process is coordinated by both Academic Committees and Services and the Quality Advancement Unit in conjunction with the Division.
WHAT HAPPENS AT CUAP?

Timeframes

Introducing a new programme is much more time consuming than most staff realise. There are only two meetings each year when CUAP considers proposals for new qualifications, new major subjects, endorsements, or minors where a major doesn’t exist.

The closing dates for receipt of proposals at CUAP are 1 May and 1 August. However, a proposal can only be submitted to CUAP once it has been approved by the University’s internal processes (BUGS/BoGS then Senate etc) and is submitted via the Academic Committees Office.

Ideally, proposals should be considered in the first CUAP round in order to meet the deadlines for the Guide to Enrolment, the Calendar and to be entered into eVision. Proposals for the second round may not be in enrolment or publicity material for the following year and should be tagged with the qualifying statement “subject to CUAP approval”.

Form 1 proposals should therefore, ideally, be going to the November Divisional Board two years prior to the intended introduction of the programme (i.e. November 2017 for introduction in 2019) in order to allow time for any necessary changes to the proposal.

The March Divisional Board is the absolute deadline for CUAP Round One proposals and June Divisional Board for CUAP Round Two proposals. Round 1 ends with a CUAP meeting in mid July. Round Two ends with a CUAP meeting in November. Please remember that CUAP approval at this point is only Conditional Approval, conditional on a successful Graduating Year Review (GYR) being completed within three years of the first cohort of graduates from the programme.

The dates and deadlines for BUGS and BoGS meetings are found on the website at:
http://www.otago.ac.nz/council/committees/committees/BUGS.html and
http://www.otago.ac.nz/council/committees/committees/BOGS.html

The Peer Review/correspondence round

Just before the beginning of each round, all University of Otago proposals are uploaded into the CUAP online database by Academic Committees and Services. Each university has an administrator who provides proposals to peer reviewers at their university and then facilitates the flow of comments and responses between peer reviewers and proposers (the departments proposing the new programme).

Comments from the peer reviewers are emailed to Academic Committees and Services, which forwards these comments to proposers and asks for a response. A response could include providing additional documentation, additional background information or justification, answering questions and agreeing to make revisions or corrections if required. The responses from Otago proposers are uploaded to the database and this is sent back to the peer reviewer. It is in our interests to respond as quickly as possible to comments from reviewers.

If the peer reviewer is satisfied with the response, their university will sign off the proposal. Otherwise further questions can be asked until the peer reviewer is satisfied with the information provided and agrees to sign off. If the peer reviewer remains unsatisfied, their university can flag the proposal for discussion at the CUAP meeting. This means that the University of Otago representative to CUAP (currently Associate Professor Tim Cooper) must defend the Otago proposal at the CUAP meeting. In this case, Tim will need additional support and resources from the proposing department to mount a defence at the meeting.
Comments and responses between a peer reviewer and the proposer are visible only to the two universities involved for a certain period of time. Following the deadline for first comments, all comments and responses become visible to all universities.

If all the universities sign off your proposal it is considered approved, and CUAP provides “Conditional approval” and notifies the Tertiary Education Commission. If issues have not been resolved, the proposal is flagged for discussion at the CUAP meeting. Academic Committees and Services keep proposers informed.

A proposal is not fully approved until it a successful Graduating Year Review (GYR) is approved by CUAP (scheduled within three year’s of the first cohort of graduates).