MITU ACADEMIC WORKPLAN 2026 – OPEN SESSION

Last updated 2026-08-27

The purpose of the Workplan is to identify the meetings at which expected items are due.
It is not the intention of the Workplan to prevent additional items from being submitted to the Chair for inclusion in AC Agenda.

Month	Standing Items	Annual Items
January	–	• Note AC ToR (via Council) • Note Standing Orders (via Council)) • Approve Subcommittees ToR
February	–	• Review 2025 Committee Attendance Reports • Policy Approvals
March	• Subcommittee Reports	• Confirmation of nominated members to AC and Subcommittees • Note list of Programmes and Qualifications for 2026 and Annual Programme Closures (Report to Council) • Approve Academic Committee Handbook (via Chair) • Review EPI (2025 draft from Dec SDR) (Report to Council) [STATUTORY REQUIREMENT]
April	• Subcommittee Reports	• Approve nominated members to AC and Subcommittees • Review of Literacy and Numeracy TEC compliance (2025) (via AQC) • Review of Consistency Report (2025) (via AQC)
May	• Subcommittee Reports	• Receive Pastoral Care Code Close-Out Report (Report to Council) [STATUTORY REQUIREMENT] • Approve Programme Committee memberships (via AQC) • Approve Programme Advisory Group memberships (via PAOC) • Receive PER/MER Summary Reports (2025) (via AQC) – **(DEFERRED to Sep)**

June	• Subcommittee Reports	-
July	• Subcommittee Reports	• Approve EPICs (2027) (via DCEA & DCELES)
August	• Subcommittee Reports	-
September	• Subcommittee Reports	• Receive PER/MER Summary Reports (2025) (via AQC)
October	• Subcommittee Reports	• Receive and consider Teaching Excellence Standards Annual Report (via LTC)
November	• Subcommittee Reports	• Approve 2027 Meeting Schedule for AC • Review Academic Committee Handbook
December	• Subcommittee Reports	• Approve 2027 Meeting Schedule for AC Subcommittees • Review 2027 AC Workplan (via DCEA)

Institutional and Operational Plans (Academic & Research) – to be incorporated once planning framework and Council direction confirmed.

It is proposed that the following legacy reports be discontinued in 2026 (at least until reviewed):

- Priority Group Reporting (replaced with revised EPI reporting)
- MIT Academic Centre Annual Report
- MIT Student Experience & Success Annual Report
- Programme Evaluative Review Institute Key Findings and Patterns (replaced with revised PER/ER reports)
- Pastoral Code Report (replaced with iQAF submission)

Academic Committee | MIT & Unitec
OPEN Meeting MINUTES

Date: 6 October 2026
Time: 1:00pm
Venue: Ōtara Campus ND317 and MS Teams

1 Whakatuwheratanga | Opening

Kia tūturu tātou *(Let's be real)*
Kia manaaki tātou *(Let's be caring)*
Kia whai hiranga tātou *(Let's pursue excellence)*
Kia tūhonohono tātou *(Let's connect)*

Whano! Whano!
Haramai te toki!
Haumi ē!
Hui ē!
Taiki ē!

Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed Doana Fatuleai to the Academic Committee following her commencement as Director, Pacific Success, noting that her role as Chair of the Pacific Academic Advisory Committee (PAAC) also made her an ex officio member of the Academic Committee. The Chair emphasised the importance of the Pacific Success portfolio in advancing equity and encouraged her to contribute her perspective and expertise to the Committee's discussions.

Doana Fatuleai introduced herself and acknowledged the opportunity to contribute to the Committee. She outlined her background in nursing and nursing education, highlighting her commitment to equity and her advocacy for Pacific learners.

Attendance and Apologies

Members:	Position	Present	Apology	Absent	Proxy
Martin Carroll	Chair	✓			
Christina Hong	Member	arrived at 1.55pm			
Annette Pitovao	Member	✓			
Chris King	Member	✓			
Chris Park	Member	✓			
Doana Fatuleai	Member	✓			
Eric Boamah	Member		✓		
Jeff Howe	Member	✓			
Julie Prentice	Member		✓		
Kylie Smith	Member	✓			
Peter McPherson	Member		✓		
Pip Schollum-Manase	Member	✓			
Rosanne Ellis	Member	✓			
Simon Nash	Member	✓			
Simon Tries	Member	✓			
Viv Merito	Member	✓			
Wiremu Manaia	Member			✓	

Members:	Position	Present	Apology	Absent	Proxy
Terina Haimona	Student Representative	arrived at 1.43pm			
Thao Nguyen	Student Representative		✓		

In attendance:
Juee Jin (Secretary) Sharon Brownie Aiono Manu Fa'aea

RESOLVED:
That the apologies from Eric Boamah, Julie Prentice and Peter McPherson be accepted and late arrival from Christina Hong and Terina Haimona be noted.

Moved: Martin Carroll
Seconded: Pip Schollum-Manase
CARRIED

The Chair received all apologies and declared the meeting quorate.

2 Resolution to exclude the public

Martin Carroll.

It will be moved by the Chair that the public be excluded from the following parts of the meeting. This resolution will be made in reliance on section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) (noting the Committee is subject to Part 7 of the LGOIMA) and the particular interests protected by section 9 of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA) which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant parts of the proceedings of the meeting in public. The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded and the reasons for passing the resolution in relation to each matter are as follows:

Closed Item	Session Item: General subject of each matter	Section(s) relied upon
2.0	Chairperson's Report	s9(2)(b)(ii), s9(2)(i) OIA
2.1	REC Report	s9(2)(a), s9(2)(i) OIA
2.2	Closed Academic Committee Meeting Minutes	s9(2)(b)(ii), s9(2)(i) OIA
2.3	Closed Academic Committee Work plan	s9(2)(b)(ii), s9(2)(i) OIA
2.4	Closed Action Register	s9(2)(b)(ii), s9(2)(i) OIA
2.5	Approval of Graduand Lists (MIT)	s9(2)(a)
2.6	Approval of Graduand Lists (Unitec)	s9(2)(a)
2.7	AAC Report	s9(2)(b)(ii)
2.8	AQC Report	s9(2)(b)(ii)
2.9	LTC Report	s9(2)(b)(ii)

Interests Protected

Section	Interest
s9(2)(a)	To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons.
s9(2)(b)(ii) OIA	To protect information where release would be likely to unreasonably prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or is the subject of the information.

s9(2)(i) OIA	To enable the organisation to carry out its activities without prejudice or disadvantage.

RESOLVED:
That the Committee exclude the public and move into closed session.

Moved: Martin Carroll
Seconded: Chris Park
CARRIED

3 Closed Session

The Meeting moved into Closed Session at 1.04 pm.

4 Return to Open Session

The Committee resumed in open session at 1.56 pm.

5 Confirmation of Resolutions from Closed Session

Martin Carroll.

RESOLVED:
That the Academic Committee confirm the following resolutions made in closed session:

Moved: Martin Carroll
Seconded: Pip Schollum-Manase
CARRIED

5.0 Receive Chairperson's update.
5.1 Receive the Research Ethics Committee report.
5.2 Confirm the Minutes of the closed portion of Academic Committee meeting minutes as a true and correct record.
5.3 Receive the Academic Committee Work Plan.
5.4 Receive the Closed Action Register.
5.5 Approve the list of graduands (MIT) as detailed in the paper.
5.6 Approve the list of graduands (Unitec) as detailed in the paper.
5.7 Receive the Academic Approvals Committee report.
5.8 Receive the Academic Quality Committee report.

6.0 Work Plan

The Committee noted the Work Plan.

6.1 Previous Minutes

RESOLVED:
That the Academic Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2026 as a true and correct record.

Moved: Rosanne Ellis
Seconded: Jeff Howe
CARRIED

6.2 Action Register

a. Development of Learner Experience KPIs on Complaints and Appeals

The development of KPIs relating to concerns, complaints, and appeals be undertaken collaboratively by the DCE Learner Experience and Success, the Director People and Culture, and the DCE Academic. The work will focus on measures of student satisfaction, staff development, and effective management of complaints, rather than numerical reduction targets.

Discussion on 2026-06-03:
A draft KPI framework for Student Concerns, Complaints and Appeals was presented to the Committee. The Committee generally supported the proposed approach and provided feedback, including consideration of measures relating to external escalations and opportunities for targeted feedback from participants in the process.

Further consultation with Student Council and other relevant stakeholders would be undertaken, and a revised KPI framework would be presented to a future meeting for consideration.

Discussion on 2026-08-05:
Progress was noted on consultation with Student Councils regarding the proposed learner experience KPIs for concerns, complaints and appeals.

Discussion on 2026-09-02:
The action was carried forward to the next meeting pending further engagement with the Student Councils. A meeting was scheduled for the following Monday, after which the action was expected to be finalised.

Discussion on 2026-10-06:

Following consultation with the student councils, which resulted in no recommended changes, the Committee confirmed the proposed learner experience KPIs for implementation. Ongoing engagement with the student councils will support their involvement in analysing the findings and informing subsequent responses.

Status: The action was closed.

b. AAC membership nominations

One nomination from the Māori Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC) Chair remained outstanding. The MAAC Chair to provide the nomination for the vacant position.

The nomination was included under agenda item 7.5, the action was closed.

c. MAAC ToR Development

Wiremu Manaia and Viv Merito to undertake further consultation with relevant Academic Committee subcommittee chairs regarding the proposed MAAC Terms of Reference amendments, and report back to Academic Committee with revised recommendations.

Discussion on 2026-07-01:
Further consultation is being undertaken following a request from the Māori Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC) for additional time. The proposed Terms of Reference amendment will be brought back to Academic Committee once that consultation has concluded.

The action was carried forward to the next meeting, with the revised proposal to be submitted for consideration.

Discussion on 2026-10-06:

The proposed changes to the MAAC Terms of Reference were not accepted onto the agenda, as a current version showing the proposed amendments in track changes was required to support informed consideration. The revised document was expected to be available for the November meeting.

It was suggested that MAAC seek wider institutional feedback on the draft Terms of Reference before resubmitting them.

d. NZQA Kaupapa Māori Programme Approval Approach – Institutional Response

Wiremu Manaia, Viv Merito, Chris Park and Simon Tries to consider the proposed NZQA approach to approving Kaupapa Māori programme applications and explore the opportunity for the institution to make a submission.

Discussion on 2026-10-06:

The Committee noted that engagement with NZQA had established a potential opportunity for MIT and Unitec to contribute to the development of the kaupapa Māori programme approval approach. Further advice on the opportunity and potential alignment with Te Mana Akoranga was awaited.

The action was closed, with Viv Merito to report back as opportunities for further engagement with NZQA progress.

7 General Business

7.1 Chairperson's Report

Presenter: Martin Carroll

The Chair conveyed Council's request for the Academic Committee to consider opportunities to improve its effectiveness and efficiency, including its size, agenda complexity and meeting duration, as part of the forthcoming review of the academic governance structure.

The Committee discussed bringing forward the planned end-of-year governance survey to inform the review. The survey would provide an opportunity to reflect on the Committee's operation, including its Terms of Reference, membership and oversight of academic governance. Members were invited to contribute feedback through the survey or by email.

7.2 Correspondence

INWARDS

Attachments:

a. To: Academic Committee
From: NZQA
Date: 21 September 2026
Subject: Notification of programme monitoring activity for Manukau Institute of Technology And Unitec – Unitec (MoE: 6004) (p. 2-8)

b. To: Academic Committee
From: NZQA
Date: 24 September 2026
Subject: Skill standards transition letter from NZQA and Industry Skills Boards (pp. 9-10)

The Committee discussed the implications of new skill standards for programme approval, nested qualifications, staff qualification requirements and professional development. While existing processes were considered adequate for identifying new standards and notifying relevant programme leaders, the discussion highlighted the need to ensure that applicable standards were addressed through programme approval and that the associated staff qualification and capability requirements could be met and monitored.

The potential for embedding vocational certificates and diplomas within degree programmes was also discussed, including the associated administrative implications. Further discussion with NZQA was identified as necessary to clarify these implications, informed by examples of current practice.

ACTIONS:
1. Programme Approval: Ensure the AAC approvals process addresses relevant skill standards in nested programmes, type 2 changes and new programme proposals.
2. Academic professional development: Ensure the academic professional development strategy explicitly address staff qualification and training requirements arising from new skill standards.
3. Staff qualification monitoring: People and Culture to confirm whether the new HRMIS can record specific staff qualifications and credentials required for programme delivery and support aggregate reporting, rather than relying solely on free- text fields.

c. To: Academic Committee
From: NZQA
Date: 10 September 2026
Subject: NZQA – Further Update to Research Section of Draft Degree Guidelines (pp. 11-15)
* The Committee received further correspondence from NZQA, including an updated Research section of the draft Degree Guidelines, provided for information following the Committee's earlier request.

OUTWARDS
Attachments:

d. To: qafredesign@nzqa.govt.nz
From: Simon Tries
Date: 7 September 2026
Subject: Transfer of MC ownership (Pg.16-25)

e. To: NZQA
From: Martin Carroll
Date: 8 September 2026
Subject: Submission from MIT and Unitec re: TES Monitoring Framework – Final (pp. 26-29)

f. From: NZQA
Date: 1 October 2026
Subject: Quality Times - He Kounga Kōrero - Updates for Tertiary Education Organisations (pp. 30-36)

RESOLVED:
That the Academic Committee receive the correspondence.

Moved: Simon Tries
Seconded: Annette Pitovao
CARRIED

7.3 Subcommittee Membership Nominations

Presenter: Martin Carroll

RESOLVED:
That the Academic Committee approve the proposed subcommittee nominations as set out in the paper.

Moved: Chris Park
Seconded: Simon Tries
CARRIED

7.4 **DAAC Feedback on EPI Analysis**
Presenter: Annette Pitovao

The Committee considered feedback from the Disability Advisory Academic Committee (DAAC) on the 2025 EPIs, which highlighted limitations in the disability data arising from differences between student self-disclosure at enrolment and subsequent engagement with disability support services.

The discussion identified the need for comparative analysis of these groups and their respective EPI outcomes, alongside consideration of broader institutional practices that support inclusive learning. The Committee agreed that this work should inform understanding of support service effectiveness and identify opportunities for improvement.

ACTION:
Simon Tries to undertake comparative analysis of disability-related EPI outcomes for students who disclose a disability at enrolment and those who subsequently engage with disability support services, and establish an ongoing approach to monitoring outcomes to inform improvements to support services and institutional practice.

RESOLVED:
That the Academic Committee receive the feedback from the Disability Academic Advisory Committee on the 2025 EPI Summary.

Moved: Annette Pitovao
Seconded: Simon Tries
CARRIED

7.5 Proposed MAAC Representatives on Academic Subcommittees
Presenter: Viv Merito

The Committee considered the proposed MAAC representatives on academic subcommittees and identified discrepancies between the nominations submitted and the membership provisions in the relevant Terms of Reference. The discussion clarified the distinction between approved members and additional representatives attending as observers or proxies, with observer participation remaining at the discretion of the relevant subcommittee chair.

The Committee agreed that the nominations required clarification with MAAC to ensure they were in accordance with the relevant Terms of Reference and previously approved memberships. The paper

was withdrawn, and a list of previously approved representatives would be provided to MAAC to support the clarification process.

ACTION:
Viv Merito to liaise with MAAC to clarify the proposed representation arrangements and revise the nominations to align with the relevant Terms of Reference and previously approved memberships.

2.9 Learning and Teaching Committee
Presenter: Simon Nash

a. LTC Report 2026-09-03
b. 'You Said We Did' Update

The Learning and Teaching Committee report originally scheduled for consideration in closed session, was considered in open session following confirmation that it could be discussed publicly.

The Committee received the LTC report, which covered the Teaching Excellence Standards (TES) Matrix, the *You Said We Did* process and the alignment of the learning and teaching strategy with the academic plan. The TES Matrix was expected to be considered at the October LTC meeting, with a view to completing the framework needed to support implementation of the Teaching Excellence Standards.

The discussion focused on strengthening the *You Said We Did* process across MIT and Unitec. While its use had increased, implementation remained uneven. The existing survey integration project was recognised as an important part of this work, alongside opportunities to strengthen communications with staff and students and to consider whether the process should be reflected in appropriate performance measures. The discussion also identified opportunities to improve the management of course feedback in Canvas and to work with student representatives to encourage survey participation.

ACTIONS:
1. Develop communications to promote the value of the *You Said We Did* process, including opportunities for student-led or joint staff–student engagement and examples of effective practice.
2. Consider whether the use of *You Said We Did* should be incorporated into appropriate institutional, school-level or individual performance measures.
3. Chris Park to clarify the course content and records to be retained or removed when courses are copied between teaching periods, including the handling of previous cohort feedback.
4. Survey teams to work with student representatives to identify opportunities to encourage survey participation, including targeted communications where response rates are low.

RESOLVED:
That the Academic Committee receive the Learning and Teaching Committee report and '*You Said We Did*' Update.

8 **Standing Items**
Subcommittee Reporting

8.1 Disability Academic Advisory Committee
No report received for this meeting.

8.2 International Academic Advisory Committee
Presenter: Jeff Howe

The Committee received the International Academic Advisory Committee (IAAC) report, which covered student experience matters relating to postgraduate visa fees, alignment of enrolment

processes across campuses, and a proposed later semester start date in 2028. These matters were being progressed operationally, and no recommendations arose from the IAAC meeting.

The Committee noted that the standing review of international student complaints and appeals had identified no clear trends of concern.

RESOLVED:
That the Academic Committee receive International Academic Advisory Committee Report.

Moved: Jeff Howe
Seconded: Rosanne Ellis
CARRIED

8.3 Māori Academic Advisory Committee
Presenter: Viv Merito

a. MAAC Report: 2026-09-08

The Committee received the Māori Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC) report. The proposed amendments to the MAAC Terms of Reference remained outstanding and were expected to return to the next meeting.

The Committee also noted progress in applying the Te Mana Akoranga framework to programme self-assessment and review, with the relevant documentation to be considered by the School.

b. Te Mana Akoranga Overview

The Committee considered the proposed revised Te Mana Akoranga document for adoption as an integrated policy. While acknowledging progress in developing the framework and its guiding principles, the Committee identified the need for further consultation and socialisation, particularly with Unitec schools and other relevant parts of the institution, before the document could be approved.

The Committee agreed that the document should be incorporated into the governance document template and further developed through a consultation process led by MAAC, with support from the General Manager Schools and Director Schools and Performance. The revised document is to return to the Committee for approval following this work.

ACTION:
Wiremu Manaia, Viv Merito, with Chris King, Pip Schollum-Manase and Hana Hohapata to coordinate further consultation and socialisation of the Te Mana Akoranga, including engagement with Heads of School and other relevant institutional stakeholders, and bring a revised document to the next Academic Committee meeting for approval.

RESOLVED:
That the Academic Committee receive Māori Academic Advisory Committee Report.

Moved: Viv Merito
Seconded: Chris Park
CARRIED

8.4 Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee
Presenter: Rosanne Ellis

a. PGRSC Report: 2026-08-11
b. PGRSC Report: 2026-09-09

c. PGRSC membership nomination

The Committee received the Postgraduate Research and Scholarship Committee (PGRSC) minutes of 11 August and 9 September.

The Committee noted ongoing work to strengthen postgraduate research supervision, including annual verification of supervisor eligibility, refreshed supervision training and capability development pathways. The work incorporates feedback on mentoring, AI awareness and culturally responsive supervision, alongside broader efforts to strengthen postgraduate research support through scholarships, supervision resources and peer support.

The Committee also noted consultation on the TREF assessment criteria and student regulations, and the continued development of support for early career researchers. While an early career researcher forum has expanded across the integrated institution, a dedicated mentoring and support programme remained under development.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Committee:
1. receive Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee Report.
2. approve the Professor Hamid Sharifzadeh's appointment as a general staff member of the PGRSC.

8.5 Research Committee

Presenter: Rosanne Ellis

a. Research Report: 2026-09-10
b. Co-option of staff member to RC

The Committee received the Research Committee report and noted ongoing work responding to consultation on the TREF assessment criteria and student regulations, alongside forthcoming reviews of research-related policies.

The Committee also noted the update on the Government's trusted research and protective security requirements, including the need for appropriate risk management when undertaking sensitive research with international partners. Further information was offered to support the Committee's understanding of these requirements.

The Committee acknowledged progress in strengthening research compliance within the School of Digital with the support of the Research team.

The Committee approved the nomination of Dr Marilou Raduban as a co-opted member of the Research Committee, recognising her active research programme and experience working with international collaborators.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Committee:
1. receive Research Committee Report.
2. approve the co-option of Dr Marilou Raduban to the Research Committee, in accordance with section 3.3 (Co-opted members) of the Research Committee Terms of Reference:

Moved: Rosanne Ellis
Seconded: Pip Schollum-Manase
CARRIED

8.6 Programme Advisory Oversight Committee

No report received for this meeting.

Whakamutunga | Closing

Ka wehe atu tātou	Peacefully
I raro i te rangimārie	Joyfully
Te harikoa	And resolute
Me te manawanui	We are united, progressing forward!
Haumi ē! Hui ē! Taiki ē!	We are departing.

The meeting concluded at 3.56pm.

Confirmed as a true and correct record:

Chair:

Date:

MIT and Unitec Academic Committee
OPEN ACTION REGISTER 2026

Meeting Date	Reference	Action Description	Action Owner	Due Date
03 June 2026, 01 Jul 2026, 05 Aug 2026, 02 Sep 2026, 06 Oct 2026, 04 Nov 2026	6.2c	**MAAC Terms of Reference Development** Wiremu Manaia and Viv Merito to undertake further consultation with relevant Academic Committee subcommittee chairs regarding the proposed MAAC Terms of Reference amendments, and report back to Academic Committee with revised recommendations.	Wiremu Manaia Viv Merito	Nov 2026
06 Oct 2026	7.5	**MAAC Representation on Academic Subcommittees** Viv Merito to liaise with MAAC to clarify the proposed representation arrangements and revise the nominations in accordance with the relevant Terms of Reference and previously approved memberships. *Revised nominations are presented under agenda item 7.10*	Viv Merito	Nov 2026
06 Oct 2026	7.5	**Te Mana Akoranga Consultation** Wiremu Manaia, Viv Merito, with Chris King, Pip Schollum-Manase and Hana Hohapata to coordinate further consultation and socialisation of the Te Mana Akoranga document, including engagement with Heads of School and other relevant stakeholders, and submit a revised document to the November Academic Committee meeting for approval. *Revised Te Mana Akoranga is presented under agenda item 7.0*	Wiremu Manaia Viv Merito Chris King Pip Schollum-Manase Hana Hohapata	Nov 2026
06 Oct 2026	7.2	**Skill Standards Implementation** 1. **Programme Approval:** Ensure the AAC approvals process addresses relevant skill standards in nested programmes, type 2 changes and new programme proposals. 2. **Academic professional development:** Ensure the academic professional development strategy explicitly address staff qualification and training requirements arising from new skill standards.	Chris Park Helen Perry	Dec 2026 Dec 2026

		3. Staff qualification monitoring: People and Culture to confirm whether the new HRMIS can record specific staff qualifications and credentials required for programme delivery and support aggregate reporting, rather than relying solely on free- text fields.	Helen Perry	Dec 2026
06 Oct 2026	7.2	**Student Survey Feedback and Follow-up** 1. Develop communications to promote the value of the *You Said We Did* process, including student-led or joint staff–student engagement and examples of effective practice. 2. Consider whether the use of *You Said We Did* should be reflected in appropriate institutional, school-level or individual performance measures. 3. Chris Park to clarify the course content and records should be retained or removed when courses are copied between teaching periods, including the handling of previous cohort feedback. 4. Survey teams to work with student representatives to identify opportunities to encourage survey participation, including targeted communications where response rates are low.	TBC TBC Chris Park TBC	TBC

COMPLETED Action Items: 2026

3 Dec 2025, 3 Feb 2026	3.3.3	**Update the REC Terms of Reference** to include regular statistical reporting on research-ethics applications and outcomes. *The item was considered under agenda item 1.5c and is now closed*	Rosanne Ellis	Prior to finalisation of ToR
3 Dec 2025, 3 Feb 2026.	3.3.7	**Record the reduction in programme development capability** as a governance risk and implement targeted upskilling for Programme Committee members and Academic Approval Committee members, with progress to be monitored and reported to the Joint Academic Committee. *The item is closed, noting that the matters will be addressed through the academic product management redesign workstream.*	Simon Tries	Progress update mid-year
23 Jan 2026, 3 Feb 2026, 4 Mar 2026	1.4e	**Academic Committee Handbook** The Chair and Chris Park to draft an Academic Committee Handbook to reflect the current governance framework and differ from previous versions.	Martin Carroll Chris Park	Mar 2026
23 Jan 2026, 03 Feb 2026, 04 Mar 2026, 02 Apr 2026	1.4d	**Clarification of Learner Representative Workload Expectations and Appointment Processes** DCE Learner Experience and Success and DCE Academic to engage with the Student Council to clarify workload expectations and Appointment processes for learner representatives on Academic Committee subcommittees. *2026-03-04:* Appointments to several learner representative roles remain in progress.	Simon Nash Martin Carroll	Apr 2026
04 Mar 2026, 02 Apr 2026	2.8	**Proposed Moderation Policy and Procedure** Targeted consultation on the proposed Moderation Policy and Procedure will be undertaken with Heads of School and academic staff, including consideration of implementation implications and proposed delegations, with a revised policy to be presented to the Academic Committee for approval at May meeting.	Simon Tries	May 2026

		The report is presented under agenda item 2.5.		
02 Apr 2026	2.11	**AI Policy and Procedures** • James Oldfield to update the draft policy to address identified issues, including correction and alignment of policy references, and to incorporate feedback arising from Committee discussion. • James Oldfield to liaise with relevant teams to resolve alignment between AI policy provisions and existing BYOD/device guidance.	James Oldfield	Jun 2026
02 Apr 2026	2.6	**AAC Standing Subcommittees** Chris Park and the Chair in consultation with Pip Schollum-Manase and Chris King, to: • develop Terms of Reference and SOPs for two AAC subcommittees, • propose an appropriate membership approach consistent with governance protocols, and • present the proposed structure to the Academic Committee for formal approval at the next meeting. *The report is presented under agenda item 2.8*	Chris Park	May 2026
01 Oct 2025, 19 Nov 2025, 03 Dec 2025, 03 Feb 2026, 04 Mar 2026, 02 Apr 2026, 06 May 2026	1.4b	**External Moderation Costing and Paid Moderation Framework** **ACTIONS:** • Simon Tries to undertake a costing exercise for external moderation. • Simon Tries to develop advice on the budgetary treatment and protocol for paid moderation arrangements. *The report is presented under CLOSED agenda item 5.4*	Simon Tries	June 2026
06 May 2026	1.3.f	**Micro-credential Ownership and Record Allocation Clarification** Simon Tries to clarify ownership, allocation, and NZQA record arrangements relating to legacy micro-credentials associated with NZIST and determine whether any further action is required.	Simon Tries	June 2026

06 May 2026	2.9	**Proposal for Shared and Multiple MAAC Representation Arrangements Across Subcommittees** Wiremu Manaia to present a formal paper outlining a proposed approach for shared Māori Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC) representation arrangements across Academic Committee subcommittees, including consideration of workload impacts, representative continuity, and any Terms of Reference amendments required to support such arrangements. *The report is presented under agenda item 2.14*	Wiremu Manaia	June 2026
04 Mar 2026, 02 Apr 2026, 06 May 2026, 03 Jun 2026	2.3	**Academic Misconduct Report** 1. Undertake further investigation into repeat misconduct patterns in the School of Health and Counselling, with consideration of targeted interventions. 2. Review assessment scheduling practices in the School of Nursing, particularly where clustered assessments may contribute to multiple misconduct incidents within a short period. *The report is presented under agenda item 2.2*	Pip Schollum-Manase Deborah Rowe	Jun 2026
02 Apr 2026, 06 May 2026	2.7	**Programmes for Closure Process** Chris Park and Simon Tries to develop and present a proposed consistent and systematic process for programme closures across the institution.	Chris Park Simon Tries	June 2026
1 Jul 2026	7.2	**NZQA Draft Degree Guidelines** ConsultationCoordinate targeted consultation on the NZQA Draft Degree Guidelines (Version 3), consolidate institutional feedback, and submit the institutional response to NZQA by the consultation deadline.	Helen Perry Simon Tries	July 2026
23 Jan 2026, 03 Feb 2026, 04 Mar 2026, 02 Apr 2026, 06 May 2026, 03 Jun 2026	1.4c	**PAC design and implementation** Julie Prentice, Pip Schollum-Manase, and Chris King to jointly lead a project to: develop a schedule mapping programmes to Programme Committees and Programme	Julie Prentice, Pip Schollum-Manase, Chris King	Jul 2026

		Advisory Committees; recommend a phased implementation approach; and socialise the new arrangements with Schools and existing advisory groups, with a report back to the Academic Committee. **Deliverable B** – Phased Implementation Proposal: Present a recommendation outlining the proposed phased approach to implementation and engagement with Schools and existing advisory groups, with report back to Academic Committee for consideration. *Implementation proposal is presented under agenda item 7.5*		
04 Mar 2026, 02 Apr 2026, 06 May 2026, 03 Jun 2026	1.4g	**Academic Misconduct Report** 1.Remind all Schools to consistently report misconduct cases in accordance with policy. *Communication issued to all Schools reinforcing expectations for the consistent reporting of academic misconduct cases in accordance with institutional policy. Action completed.*	Pip Schollum-Manase	Jul 2026
02 Apr 2026, 06 May 2026, 03 Jun 2026, 01 Jul 2026.	1.4h	**Student Complaints and Appeals** Further analysis of international student complaints be referred to the International Academic Advisory Committee (IAAC), with findings to be reported back to the Academic Committee. Student Complaints and Appeals were considered by the IAAC and is documented in the minutes of 17 June 2026. There were 7 formal complaints 147 issues were actually enquiries. The matter was concluded.	Jeff Howe	Jul 2026
06 May 2026, 03 June 2026, 01 July 2026	1.4j	**Establishment of appropriate Programme Advisory Committee support for the Health and Wellbeing programme** **ACTION:** That Julie Prentice progress establishment of appropriate Programme Advisory Committee support for the Health and Wellbeing programme area as part of continuing programme redevelopment activity. Discussion on 2026-07-01:	Julie Prentice	Jul 2026

		The establishment process for appropriate Programme Advisory Committee support is underway. Ongoing oversight of implementation will be provided through the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee's regular reporting to Academic Committee, and a separate Academic Committee action is no longer required. The matter was concluded.		
03 Jun 2026, 01 Jul 2026	1.4l	**NZQA Credit Recognition and Transfer Guidelines** Simon Tries and Chris Park to review the NZQA Credit Recognition and Transfer Guidelines and advise whether any immediate action is required, and to ensure the guidelines are considered as part of upcoming policy review activities. Discussion on 2026-07-01: The NZQA Credit Recognition and Transfer Guidelines have been reviewed. No immediate institutional action is required at this stage. The guidelines will be considered through the forthcoming policy review programme, considering any further clarification provided by NZQA. The matter was concluded.	Simon Tries Chris Park	Jul 2026
03 June 2026	1.4m	**2025 EPI Analysis** 2.Pip Schollum-Manase and Chris King to facilitate distribution of the EPI data to Heads of School to support further programme and School-level analysis. EPI data has been distributed to Heads of School to support programme and school-level analysis. The original action has been completed through the delivery of the 2025 EPI reporting process. The matter was concluded.	Pip Schollum-Manase Chris King	Jul 2026
05 Aug 2026	6.0	**Alignment of the 2028 academic calendars across MIT and Unitec** Establish a cross-functional working group, led by Chris Park, to develop principles and recommendations for alignment of the 2028 academic calendars across MIT and Unitec, recognising differing programme requirements and institutional priorities.	Chris Park	Sep 2026

		Academic Calendar was presented under agenda item 7.4		
01 Oct 2025, 19 Nov 2025, 03 Dec 2025, 03 Feb 2026, 04 Mar 2026, 02 Apr 2026, 06 May 2026, 03 Jun 2026, 01 Jul 2026, 05 Aug 2026, 02 Sep 2026, 06 Oct 2026	6.2a	*Development of Learner Experience KPIs on Complaints and Appeals* *The development of KPIs relating to concerns, complaints, and appeals be undertaken collaboratively by the DCE Learner Experience and Success, DCE Academic and the Director People and Culture.* *Following consultation with the student councils, which resulted in no recommended changes, the Committee confirmed the proposed learner experience KPIs for implementation. Ongoing engagement with the student councils will support their involvement in analysing the findings and informing subsequent responses.* *Status: The action was closed.*	Martin Carroll Simon Nash Christine Hutton	Oct 2026
03 June 2026, 01 Jul 2026, 05 Aug 2026, 02 Sep 2026, 06 Oct 2026	6.2b	*AAC membership nominations* *One nomination from the Māori Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC) Chair remained outstanding. The MAAC Chair to provide the nomination for the vacant position.* *The nomination was included under agenda item 7.5, the action was closed.*	Wiremu Manaia	Oct 2026
02 Sep 2026, 06 Oct 2026	7.2	*NZQA Kaupapa Māori Programme Approval Approach – Institutional Response* Wiremu Manaia, Viv Merito, Chris Park and Simon Tries to consider the proposed NZQA approach to approving Kaupapa Māori programme applications and explore the opportunity for the institution to make a submission. *The action was closed, with Viv Merito to report back as opportunities for further engagement with NZQA progress.*	Wiremu Manaia Viv Merito Chris Park Simon Tries	Oct 2026

Memo to: Academic Committee
Subject: Correspondence
Classification: Unclassified
Date: 2026-10-22

Recommendations
That the Academic Committee receive the correspondence.

INWARDS:
Attachments:

a. To: Academic Committee
From: NZQA
Date: 22 October 2026
Subject: Application processing delays

From: Team Mailbox QA Admin <qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 22 October 2026 11:42 am
Subject: Application processing delays

Kia ora koutou

We wanted to provide a brief update on the delays affecting outcome letters.

Unfortunately, the internal system issues that have impacted our approval processing timeframes have not yet been fully resolved. As a result, delays continue while we work through affected applications and address the underlying issues.

We understand this is frustrating and appreciate the impact these delays may be having. Please be assured that resolving the issue and progressing applications remains a priority for our team.

While we do not yet have a confirmed timeframe for resolution, we will provide a further update when more information is available.

Thank you for your patience and understanding.

Ngā mihi nui
Service Support | Quality Assurance Division

Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

www.nzqa.govt.nz
125 The Terrace,
PO Box 160
Wellington, 6140

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Chris Park, General Manager, Academic Services
Fiona Campbell, Academic Quality Assessor

Subject: Review of the MIT and Unitec Student Regulations for 2027

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 28 October 2026

Purpose

Attached for the Academic Committee's consideration and endorsement are the draft 2027 MIT and Unitec Student Regulations, which incorporate feedback received through consultation with staff, the Extended Leadership Team, and key service areas across MIT and Unitec, together with a final review by the Academic Leadership Team.

This paper:

- Outlines the key proposed amendments arising from the 2026 review of the Student Regulations; and
- Seeks feedback from the Academic Committee and, if appropriate, endorsement of the draft Regulations and a recommendation of the document to the MIT and Unitec Council for approval.

Background

The MIT and Unitec Student Regulations came into effect on 1 January 2026, establishing a single academic regulatory framework.

During September 2026, all MIT and Unitec staff were invited to provide feedback on the Regulations following the first year of implementation. Feedback was sought on challenges or issues experienced in practice, areas requiring clarification or simplification, any gaps, inconsistencies or unintended consequences within the Regulations, and opportunities for improvement.

A significant volume of feedback was received through this review process and has informed the proposed amendments. While all feedback was carefully considered, it was not possible to incorporate every recommendation.

Following the staff consultation, the revised draft Student Regulations, including proposed amendments, were circulated to the Extended Leadership Team and key service areas for further feedback, and the draft was updated accordingly. The final draft was subsequently reviewed by the Academic Leadership Team. The amendments presented in this paper therefore reflect the outcome of the full review and consultation process.

It should be noted that the nomenclature, position titles, and organisational references used throughout the draft Regulations will require further updating to align with any approved changes to the MIT and Unitec name and the newly approved organisational structure before the Regulations are finalised and published.

A marked-up version of the Student Regulations accompanies this paper. The table below summarises the key amendments proposed in response to feedback received during the review and consultation process. As not all changes are captured in the summary, members are encouraged to review the full marked-up document for a comprehensive overview of all proposed amendments.

Key proposed changes

Section	Content	For specific consideration
General	Delegations and designated contacts and organisational references	Delegations and designated contacts have been incorporated throughout the draft Student Regulations. Due to legacy organisational arrangements and the transitional nature of proposed organisational changes, some provisions currently reference multiple positions, departments, or organisational units. Position titles, organisational references, and delegations will be reviewed and updated prior to publication to align with any approved changes to the MIT and Unitec name and the newly approved organisational structure.
1	Document hierarchy	The draft Student Regulations have been updated to clarify the hierarchy and interaction of governing documents. The amendments establish a clear order of authority, with New Zealand legislation and MIT and Unitec Statutes taking precedence, followed by the Student Regulations, Programme Regulations, and institutional policies, procedures, and processes. Amendments also clarify: • That the Student Regulations: – are the primary academic regulatory document governing students; – apply across all programmes unless otherwise specified; – prevail over Programme Regulations, policies, procedures, and processes where inconsistencies arise; and – may permit exceptions through specific provisions or approved transition arrangements; • That Programme Regulations prescribe programme-specific requirements and must remain consistent with the Student Regulations, except where an approved exception or transition arrangement applies; • That students are generally subject to the versions of the Student Regulations and Programme Regulations that were in force when their enrolment commenced, while policies, procedures, and processes generally apply from their effective date. Earlier

Section	Content	For specific consideration
		versions may continue to apply where preserved through approved transition arrangements specified in Programme Regulations; and • Mechanisms for resolving conflicts between institutional documents and external legal, regulatory, standard-setting, or funding requirements.
1.2.6	Continuing postgraduate provisions	A new section 1.2.6 has been included to clarify the ongoing status of existing regulations, rules, and requirements that apply to Master's and Doctoral degree programmes. These requirements are currently contained across a range of sources, including Programme Regulations and legacy Unitec postgraduate regulatory documents, and are not currently applied or documented consistently across programmes. This new section is intended to prevent regulatory gaps while a comprehensive review of existing postgraduate requirements is undertaken. This review will inform decisions about which provisions should apply institution-wide through future Postgraduate Regulations, potentially contained or appended to the Student Regulations, and which should remain within individual Programme Regulations.
1.4.2	Reciprocal responsibilities	MIT and Unitec's commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi is recognised with the inclusion of the following provision: *"Students can expect MIT and Unitec to:… Uphold its commitments under the Treaty of Waitangi by promoting culturally safe learning environments, respecting tikanga and Mātauranga Māori, and supporting equitable outcomes for Māori ākonga."*
2.8.2	Late enrolment	Requirements for students enrolling after 10 per cent of the course duration have been clarified. Students must negotiate and agree an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) with the school and agree to comply with its requirements as a condition of enrolment.
2.9.1	Refusal or cancellation of enrolment	Factors relevant to assessing good character have been expanded to include risks to the safety, wellbeing, and integrity of the MIT and Unitec community. Exclusion from a practicum or work placement (where no alternative placement is available) has also been included as a ground for refusal or cancellation of enrolment.
2.11.1	Enrolment provisions for specific student groups	This table now recognises that: *"Additional provisions may apply to postgraduate programmes where specified in the relevant Programme Regulations. Students should contact their School for further information."*

Section	Content	For specific consideration
3	Recognition of prior knowledge and skills (RPKS)	The RPKS provisions have been updated to strengthen and clarify application, assessment, and decision-making processes. Key changes include: • Explicit recognition of Mātauranga Māori and Māori knowledge systems as potential sources of prior learning for credit purposes; • Clarification of application timeframes and refund implications; • Refinement of assessment criteria; • Introduction of a formal pathway for students to raise concerns about RPKS decisions; and • Updating administrative process information to improve clarity and consistency. The Student Regulations currently limit the granting of credit through credit transfer or cross credit to learning completed within the previous five years (section 3.5). During consultation, questions were raised regarding the appropriateness of this requirement. It was noted that some programmes have completion periods exceeding five years and that learning completed earlier may, in some disciplines, remain relevant and current. **Academic Committee's guidance is sought on whether the current five-year currency requirement remains appropriate, whether a longer period should apply, or whether currency should be assessed on a case-by-case basis having regard to the discipline area and the nature of the learning concerned.**
5	Cancellations, postponements, timetable changes, and programme discontinuation	These provisions have been updated to clarify that cancellation and postponement provisions in section 5.1.1 relate to specific programme and course occurrences rather than programmes or courses generally. Amendments also introduce a new framework for programme discontinuation, establish requirements for reasonable transition arrangements for affected students, and clarify fee refund entitlements where a programme is permanently discontinued.
8.3	Refunds – international students	International refund provisions have been amended to: • Include a new 80% refund category for students withdrawing within the first ten calendar days of study; Previously no refunds were made for withdrawals less than ten (10) working days before the earliest course start date; • Introduce new refund arrangements for short courses and micro-credentials of 12 weeks or less, mirroring those for domestic students; and • Expressly incorporate an administration fee into certain refund calculations.

Section	Content	For specific consideration
9	Engagement and attendance	Attendance provisions have been updated to clarify attendance and engagement requirements. Amendments confirm that engagement with a LMS or other online platform does not automatically constitute attendance unless specifically stated within the course requirements or approved mode of delivery. Provisions relating to international students have also been updated to reflect current practice, including replacing Immigration New Zealand panel doctor requirements with more flexible evidential requirements based on certification from a registered New Zealand general practitioner or other evidence approved by the International Office.
10.2.3 – 10.2.5	Postgraduate research supervision	Postgraduate research supervision requirements have been strengthened and updated. New provisions require internal supervisors to be appropriately qualified, research active, hold Green Light status under the Research Traffic Light Framework, and be approved on the MIT and Unitec Register of Supervisors. The revised provisions also clarify supervisor appointment processes, recognise the need for cultural expertise within supervisory teams where appropriate, and strengthen processes for addressing supervisor availability and supervisory relationship concerns.
10.3	Ethical approval for student research	Research ethics provisions have been strengthened to require research involving Māori participants, communities, or Mātauranga Māori to demonstrate appropriate cultural and ethical considerations, including engagement with relevant tikanga and protection of Māori knowledge.
11.5	Assessment concession	The assessment concession provisions have been substantially revised and consolidated within section 11.5 to improve clarity, accessibility, and ease of administration. The section now brings together all assessment concession provisions, including extensions, assessment assistance, further assessment and resubmission opportunities granted as concessions, and aegrotat passes. Consultation feedback highlighted the complexity of the current processes and supported the development of a single application process and form, preferably delivered online. While operational processes sit outside the Regulations, the revised structure has been designed to better support a more streamlined approach to the administration of assessment concessions. For clarity, the further assessment opportunity and resubmission provisions in section 11.5 apply only where these are granted as assessment concessions based on circumstances beyond a student's control. Further assessment opportunities and resubmissions

Section	Content	For specific consideration
		available following a failed course are addressed separately in section 11.13. Aegrotat pass provisions have also been relocated from section 12 (Assessment Results and Grades) to section 11.5, bringing all assessment concession provisions together within a single section of the Regulations.
11.5.27	Aegrotat Pass	Proposed amendments substantially revise and strengthen the aegrotat framework by: • Removing the existing requirement that a student be enrolled in a programme of at least 120 credits to be eligible for an aegrotat pass. The limit of one aegrotat pass per 120 credits of enrolment, unless otherwise specified in Programme Regulations, is retained However, an approval pathway for exceptional cases, is established allowing the normal limit to be exceeded with approval from the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic, following recommendations from the Programme Committee and Head of School; • Reinforcing the principle that aegrotat passes are a measure of last resort, by requiring students to utilise available assessment concessions and alternative assessment opportunities wherever practicable before an aegrotat application will be considered; and • Strengthening academic standards for approval, by requiring evidence that the student would have achieved both a passing result and the relevant course learning outcomes had the exceptional circumstances not occurred.
11.7.3	Plagiarism	This section has been updated to expressly require referencing and acknowledgement of content generated by artificial intelligence tools.
11.13	Further assessment opportunities and resubmissions	This section now only addresses situations where a student has failed an assessment and may be eligible for a further assessment opportunity or resubmission, separate from assessment concessions granted due to circumstances beyond the student's control.
12.2	All learning outcomes must be achieved	New section included stating: *"To pass a course and be awarded credit, a student must successfully achieve all course learning outcomes at the required level. This requirement applies in addition to any other course or programme pass requirements, including any specified minimum pass mark.* This provision is intended to address updated NZQA requirements.

Section	Content	For specific consideration
12.6	Grade point average	Section 12.6.2 has been updated to clarify that courses assessed solely on a competency basis are not included in GPA calculations. GPA calculation provisions in section 12.6.3 have been updated for clarity and to ensure that the result is weighted by the credit value of each course.
13	Insufficient Academic Progress	2026 Student Regulations define insufficient academic progress based on repeated failure of the same course or failure of 50 per cent or more of enrolled credits. Following feedback, the definition has been relaxed: • Increasing the threshold from 50 per cent or more to more than 50 per cent of enrolled credits; • Assessing full-time students over a 12-month period rather than a single enrolment period; and • The existing provision relating to students who fail the same course two or more times has been retained. Section 13.3 consequences of insufficient progress have been revised to provide a clearer and more consistent framework for managing re-enrolment decisions. This represents a substantive change from the 2026 Regulations. Key changes include: • Introduction of an exclusion framework: Students who make insufficient academic progress will normally be subject to a period of exclusion unless exceptional circumstances apply. • Establishment of a re-enrolment pathway following exclusion, with escalating approval requirements for repeated instances of insufficient academic progress. • Introduction of an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) pathway for students who make insufficient academic progress for the first time. • Explicit recognition of a broader range of possible outcomes, including reduced study loads, enrolment in an alternative programme, conditions on enrolment, or a further period of exclusion. • Requirement to consider a student's previous findings of insufficient academic progress when assessing admission to another programme. • Introduction of a reconsideration process for decisions to exclude a student or refuse re-enrolment. This sits outside the usual complaints and appeals process. • Clarification of institutional obligations to provide academic support and interventions for students permitted to re-enrol.

Section	Content	For specific consideration
14	Student concerns and complaints (including academic decisions)	The student concerns and complaints provisions have been updated to provide greater clarity regarding support arrangements, eligibility for formal complaints, and complaint management processes. Key amendments include: • Reduction of the timeframe for lodging complaints relating to academic decisions from ten to five working days • The introduction of provisions enabling MIT and Unitec to decline complaints that are outside scope, impracticable to investigate, significantly delayed, or anonymous. • Clearer guidance on the types of matters that may proceed directly to a formal complaint.
15	Student Misconduct	The student misconduct provisions have been updated to improve procedural clarity and strengthen decision-making frameworks. Key amendments include: • Clarification of the distinction between immediate removal and suspension pending investigation, confirming that suspension is a precautionary measure rather than a disciplinary penalty. • Introduction of enhanced provisions for students enrolled in School of Secondary-Tertiary Studies and Supported Learning programmes, recognising the need for additional support, intervention, reintegration, and educational planning measures.
16	Investigation procedure	Investigation provisions have been updated to strengthen procedural fairness, improve accessibility, and clarify investigation processes. Key amendments include: • Clarification that complaints that involve potential misconduct may be referred to, and investigated concurrently under, the student misconduct framework where appropriate • A requirement for MIT and Unitec to make reasonable adjustments to investigation, complaints, and appeal processes to enable effective student participation.
17	Appeals	The appeals provisions have been substantially revised to clarify grounds of appeal, distinguish reconsideration processes from appeals, and simplify appeal pathways. The draft removes the second right of appeal on the basis that matters should generally be resolved through a single appeal process.
25	Glossary	New definitions have been included for: appeal; approved translator; Artificial Intelligence; assessment concession; Learning Management System; manifestly at odds with the evidence provided; NZQA fees; procedural flaw; Supported Learning Programmes;

Section	Content	For specific consideration
		Definitions have been updated for the following terms: academic decision; Chief Executive Officer; course engagement; enrolment period; exceptional circumstances / grounds; fees;

Recommendation

That the Academic Committee:

- Note the proposed amendments from the 2026 review of the MIT and Unitec Student Regulations;
- Provide any final feedback on the draft Student Regulations and matters identified in this paper; and
- Endorse the draft 2027 MIT and Unitec Student Regulations, subject to any amendments arising from its deliberations, and recommend the Student Regulations to the MIT and Unitec Council for approval.

MIT and Unitec Student Regulations

Audience

These regulations are relevant to all Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec ("MIT and Unitec") staff and students.

Table of Contents

MIT and Unitec Student Regulations 1

Audience 1

Table of Contents 1

1. General 2
2. Admission and enrolment 5
3. Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills (RPKS) ..... 13~~11~~
4. Paying fees ..... 16~~13~~
5. Cancellations, postponements, and timetable changes ..... 17~~14~~
6. Withdrawals ..... 18~~15~~
7. Transfers ..... 22~~17~~
8. Refunding fees ..... 23~~18~~
9. Engagement and attendance ..... 30~~23~~
10. Student research ..... 31~~24~~
11. Assessment (including Assessment Concessions, Examinations and Academic Integrity) ..... 33~~25~~
12. Assessment results and grades ..... 55~~39~~
13. Insufficient academic progress ..... 63~~45~~
14. Student concerns and complaints (including academic decisions) ..... 65~~47~~
15. Student misconduct ..... 68~~49~~
16. MIT and Unitec investigation procedure ..... 72~~52~~
17. Appeals ..... 74~~54~~
18. Maximum time for completion of a programme ..... 77~~56~~
19. Awards and graduation ..... 77~~56~~
20. Intellectual property ..... 81~~59~~
21. Information and communications technology systems use ..... 81~~59~~
22. Comments and feedback ..... 82~~60~~
23. Health and safety ..... 82~~60~~
24. MIT and Unitec communications with students ..... 83~~61~~
25. Glossary ..... 83~~61~~
26. Document management and control ..... 99~~77~~
27. Amendment history ..... 100~~77~~

APPENDIX ONE - MIT AND UNITEC ACADEMIC DRESS ..... 101~~78~~

MIT and Unitec Student Regulations

1. General

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1 MIT and Unitec, as a single organisation, is committed to:

- Maintaining the highest academic standards;
- Providing a safe, effective, and inclusive learning environment; and
- Ensuring the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi are reflected in educational practice.

1.1.2 The *MIT and Unitec Student Regulations* outline the overarching rules for students. They detail MIT and Unitec expectations and requirements for students, as well as the standards MIT and Unitec will meet.

1.2. Scope and ~~status of the Student Regulations~~interpretation

1.2.1 The Glossary in section 25 sets out the meaning of defined terms used in these Regulations. Unless otherwise stated, those meanings apply wherever the terms are used.

~~1.2.1~~1.2.2 For the purposes of these Regulations, the term 'programme' ~~is deemed to include~~includes all MIT and Unitec educational offerings (including programmes, micro-credentials, and short courses), unless expressly stated otherwise.

Where used in these Regulations, the term 'course' refers to the smallest component of a programme. A specified course or collection of courses forms a programme.

1.2.3 These Regulations apply to any person ~~applying for~~who has applied for enrolment, is ~~enrolment,~~ enrolled in, or is participating in any programme offered by MIT and Unitec, unless otherwise provided for in a third-party delivery agreement. These regulations also apply to applicants seeking Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills, regardless of whether they are enrolled with, or intending to enrol with, MIT and Unitec.

Note: *Not all provisions of these Student Regulations apply to every applicant or student. These Regulations do not apply to prospective students who have not submitted an enrolment application, unless expressly stated otherwise.*

~~1.2.2~~1.2.4 In addition to the *Student Regulations*, students are ~~also~~ bound by:

- The applicable Programme Regulations, which prescribe requirements~~, including for entry into and completion of each programme, and the courses making up the programme~~ for admission, progression, completion, and other academic requirements relating to a programme and its courses; and
- MIT and Unitec policies, procedures, and processes that give effect to the *Student Regulations*.

1.2.5 ~~Where~~ The versions of the Student Regulations and Programme Regulations~~, policies, procedures, or processes~~ in force at the commencement of the relevant enrolment apply to that enrolment~~ have been amended after a student first enrolled in a programme, the latest approved version shall apply to any current or future enrolments~~. MIT and Unitec policies, procedures, and processes apply to all students from the date they come into effect. Exceptions to this may be specified within the document. ~~MIT and Unitec policies, procedures,~~

~~and processes apply to all students from the date they come into effect, unless otherwise specified.~~

Approved transition arrangements included in Programme Regulations may provide that specified provisions of these Student Regulations, or of MIT and Unitec policies, procedures, and processes that were in force before an amendment took effect, continue to apply to students who enrolled before a stated date.

1.2.6 Notwithstanding any other provision set out in these Regulations, Master's and Doctoral degree programmes may be subject to additional regulations, rules, or provisions relating to matters including, but not limited to, examination of research, the award of honours, research supervision, progression, and suspension or pause of study.

Such provisions are preserved and continue to have effect unless and until they are amended, revoked, or replaced by approved Programme Regulations, Postgraduate Regulations, or other applicable institutional regulations governing postgraduate study. They apply only to the extent that the matter is not addressed by these Student Regulations or any approved Programme Regulations. Where there is any inconsistency, the order of precedence set out in section 1.2.8 applies.

1.2.7 Except as stated in this sub-section, amendments to the Student Regulations and Programme Regulations apply only to enrolments commencing on or after the effective date of the amendment. An amendment may apply to current enrolments only if:

- The amendment expressly states that it applies to current enrolments; and
- Affected students are notified of the amendment and its application.

~~1.2.3 The *Student Regulations* are intended to be consistent with relevant New Zealand legislation, external regulatory, standard setting, and funding body requirements, and MIT and Unitec statutes.~~

1.2.8 If there is an inconsistency between the *Student Regulations* and ~~other~~ a Programme Regulation~~s~~, ~~policies~~policy, procedure~~s~~, or process~~es~~, the *Student Regulations* ~~will~~ prevail, unless an exemption is permitted by the ~~stated otherwise~~ Student Regulations or otherwise provided in approved transition arrangements under section 1.2.5

~~1.2.4 .~~

The *Student Regulations* are intended to be consistent with relevant New Zealand legislation, external regulatory, standard-setting, and funding body requirements, and MIT and Unitec statutes.

~~1.2.5~~1.2.9 In the event of any inconsistency between MIT and Unitec documents and legislative provisions, the following order of precedence ~~shall be applied~~applies:

- New Zealand legislation;
- MIT and Unitec statutes;
- Student Regulations;
- Programme Regulations; and
- MIT and Unitec policies, procedures, and processes.

Where there is any ~~conflict~~ inconsistency between these Regulations and ~~any~~ applicable external regulatory, standard-setting, or funding body requirements, the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic will determine ~~whether~~ how the ~~regulations~~ inconsistency is to be

Formatted: 2.1.1 sub para, Space After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering

resolved and which requirements apply, ensuring that mandatory and regulatory obligations are complied with.~~of that other authority will apply in respect to that programme.~~

In making such a determination, the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic will take into account:

- ~~consider a~~Any agreements ~~and/or~~or arrangements ~~that exist~~ between MIT and Unitec and the external authority~~,~~;
- The maintenance of the academic integrity ~~of the programme~~and academic standards; and
- ~~a~~Any other relevant ~~factors~~considerations.

1.2.10 In exceptional circumstances, the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic may approve an exception~~s~~ to ~~the~~ a provision~~s~~ outlined in these Regulations.

Information about all exceptions approved under this section must be reported to the next meeting of the Academic Committee.

~~1.2.6~~1.2.11 Information regarding relevant requirements set out in specific Programme Regulations will be provided to students in programme and course information. Regulations, policy, and procedure documents are available on the MIT and Unitec website. Students are encouraged to familiarise themselves with this information.

1.3. Changes to this document

1.3.1 The *Student Regulations* are approved by MIT and Unitec Council on the recommendation of the Academic Committee.

1.3.2 The *Student Regulations* are reviewed periodically and issued annually.

1.3.3 Information provided to students will be updated where necessary to reflect any changes made to the *Student Regulations*. MIT and Unitec will inform students of any changes to these Student Regulations made outside of the regular review cycle, where such changes may affect them.

1.4. Reciprocal responsibilities

1.4.1 In the context of their enrolment at MIT and Unitec, students are expected to act with honesty and integrity, and:

- Actively participate and engage in their learning;
- Familiarise themselves with, and comply with~~follow~~ MIT and Unitec regulations ~~and~~, policies, and procedures;
- Comply with New Zealand law;
- Provide accurate and truthful information;
- Act honestly and uphold academic integrity in all learning, assessment and research activities;
- Engage respectfully with staff, other students, and the wider community;
- Engage responsibly in digital and online environments;
- Engage safely and professionally in all learning activities, including work-based learning activities;
- Respect the rights and property of others both on and off campus;
- Report any instances of misconduct or unsafe behaviour (including harassment, bullying and discrimination);

- Follow health and safety instructions;
- Maintain confidentiality of personal and sensitive information;
- Use MIT and Unitec resources responsibly and sustainably.

1.4.2 Students can expect MIT and Unitec to:

- Treat students respectfully, fairly, and transparently;
- Provide a quality learning experience;
- Promote an inclusive learning experience;
- Provide services supporting learning and wellbeing;
- Provide regular and constructive feedback on academic progress;
- Provide accessible regulations, policies, procedures, and processes;
- Appropriately manage and protect personal information;
- Provide opportunities for student involvement, and encourage and consider student feedback;
- Treat concerns, complaints, and misconduct seriously and fairly, following a clear and transparent process;
- Uphold its commitments under the Treaty of Waitangi by promoting culturally safe learning environments, respecting tikanga and Mātauranga Māori, and supporting equitable outcomes for Māori ākonga.
-
- Meet the requirements set out under the Education (Pastoral Code of Tertiary and International Learners) Code of Practice 2021.

1.4.3 Harassment, discrimination, and bullying in any form will not be tolerated and will be dealt with ~~in accordance with~~as set out in section 14: Student concerns and complaints and may be treated as misconduct for the purposes of section 15: Student misconduct.

2. Admission and enrolment

2.1. General provisions

2.1.1 Students may only be enrolled into programmes that have met the relevant internal and external approvals. For programmes listed on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework (NZQCF) this may include approval and accreditation from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). Enrolment into programmes that have not met, or do not hold these approvals, is not permitted.

~~2.1.1~~2.1.2 Before students can enrol at MIT and Unitec, they must complete and sign (digitally for online applications) all relevant admission and enrolment forms, and provide evidence of identity and eligibility to study in New Zealand:

Admission and Enrolment forms are available on the MIT and Unitec website and from the Enrolment Team. Where students have a legal guardian or have granted power of attorney to someone else, then that person may sign the form on behalf of the student.

2.1.3 Prospective students will be provided with information relevant to their application and enrolment, including any information required under the Education (Pastoral Care of Tertiary and International Learners) Code of Practice, before entering an enrolment contract or completing enrolment.

~~2.1.2~~2.1.4 Failure by students to complete an MIT and Unitec admission, registration, or enrolment form correctly and truthfully, or to provide the necessary documents to confirm identity, citizenship, and any other information requested by MIT and Unitec, may result in their application being declined or their enrolment being cancelled (see section 2.9: Refusal or cancellation of enrolment).

~~2.1.3~~2.1.5 Students enrolled at MIT and Unitec will be classified as either domestic students or international students (see section 4~~.1~~: Paying fees ~~– Domestic students~~).

2.2. ~~Name and gender changes~~Student name and gender information

2.2.1 Students who have officially changed their name or gender must provide MIT and Unitec with appropriate evidence to support the change including, but not limited to a:

- Marriage Certificate or Civil Union Certificate;
- Dissolution of Marriage Certificate;
- Birth Certificate;
- Name Change Certificate (for students whose births are not registered in New Zealand); or
- Statutory Declaration issued by the Registrar of Births, Deaths, and Marriages.

2.2.2 Name and gender preferences will be sought and recorded at enrolment, and MIT and Unitec will endeavour to respect and accommodate these preferences. Where students have not officially changed their name or gender, external legal requirements may limit MIT and Unitec's ability to do this in all situations. MIT and Unitec records gender according to the Department of Internal Affairs gender settings.

2.2.3 Limitations may be imposed on the use of preferred names (e.g., where they are considered offensive, are longer than 30 characters, are an official title or rank or resemble one, or are spelled with numbers or symbols).

2.3. Entry requirements

2.3.1 To be considered for enrolment at MIT and Unitec, students must be an eligible person as defined in the Education and Training Act 2020.

2.3.2 The detailed criteria for entry into and completion of MIT and Unitec programmes are outlined in the relevant Programme Regulations. Where applicable, students must meet the minimum entry requirements and any pre-requisites for the programme before they can enrol. They must also provide appropriate evidence of meeting such requirements.

2.3.3 **Special admission**: Students who have attained the age of 20 years and do not hold the minimum entry requirements for a programme may be eligible to be enrolled. Such decisions must consider any applicable pre-requisites and will be made by the~~:~~ Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager.

2.3.4 **Discretionary admission:** ~~Students~~ Unless otherwise specified in the programme regulation, students who have not attained the age of 20 years and do not hold the required minimum entry requirements may be eligible to be enrolled in exceptional circumstances where they can demonstrate capability for study at the required level. Such decisions must consider any applicable pre-requisites and will be made by the Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager.

2.4. Maximum credit load

2.4.1 Students may not enrol in more than 60 credits in any one semester or more than 30 credits in any quarter or summer semester, except in exceptional circumstances (such as demonstrated high academic performance) and with the approval of the: General Manager Schools or Director, Schools and Performance~~; Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager~~. This limit also applies where students are enrolled concurrently at more than one institution.

In considering requests to enrol for more than the maximum credit load the General Manager, Schools or Director, Schools and Performance will consider a student's academic record and any other evidence provided by the student.

To apply for approval to exceed the maximum credit load, students should contact the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager.

2.5. Limitations on enrolment

2.5.1 Where students meet the requirements for entry into a programme or course, they are entitled to be enrolled if places are available.

2.5.2 MIT and Unitec may limit enrolments in any programme or course when necessary. Reasons for limiting the number of enrolments include, but are not limited to, the availability of:

- Staff;
- Accommodation (e.g., classroom space, work-experience places, or health and safety constraints);
- Equipment; and
- Funded places.

2.5.3 If there are more eligible applicants than available places in a programme or course, selection will be based on criteria specified in the Programme Regulations. If no selection criteria are outlined in the Programme Regulations, places will be allocated on a first-come, first-served basis (in the order fully completed applications accompanied by full documentation are received).

2.5.4 Where students provide evidence of meeting the required level of English language proficiency for entry into a programme, MIT and Unitec reserve the right to reconfirm, using a method determined by the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic, that the student has sufficient English language proficiency to have a reasonable chance of success in the programme. This may include requiring the student to participate in an interview or other assessment of English language proficiency. Where the student is unable to demonstrate sufficient English language proficiency through that process, MIT and Unitec may decline or revoke admission or enrolment in the programme.

2.6. Alternative programmes or courses

2.6.1 Where students apply for a programme or course that is not available or is full, MIT and Unitec may place the student on a waiting list and/or offer them entry into an alternative programme or course.

2.6.2 Students will be notified at the time of application if the programme or course in which they wish to enrol is full. They will be advised whether they will be placed onto a waiting list and/or offered the opportunity to select an alternative programme or course.

2.7. Confirmation of accepted or declined entry

2.7.1 Students will be informed in writing of the outcome of their application for entry into a programme or course.

2.8. Late enrolment

2.8.1 Unless otherwise specified in the Programme Regulations, students may be accepted for late enrolment by the Head of School or Academic Programme Manager up to 10 per cent of the course duration. In exceptional circumstances this period may be extended at the discretion of the General Manager Schools, Director, Schools and Performance or delegate. ~~For~~

~~international students, the decision to allow late enrolments in exceptional circumstances must be made in consultation with the *[Designated Contact]*.~~

2.8.2 All decisions to allow late enrolments must consider the student's likelihood of success following late enrolment. To be accepted for enrolment after 10 per cent of the course duration, students must negotiate and agree an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) with the school and agree to comply with its requirements. Nothing in this section prevents the school from requiring an ILP for any student.

~~2.8.2 All students accepted for enrolment after 10 per cent of the course duration will be provided with an Individual Learning Plan provided by the school. Nothing in this section prevents the school from requiring an Individual Learning Plan for any learner.~~

2.8.3 Until they are officially enrolled at MIT and Unitec, students may not attend classes (in person or online).

2.9. Refusal or cancellation of enrolment

2.9.1 MIT and Unitec may refuse to permit, or may cancel the enrolment of students who:

- Do not meet the minimum entry requirements or any pre-requisites for a programme (see section 2.3: Entry requirements) or course;
- Have a history of repeated enrolments followed by non-attendance, withdrawal, or non-completion;
- Are not of good character ~~(including~~(taking into account factors including, but not limited to, ~~having~~ history of non-payment of fees, a criminal conviction, a history of breaching any tertiary institution's regulations or policies, ~~or~~ misconduct during enrolment or presenting a significant risk to the safety, wellbeing or integrity of the MIT and Unitec community);
- Have been guilty of misconduct or a breach of discipline (see section 15: Student misconduct);
- Have been excluded from a practicum or work placement and an alternative suitable placement is not available;
- ~~.~~
- Are enrolled for full-time instruction in another institution or in secondary school (see section 2.11: Enrolment provisions for specific student groups); or
- Have made insufficient progress at MIT and Unitec or another tertiary institution (see section 13: Insufficient academic progress).

The above factors will not automatically prevent enrolment or re-enrolment at MIT and Unitec. Students who may be affected by this provision are encouraged to discuss their circumstances with the Academic Lead Student (via AskMe! or Student Central) or the Academic Programme Manager, or where they have been excluded, to re-enrol once their period of exclusion has expired.

2.9.2 Students whose enrolment has been cancelled because of misconduct will not be re-enrolled at MIT and Unitec until their term of exclusion has been lifted or expired. The Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; or the Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success, determines the term and conditions of exclusion in each case (see section 15: Student misconduct).

2.9.3 Where, subsequent to enrolment, students are found to have falsified evidence or not disclosed required information relevant to meeting the entry requirements for a programme, this will be treated as misconduct (see section 15: Student misconduct) and is likely to result in

the cancellation of a student's enrolment without a refund of fees (see section 2.9: Refusal or cancellation of enrolment and section 8: Refunding fees).

2.9.4 Where falsification or non-disclosure results in a student no longer meeting the minimum entry requirements for a programme, their enrolment may be ~~automatically~~ cancelled (~~without the need to complete the misconduct investigation process~~ see section 15 Student misconduct and section 16: MIT and Unitec investigation procedure).

2.9.5 Students with an outstanding debt to MIT and Unitec may be ~~excluded~~ precluded from re-enrolling (see section 2.9: Refusal or cancellation of enrolment and section 4.3: Consequences of unpaid fees). Students with a company or other third-party bad debt may re-enrol if they are paying their fees themselves or through a student loan or other third-party. Students cannot enrol or re-enrol using a company or other third-party invoice for payment where the company or third-party has a debt. Students with a history of non-payment of fees may be required to pay their fees before they will be re-enrolled at MIT and Unitec.

2.9.6 Where mandated by the Government, MIT and Unitec may require students to meet certain health or vaccination requirements (or hold a valid exemption) to access MIT and Unitec campuses. MIT and Unitec may refuse to permit or cancel the enrolment of students who do not provide sufficient proof of meeting these criteria within specified timeframes.

~~2.9.7~~ When required, Immigration New Zealand will be immediately notified where enrolments of international students are cancelled.

Formatted: 2.1.1 sub para

2.10. When enrolment becomes official

2.10.1 MIT and Unitec will issue a confirmation of enrolment to students once they have been accepted onto a programme. This will include:

- The specified teaching periods for their courses (course timetable);
- Information about withdrawal periods (see section 6: Withdrawals);
- A statement of applicable fees/course costs for the programme; and
- Any information required under the Education (Pastoral Care of Tertiary and International Learners) Code of Practice.

2.10.2 Students are deemed to be enrolled in a programme when:

- The relevant form(s) for admission, registration and enrolment have been:
  - Completed and signed by the student (forms may be signed either in person or, when enrolling online, by online acceptance);
  - Submitted through the appropriate enrolment channels; and
- They have received an offer of enrolment from MIT and Unitec; and
- They have either:
  - Paid their fees or have made provision for their fees to be paid; or
  - Not paid their fees but have engaged with the course.

2.10.3 If enrolled ~~for~~ in more than 4 credits, students will be issued an ID card at the time of enrolment. This card may be required to access MIT and Unitec services and is required for entry to MIT and Unitec examinations.

2.11. Enrolment provisions for specific student groups

2.11.1 The following table details enrolment provisions for specific student groups:

Group	Enrolment details
Students under 16 years (excluding School of Secondary-Tertiary Studies, Trades Academy, and STAR students)	**Full-time study:** Students under 16 years of age who wish to enrol full-time at MIT and Unitec must provide: ▪ An *Early Leaving Exemption Certificate* from the Ministry of Education ▪ Evidence of support from a parent, guardian, or caregiver. **Part-time study while still at school:** Students under 16 years of age who wish to enrol part-time at MIT and Unitec while staying at school must provide a letter from their school principal confirming that: ▪ They ~~are capable of managing~~can manage both secondary and tertiary study; and ▪ The principal has approved their attendance at MIT and Unitec. Enrolment will only be approved if MIT and Unitec is satisfied the student has a reasonable likelihood of success. Students must be at least 16 years of age at the course start date to be exempt from the above requirements. If they are 15 at the start date, all conditions listed above must be met.

Group	Enrolment details
Students who are still at school *(incl. the School of Secondary-Tertiary Studies, Trades Academy, and STAR students)*	In most cases, students who are enrolled at secondary school cannot be enrolled in courses that require them to be absent from school to complete their studies. These students can only enrol at MIT and Unitec during school hours in specific programmes such as the School of Secondary-Tertiary Studies, Trades Academy, and STAR funded courses.
Students with the Department of Corrections/Forensic Mental Health Services	Students who are in a correctional or forensic mental health facility and wish to apply for a programme not covered by publicly funded programmes designed for prisoners or forensic mental health patients, may be eligible to enrol at MIT and Unitec provided: ▪ They meet the entry requirements for the programme; ▪ They can take part in the programme based on its mode of delivery; ▪ They can fulfil all programme requirements, such as attendance and placement obligations. Such students may have to complete a pre-enrolment assessment to determine their readiness and suitability for study.
Students who are studying in another provider's programme at MIT and Unitec	Students who are not enrolled with MIT and Unitec, but who are studying in a programme delivered by another provider at an MIT and Unitec campus must enrol and follow the enrolment process of that provider. In some cases, these students may be entitled to use specified MIT and Unitec support services (e.g., library, computers, cultural support). Students will be informed where this is the case. Whilst engaging in study based at or through MIT and Unitec these students will have to follow MIT and Unitec regulations, policies, and rules for the use of these services.
International Students	MIT and Unitec may refuse to allow or may cancel the enrolment of international students who do not meet the terms of their student visa. International students who will be under ~~the age of~~ 18 years of age at the commencement of a proposed programme of study, may only be enrolled with the approval of the International Director and: the Manager, Student Experience and Success *or* the Director, Student Success.
Postgraduate programmes	Additional provisions may apply to postgraduate programmes where specified in the relevant Programme Regulations. Students should contact their School for further information.

Formatted: Space Before: 6 pt, After: 6 pt

3. Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills (RPKS)

3.1. General

3.1.1 Recognition of prior knowledge and skills (RPKS) includes assessment and recognition of prior learning, cross credit, and credit transfer. These processes recognise formal, informal, and non-formal learning. Credit may be granted when evidence provided by the applicant shows the learning is:

- Current (see section 3.5: Limitations on the granting of RPKS);
- Equivalent to the learning outcomes of the course for which credit is sought (see section 3.3: Assessment of RPKS); and
- At the same level or a higher level than the course.

Prior learning may include Mātauranga Māori, te reo Māori, tikanga Māori, and knowledge and skills acquired through iwi, marae, whānau, and kaupapa Māori settings, where these can be demonstrated as meeting the applicable requirements for the award of credit.

3.1.2 RPKS credit is assessed and awarded at a course level only. It will not be awarded for an assessment making up part of a course.

3.1.3 RPKS may be pre-approved to allow automatic crediting of courses between agreed programmes through cross credit or credit transfer. This typically occurs through articulation agreements or where students transition from lower-level embedded programmes into higher-level programmes. Where this is available, it will be clearly stated in programme information.

3.1.4 RPKS is available for all programmes subject to limitations outlined in section 3.5: Limitations on the granting of RPKS.

~~3.1.5~~ RPKS is available to current MIT and Unitec students, those in the process of enrolling, and for anyone seeking the award of a qualification through MIT and Unitec (subject to the provisions set out in these Regulations). Non-MIT and Unitec students seeking the award of a qualification from MIT and Unitec through RPKS will have to complete an MIT and Unitec enrolment for the purposes of the awarding of credit for the qualification.

3.2. Applying for RPKS

3.2.1 Students are encouraged to apply for RPKS at the beginning of their programme of study.

~~3.2.1~~3.2.2 Students may apply for RPKS by completing and submitting an *RPKS Application form*.

RPKS Application forms and further information are available on the MIT and Unitec website or from the Campus Admin via AskMe!, ~~the Enrolment Processing Team~~Student Central, or the Academic Programme Manager.

~~3.2.2~~3.2.3 Applicants who wish to seek credit for courses as part of their enrolment~~, must~~ should ~~formally request RPKS at~~submit an RPKS application at least 30 working days before the course start date to allow sufficient time for the application to be assessed and, where approved, for enrolment to be finalised. In some circumstances, a shorter timeframe may be approved~~, unless otherwise agreed by~~ by the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager.

~~3.2.3~~3.2.4 Students seeking credit through RPKS for pre-requisite or compulsory courses in a programme, must obtain RPKS for those courses before enrolling in the subsequent course.

~~3.2.4~~3.2.5 ~~If students realise after starting a course that they may be eligible for RPKS, they should seek guidance from the teacher responsible for the course.~~ Students who believe they may be eligible for RPKS after starting a course, should seek guidance from the academic staff member responsible for the course as soon as practicable. ~~In these circumstances~~ MIT and Unitec withdrawal (see section 6: Withdrawals) and refund (see section 8: Refunding fees) provisions will apply. Students who apply for RPKS after 10 per cent of their course is completed, will not be eligible for a refund of fees. Until RPKS credit is approved, students should remain enrolled and ~~continue attending the course~~meet all course requirements, including attendance and assessment requirements.

~~3.2.5~~3.2.6 International students wishing to be granted RPKS should contact the International Office in the first instance. All international documentation, if not in English, must be authenticated and translated by an approved translator before it is accepted.

3.3. Assessment of RPKS (equivalence assessment)

3.3.1 Applicants for RPKS must provide appropriate and authentic evidence to support their application.

3.3.2 After receiving an RPKS application, MIT and Unitec will assign an RPKS assessor to determine whether the applicant's prior knowledge and skills are current and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes equivalent to the course learning outcomes. Each RPKS application will be considered on its own merits.

3.3.3 Subject to limitations set out in section 3.5 Limitations on the granting of RPKS, applicants whose prior knowledge and skills are equivalent to the achievement of the course learning outcomes will be granted credit for the course.

3.3.4 Students will be kept regularly informed of the progress of their application.

3.3.5 Misconduct during the RPKS process will be treated as academic misconduct and will be dealt with ~~in accordance with~~under student misconduct provisions set out in these Regulations (see section 15: Student misconduct).

3.4. Fees

3.4.1 RPKS fees are charged for the equivalence assessment (see section 3.3: Assessment of RPKS) and are non-refundable. Fees are to be paid prior to the equivalence assessment being undertaken by MIT and Unitec.

3.5. Limitations on the granting of RPKS

3.5.1 Some programmes may limit the recognition of credit through RPKS. Where this is the case, it will be outlined in the Programme Regulations.

3.5.2 Unless otherwise stated in the relevant Programme Regulations or prescribed by an external regulatory body, the following limitations apply to the granting of credit for RPKS:

- Learning for which credit is sought via credit transfer or cross credit must have taken place within the past five years;
- No RPKS credit will be granted for capstone or compulsory research projects, including theses and dissertations, at Level 7 or above; and
- No more than two-thirds of programme credits may be awarded through RPKS.

~~In exceptional circumstances, the Chair of the Academic Committee may waive requirements set out in this section for an individual student or for the programme.~~

~~*Applications to waive these requirements should be made as part of the application for RPKS using the RPKS Application form.*~~

~~3.5.3~~ In most cases, RPKS credits may be counted ~~**can be used once only**~~**only once** towards ~~a~~ the requirements of a specific programme or course.

Formatted: 2.1.1 sub para

3.6. Other considerations

3.6.1 Domestic student eligibility for student loans and allowances may be affected by RPKS.

3.6.2 International students who are granted RPKS may need to update their visa with Immigration New Zealand. They are encouraged to seek advice from the International Office at MIT and Unitec to ensure all visa requirements are met.

3.6.3 Applicants who are dissatisfied with an RPKS decision may raise the matter as set out in section 14: Student concerns and complaints (including academic decisions).

~~3.6.2~~

4. Paying fees

4.1. Domestic students

4.1.1 ~~By the start of the course f~~Fees must be paid in full by the start of the ~~or~~course, or a signed agreement made for payment by instalments as set out in section 4.1.3 below.

4.1.2 To qualify for domestic fees, students must verify their status as a domestic student before enrolling. Domestic students include:

- Citizens or residents of New Zealand, the Cook Islands, Tokelau, or Niue;
- Australian citizens or permanent residents living in New Zealand;
- Recognised refugees and their partners and children; and
- Any other class of visa holder approved for domestic fees by the Ministry of Education.

Students will be considered an international student until sufficient documentation is provided proving they are domestic (see also section 8.3.6: Refunds –– International students).

4.1.3 In exceptional circumstances, students may be approved to pay their fees in instalments. Where students are eligible for a student loan, payment in instalments will not normally be approved. Agreements for the payment of fees in instalments will incur a nonrefundable ~~n~~ administration fee.

Students may apply to pay fees in instalments by completing and submitting an Instalment Application form. Instalment Application forms for domestic students are available from: ~~AskMe!,~~ Academic Registry; or Student Finance. Completed forms must be submitted to ~~AskMe!,~~ Academic Registry or Student Finance along with supporting information.

4.1.4 Where fees are paid by instalment, payment must be completed by the end of the course.

4.1.5 Fees may also be paid by a third-party (e.g., employer).

Students who would like more information about this option should contact Student Finance.

4.2. International students

4.2.1 Fees must be paid in full by the start of the course.

~~4.2.1~~

4.3. Consequences of unpaid fees

4.3.1 Students who do not pay their fees are in breach of their enrolment agreement with MIT and Unitec and may be referred to a debt collection agency. This could result in additional fees and may affect their credit rating.

Students with unpaid fees should contact Student Finance as soon as ~~possible~~ practicable to discuss options for payment.

4.3.2 Until students have paid their fees in full, they will not be:

- Enrolled in further programmes or courses (see section 2.9: Refusal or cancellation of enrolment);
- Issued with an academic transcript (see section 12.~~8~~ 9: Academic Transcript);
- Granted the award for which fees are owed (see section: 19.2: Eligibility for awards); or
- Eligible to have their academic records confirmed to a third-party.

4.4. Fees paid by a company or other third-party

4.4.1 Companies or third parties that agree to pay student fees either in writing to MIT and Unitec or through the provision of a purchase order number, are responsible for any outstanding fees, even if the student withdraws or transfers their enrolment or no longer works for the company.

5. Cancellations, postponements, and timetable changes

5.1. Cancellation or postponement of a programme or course occurrence

5.1.1 MIT and Unitec reserves the right to cancel or postpone a programme or course occurrence if:

- There are insufficient enrolments before the ~~programme or course~~occurrence is planned to start; or
- For any other reason where it is necessary for the sound management of MIT and Unitec and its resources.

Academic delivery may be cancelled or postponed on the following authority:

- Programmes, by the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; or
- Courses, by the Head of School.

When this occurs, affected students will be given as much notice as practicable. For programmes where international students have been enrolled, a minimum of three (3) months' notice will be given before cancellation or postponement, unless an exception is approved by the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic.

5.1.2 Where MIT and Unitec cancels or postpones a programme or course occurrence, and an equivalent cannot be provided, the student will be withdrawn, and all fees will be (as decided by the student):

- Refunded in full; or
- Credited to another programme or course.

5.1.3 Immigration New Zealand will be notified where cancellations or postponements affect international students.

5.1.4 MIT and Unitec disclaims liability in the event of a programme or course occurrence being cancelled or postponed from delivery for an indefinite period because of circumstances beyond MIT and Unitec's control.

5.2. Programme discontinuation

5.2.1 Where MIT and Unitec permanently discontinue a programme, reasonable transition arrangements will be made, where practicable, to enable affected students to complete the programme or to transfer to a suitable alternative qualification.

5.2.2 Transition arrangements may include, but are not limited to:

- Equivalent or replacement courses;
- Programme transfer arrangements;
- RPKS; and/or
- Individual programme completion plans.

The permanent discontinuation of a programme does not entitle a student to a refund of fees paid for courses completed or undertaken before the programme was discontinued.

~~5.2.~~5.3. Timetable changes

~~5.2.1~~5.3.1 MIT and Unitec will endeavour to provide at least one week's notice of timetable changes.

- Where a permanent change is made to the delivery day, time or campus which disadvantages students, MIT and Unitec will endeavour to provide an alternative course that meets their requirements or will withdraw the student enrolment and refund their fees in full.
- Where a temporary change is required to be made to the timetable due to matters outside MIT and Unitec control, alternative delivery options will be provided to ensure students are not disadvantaged by the change.

6. Withdrawals

6.1. General provisions

6.1.1 Students may withdraw from a course before the start date by advising MIT and Unitec in writing (e.g., email or by completing a *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form).

6.1.2 Students may apply to withdraw from a course after the course start date by completing and submitting a *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form.

Forms are available online or from AskMe!, Student Central, Academic Registry or the International Office. Completed forms and supporting information are to be submitted online or to AskMe!, Student Central, Academic Registry or the International Office.

6.1.3 Withdrawal applications will only be accepted before or within the course duration.

6.1.4 The withdrawal date will be the date which the completed *MIT and Unitec Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form is received by the Academic Registry, the International Office or ~~Enrolments Processing Team~~Student Central.

6.1.5 The withdrawal period starts from the course start date, and **not** the programme start date or the date on which the student ~~started the course~~enrolled in or began the course.

6.1.6 Where students transfer between courses, the withdrawal/transfer dates will apply from the start date of the course in which they initially enrolled.

~~6.1.7~~ Withdrawal from a course does not affect a student's right to apply for re-enrolment in that course, except where they have a history of repeated enrolments followed by withdrawal (see section 2.9.1: Refusal or cancellation of enrolment).

Formatted: 2.1.1 sub para

6.1.8 MIT and Unitec may cancel a student's enrolment in a course if pre-requisites are not met (see section 2.9.1: Refusal or cancellation of enrolment). Students who enrol in a course before receiving their results and subsequently fail a pre-requisite will be withdrawn from the affected courses. In such cases, MIT and Unitec will contact the student to discuss alternative course enrolment options ~~and~~ and confirm ~~whether~~ that course fees will be refunded.

6.1.9 Students who enrol and become subject to exclusion because of insufficient academic progress (see section 13: Insufficient Academic Progress) will be withdrawn from any affected courses and associated fees will be refunded (see section 2.9.1: Refusal or cancellation of enrolment and section 13: Insufficient Academic Progress).

6.1.10 Immigration New Zealand will be notified of withdrawals of international students.

6.2. Withdrawal by MIT and Unitec

6.2.1 MIT and Unitec may withdraw students from a course where there is no evidence of course engagement. Before doing this, MIT and Unitec will try to contact students to determine whether they wish to remain enrolled. If students do not respond to these efforts, they will be deemed to have withdrawn.

6.2.2 Students enrolled in attendance-only (non-credit bearing) courses which are ~~which are~~ longer than two weeks ~~will be automatically withdrawn if they do not attend in the first two weeks of their enrolment~~who do not attend within the first two weeks of enrolment will be automatically withdrawn. Students will be ~~advised that they have been~~notified of their withdrawal ~~. These students~~and may not re-enrol ~~unless the~~without the approval of the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; Academic Programme Manager; or delegate ~~approves the re-enrolment~~. Re-enrolment will only be considered in exceptional circumstances such as injury, bereavement, critical family business or company business, and where appropriate written supporting documentation has been supplied.

~~6.2.3 Re-enrolment will only be considered in exceptional circumstances, for instance, injury, bereavement, critical family business or company business, and where appropriate written supporting documentation has been supplied.~~

~~6.2.4~~6.2.3 In exceptional circumstances, students may be withdrawn from a course at the discretion of the: ~~–~~ Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success; the General Manager Schools; the Director, Schools and Performance; or General Manager, Academic Services.

6.3. Academic consequences of withdrawal

6.3.1 The table below outlines what will be recorded on the academic record of students who withdraw, or are withdrawn, from a course (this will apply for both domestic and international students):

Date of withdrawal	Academic Record
Up to 10% of the course duration	There will be no academic record for the relevant course.
After 10% and up to 80% of the course duration	The grade 'W' or 'WD' (withdrawn from course) will be recorded against the relevant course
After 80% of the course duration	The grade 'NC' or 'DNC' (did not complete course) will be recorded against the relevant course

7. Transfers

7.1. Transfers between/within programmes or courses at MIT and Unitec

7.1.1 Students may apply to transfer between MIT and Unitec programmes or courses, or within a programme between strands, specialisations, or majors by completing and submitting a *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form.

Forms are available online or from AskMe!, Student Central, Academic Registry or the International Office. Completed forms and supporting information are to be submitted online or to AskMe!, Student ~~Academic~~Central, Academic Registry or the International Office.

7.1.2 Transfers are only accepted:

- ~~In accordance with~~Where permitted by the relevant Programme Regulations;
- ~~In accordance~~Subject to ~~with~~ section 2.8: Late enrolment;
- Within the current academic year;
- Where places are available in the relevant course; and
- With the approval of the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; Academic Programme Manager; or delegate.

7.1.3 Transfer timeframes are calculated from the start date of the course in which the student enrolled, i.e., where students transfer into a course and later withdraw from that course, the withdrawal date will be calculated from the date of their initial enrolment (see section 6.3~~.1~~: Academic consequences of withdrawal).

7.1.4 The date of transfer will be the date that the completed *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form is received online or by the Academic Registry, ~~,~~ Campus Administration, Student Central, or the International Office.

7.1.5 Transfers are treated as withdrawals for the purposes of the academic consequences entered on the student's academic record (see section 6.3 Academic consequences of withdrawal).

7.1.6 Students who wish to transfer within a suite of nested programmes (e.g., a diploma equivalent to the first year of a degree, or from a postgraduate certificate to a postgraduate diploma), may apply to do so at any time during their enrolment. Where students are transferring courses as part of this process, section 7.1.2 will apply.

7.2. Fees associated with transfers

7.2.1 An administration fee may be charged for each transfer initiated by students. The fee must be paid before the transfer application will be processed.

7.2.2 Where transfers involve the payment of further fees, students must pay or arrange for payment of the additional fees when requesting the transfer.

7.2.3 Students must pay any direct costs (e.g., equipment, uniform, books) incurred by MIT and Unitec because of the transfer.

7.3. Transfers of international students

7.3.1 By accepting a place in an MIT and Unitec programme, international students enter an agreement with MIT and Unitec for the period defined in their student visa. Unless their circumstances fall within specific criteria set out in sections 8.3: Refunds - international

students or 8.4: Refunds on compassionate or exceptional grounds, there will be no transfer of tuition fees for study within this period.

7.3.2 Where Immigration New Zealand requires the payment of one year's tuition fees for students to obtain a visa, no tuition fees will be transferred if the student does not complete the full year of study.

7.3.3 Immigration New Zealand will be notified of transfers of international students.

7.4. Deferral of study of international students

7.4.1 International students can only defer their study for one enrolment period, or as otherwise stated in the Programme Regulations. Applications to defer study must be submitted ~~at least ten (10) working days~~ before the start of the courses the international student wishes to defer. Students who defer their study under this section will not be required to re-establish that they meet English language proficiency requirements when they resume their studies, except as provided for in section 2.5.4.

~~7.4.1~~

7.4.2 International students who wish to defer their study must ~~first meet~~secure a variation of condition visa from ~~with~~ Immigration New Zealand ~~to apply for a change of visa status~~. ~~Once the change of visa has been approved by Immigration New Zealand, students must meet with staff from the International Office to arrange the deferral of their studies.~~ MIT and Unitec will support students with an appropriate letter of offer.

7.4.2

~~7.4.3 Applications to defer study must be submitted at least ten (10) working days before the start of the courses the international student wishes to defer.~~

Formatted: 02_Header

8. Refunding fees

8.1. General provisions

8.1.1 Refunds will only be made as outlined in this section.

8.1.2 Refunds will be calculated from the date that a completed *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form is received by MIT and Unitec (see section 6: Withdrawals).

8.1.3 Except as outlined in this section, students who withdraw from, or cease attending, a course before paying their fees remain responsible for the payment of all outstanding fees.

8.1.4 Where students owe other fees to MIT and Unitec, those fees will be deducted from any refund.

8.1.5 Refunds will be paid directly into a bank account. Printed confirmation of the bank account details (e.g., a deposit slip, bank statement or similar document that meets MIT and Unitec audit requirements) is required before a refund will be made.

8.1.6 Where it is known that student fees have been paid by a recognised third-party (including student loans), the refund will be issued to that third party. The refund will only be paid to the student if they provide sufficient evidence, such as a written authority from the third party, allowing payment to be made to them.

8.1.7 Overpayments will be refunded into the same account from which the funds originated. No exceptions will be granted, except that where the originating bank account has been closed, in which case the overpayment will be refunded into the student's nominated bank account in the same jurisdiction as the originating bank account. Any refunds due to overpayments must be authorised by the General Manager, Academic Services or delegate.

8.1.8 Refunds for international students transferring to another institution will be paid directly to that institution.

8.1.9 Students are responsible for any bank fees, transaction fees, duties, or taxes related to the refund. These may be deducted from the refund amount.

8.1.10 Where MIT and Unitec administer external examinations on behalf of an external organisation (e.g., a regulatory body), fees will be refunded less an administration fee, provided MIT and Unitec is notified of the withdrawal before the cut-off date set each year. Where fees have been sent to the examining body, students must request the refund directly from the appropriate organisation, within the publicised timeframe.

8.1.11 ~~No r~~Refunds of less than $100.00 (including GST) will not be made. Where the refund due to any student within an academic year totals less than $100.00, MIT and Unitec shall retain ownership of the funds.

~~8.1.11~~8.1.12 Exceptions to this section ~~will~~ may be approved by the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic.

8.2. Refunds – Domestic students

8.2.1 Fees for domestic students will only be refunded in the following circumstances:

Circumstances under which fees will be refunded	Refund
▪ All courses other than short courses or micro-credentials - *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form (or email notification) is received by MIT and Unitec before the course start date and up to 10% of the course duration. ▪ Short courses or micro-credentials of 12 weeks duration or less - *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form (or email notification) is received by MIT and Unitec five (5) working days or more prior to the course start date. Micro-credentials over 12 weeks' duration will be treated as a course. ▪ MIT and Unitec withdraws a student where there is no evidence of course engagement (see section 6.2: Withdrawal by MIT and Unitec). ▪ MIT and Unitec ~~cancels~~cancel an enrolment where the student has not passed a pre-requisite course or has made insufficient academic progress (see sections 6.1.8 - 6.1.9: Withdrawals). ▪ Course cancelled or postponed (see section 5: Cancellations, postponements, and timetable changes).	100% tuition fees 100% resource fees where these apply *(provided physical resources are returned unused)*

Circumstances under which fees will be refunded	Refund
▪ Compassionate or exceptional circumstances (see section 8.4: Refunds on compassionate or exceptional grounds).	As determined by the: Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; General Manager, Schools; Director, Schools and Performance; General Manager, Academic Services; or International Director

8.3. Refunds - International students

8.3.1 By accepting a place in a programme, international students enter a legally binding agreement with MIT and Unitec for the period specified in their student visa. Fees will only be refunded in the following circumstances:

Circumstances under which fees will be refunded	Refund
▪ MIT and Unitec declines or withdraws an offer of a place to the student. ▪ A ~~P~~programme or course is cancelled or postponed (see section 5: Cancellations, postponements and timetable changes). ▪ For short courses or micro-credentials of 12 weeks duration or less - *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form (or email notification) is received by MIT and Unitec five (5) working days or more prior to the course start date. Micro-credentials over 12 weeks' duration will be treated as a course.	100% tuition fees 100% resource fees where these apply *(provided physical resources are returned unused)*
▪ The ~~S~~student's visa application or extension to the visa is rejected by Immigration New Zealand, and: – the student has not commenced study for the relevant period – a *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form (or email notification), including appropriate evidence that the application has been rejected by Immigration New Zealand, is received by MIT and Unitec within at least ten (10) working days of the student receiving notification from Immigration New Zealand. ▪ A *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form (or email notification) received by MIT and Unitec at least ten (10) working days before the earliest course start date. ▪ Student is on a student visa and fails to enrol at MIT and Unitec before the start date of the earliest course.	100% tuition fees 100% resource fees where these apply *(provided physical resources are returned unused)* A $500 administration fee will be deducted from the refund ~~A $500 admin fee may be charged~~
▪ Student withdraws from all courses, and a *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form (or email notification) is received by MIT and Unitec within the first ten (10) calendar days after the earliest course start date.	80% of tuition fees 100% of resource fees where these apply *(provided physical resources are returned unused)* A $500 administration fee will be deducted from the refund
▪ *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form requesting transfer to another institution received by MIT and Unitec (including an offer letter from the other institution) at least ten (10) working days before the earliest course start date. ▪ MIT and Unitec ~~withdraws~~withdraw or declines to offer a place before the earliest course start date because of a student supplying fraudulent information.	70% of tuition fees* 100% resource fees where these apply *(provided physical resources are returned unused)* A $500 administration fee will be deducted from the refund

Circumstances under which fees will be refunded	Refund
~~▪ Student has paid one year's tuition fees to be granted a student visa and does not complete the full year of study.~~ ~~▪ Student is on a student visa and fails to enrol at MIT and Unitec before the start date of the earliest course.~~ ▪ *Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form is received by MIT and Unitec ~~less~~ after the first ten (10) calendar days of the earliest course start date.~~than ten (10) working days before the earliest course start date.~~ ▪ Student has started study but has not obtained or maintained a student visa or has had their visa application rejected; ▪ Student has deferred their study for an enrolment period (see section 7.4: Deferral of study of international students) but does not enrol and/or attend as agreed; or ▪ Where Immigration New Zealand requires the enrolment of the student with a special visa application under section 61 of the Immigration Act 2009 to be cancelled. ▪ Enrolment is cancelled because of misconduct (see section 15: Student misconduct).	No tuition or resource fees will be refunded
▪ Compassionate or exceptional circumstances (see section 8.4.~~3~~: Refunds on compassionate or exceptional grounds).	As determined by the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic or General Manager, Schools, or General Manager, Academic Services, or Director, Schools and Performance or International Director; (for International Students only)
Note: Where an international student has paid one year's tuition fees in advance to obtain a student visa and does not complete the full year of study, any tuition fee refund will be determined in accordance with this section based on the date on which the student withdraws, ceases study, or otherwise becomes eligible for a refund.	

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75 cm, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 cm

8.3.2 Notwithstanding section 8.3.1, MIT and Unitec will not reimburse students any commission or fees paid to an agent. Students must seek reimbursement directly from the agent for any fees they have paid. Any commission or fees paid by MIT and Unitec relating to the student recruitment, enrolment, or accommodation will be deducted from the amount of any refund payable. This includes (but is not limited to):

- Agent fees;
- Homestay placement fees;
- Airport shuttle fees;
- Insurance; and
- Any Visa administration fees.

8.3.3 Refunds will be paid to international students upon their return to their home country, except when they transfer to another institution within Aotearoa New Zealand (see section 7.3: Transfers of international students) or obtain a changed immigration visa. MIT and Unitec must be provided with appropriate evidence that the student has ceased studying in New

Zealand. This includes documentation showing the cancellation of their student visa and confirmation of their return home, or verification of the changed immigration visa.

8.3.4 Refunds will be paid in New Zealand dollars or a nominated currency (at the current exchange rate) at the student's or recognised third party's (see section 8.1.6) reasonable discretion. MIT and Unitec is not liable for any exchange rate loss or bank fees charged upon payment of a refund. The agent commission is not refunded.

8.3.5 Refunds will be paid as follows:

- Directly into an overseas nominated bank account in the same jurisdiction from which the funds originated;
- To another institution, if requested in writing with the applicant's signature and supported by evidence of an offer of place by the other institution and a Student Visa for that institution; or
- To the student's bank account in New Zealand on sighting a changed immigration visa.

8.3.6 International students who gain residency after the start of a course will not receive a refund for that course. However, they will be treated as a domestic student for courses that start after they gain residency, whether in the same or a different programme (see section 4.1.2: Domestic student - eligibility for domestic fees). Any international fees paid in advance for courses that have not yet commenced will be refunded, provided the student notifies MIT and Unitec and provides sufficient evidence of their changed residency status.

8.4. Refunds on compassionate or exceptional grounds

8.4.1 To be eligible for a refund on compassionate or exceptional grounds, a student's application to withdraw must be received within the academic year in which they are enrolled, and the following criteria must be met:

- **Compassionate grounds:** where the student's ability to study has been significantly affected by events beyond their control, including but not limited to:
  - Serious illness or injury;
  - Bereavement;
  - Major personal crises or major mental health issues.
- **Exceptional grounds:** where the student's ability to study has been significantly affected by unexpected events beyond their control, including but not limited to:
  - Being called up for New Zealand armed forces duty;
  - Serious impact from being the victim of a crime etc.;
  - Being unable to travel to MIT and Unitec sites due to civil emergency;
  - Errors on the part of MIT and Unitec.

8.4.2 To request a refund on compassionate or exceptional grounds, students must submit a completed *Withdrawal under Compassionate or Exceptional Circumstances Application* form and appropriate documentary evidence (e.g., a medical certificate or other appropriate evidence of the illness, injury, or exceptional circumstances).

For injury or illness, international students must provide medical reports from a registered general practitioner in New Zealand ~~doctor~~. If a student has returned to their home country, the International Office will specify the required documents to support the application. ~~from an Immigration New Zealand approved panel doctor. Further information about approved~~

~~panel doctors is available from the International Office or Student Success or Immigration New Zealand.~~

Withdrawal under Compassionate or Exceptional Circumstances Application Forms are available online or from: Student ~~Student Success~~Support; International Student Support; AskMe!; Student Central, or Academic Registry~~, or the International Office~~. Completed forms and supporting information are to be submitted online or to: Student Support; International Student Support; AskMe!; Student Central, or Academic Registry.

~~*Student Success; AskMe!; Academic Registry; or the International Office.*~~

8.4.3 In deciding whether to ~~Decisions to~~ approve a refund, and the amount ~~refund~~payable, consideration may be ~~consider~~ given to the student's circumstances and the proportion of the course completed before withdrawal~~how much of the course the student has completed before withdrawal~~. Refunds may be approved in full or in part. ~~Partial refunds may be approved.~~ Fees may also be transferred to another course, programme ~~or course~~, ~~or~~ ~~to the same programme or course for a different~~ intake. Students should not expect that repeat applications for compassionate or exceptional refunds will automatically be approved for the same or similar circumstances.

Refunds on compassionate and exceptional grounds will be decided at the discretion of the: Deputy Chief, Executive, Academic; General Manager, Schools; Director, Schools and Performance; General Manager, Academic Services; or International Director (for International Students only).

9. Engagement and attendance

9.1. General provisions

9.1.1 Students are expected to engage in all classes, including being punctual and present for the duration of classes, practica, work placements, and other in-person activities (whether face-to-face or online) and interacting in a timely manner with online content.

9.1.2 Some programmes or courses may have minimum attendance requirements outlined in the ~~programme~~ Programme ~~document~~Regulations. If applicable, these requirements will be communicated to students in course information. Failure to meet these requirements may result in students failing a course. In the absence of any other form of engagement, engagement with the Learning Management System, or other online platforms does not constitute attendance unless expressly stated in the course requirements or approved mode of delivery.

9.1.3 Attendance is recorded by the teacher for the course, for the duration of the course.

9.2. International students

9.2.1 International students must meet Immigration New Zealand attendance requirements to fulfil student visa requirements. Failure to attend may result in deportation. MIT and Unitec therefore ~~urges~~ expect international students to attend 100 per cent of the courses in which they are enrolled.

~~9.2.1~~9.2.2 International students who are unable to attend any scheduled class/es are expected to advise the course teacher, Campus Admin, or International Student Support ~~Student Success~~ as soon as practicable.

~~9.2.2~~9.2.3 In cases where an international student is absent for more than one scheduled course day, or has repeated absences due to illness or injury, they must, as soon as practicable, provide ~~the International Office or Student Success~~International Student Support with:

- A medical certificate from ~~an Immigration New Zealand approved panel~~a registered general practitioner in New Zealand ~~doctor~~ (in the case of illness or injury); or
- Suitable documentation clearly indicating the reason(s) for non-attendance.

9.2.4 Where international students return to their home country due to illness or injury, as outlined in section 8.4: Refunds on compassionate or exceptional grounds, they must ~~as soon as practicable~~ provide MIT and Unitec, as soon as practicable, with a medical report~~s~~ from a

registered general practitioner in New Zealand or such other evidence as may be specified by the International Office ~~doctor~~ ~~an Immigration New Zealand approved panel doctor~~. ~~These~~ This evidence ~~medical reports~~ may be required by Immigration New Zealand ~~to consider~~when assessing whether there were genuine reasons for an absence/s.

~~9.2.3~~9.2.5 Further information about approved visa requirements ~~and panel doctors~~ is available from: Immigration New Zealand~~,~~; ~~International Office~~ or International Student Su~~ccess~~pport~~ccess~~.

10. Student research

10.1. Support for student research

10.1.1 Where research is being undertaken as part of their studies, students will be supported to achieve high research standards. ~~Specifically~~ The following principles (as relevant to the type and level of research being conducted)~~:~~ apply to all student research, with additional requirements for postgraduate theses, dissertations, and research projects set out in section 10.2:~~(as relevant to the type and level of research being conducted):~~

- Staff will guide the development of research proposals;
- The research proposal approval process will be rigorous and supportive;
- Research will be appropriately supervised, and students will have access to the methodological expertise, discipline-specific knowledge, and practical wisdom needed to complete research;
- Completed research must meet academic integrity standards;
- ~~~~
- ~~The r~~Research supervision, assessment, and examination processes will be appropriate to the nature, scope, and level of the research being undertaken~~esearch examination process will be independent and rigorous~~; and
- Students will be encouraged and supported to publish quality-assured research (unless otherwise stated, this applies only to postgraduate research).

Refer to the MIT and Unitec Conduct of Student Research Policy.

10.2. Supervision of postgraduate theses, dissertations, and research projects

10.2.1 Students undertaking a thesis, dissertation, or research project must obtain approval of their research proposal as required by institutional requirements.

10.2.2 ~~Student proposals for a thesis, dissertation, or research project topic must meet the requirements for the type of proposal.~~ Students undertaking a postgraduate thesis, dissertation, or research project must have access to appropriately qualified supervision throughout the research process.

10.2.3 Supervisors will be appointed ~~by the Director Research and Enterprise~~ through the relevant programme processes and in accordance with MIT and Unitec ~~s~~requirements. Supervisors ~~to su~~will support and guide students throughout the research process. Thi~~s~~e appointment of a supervisor will occur no later than six weeks from the start of the thesis, dissertation, or research project.

10.2.4 Internal supervisors must be appropriately qualified, research active, hold Green Light status under the Research Traffic Light Framework, and be included on the MIT and Unitec Register of Supervisors approved by the Director, Research and Enterprise.

~~10.2.1 This appointment will occur no later than six weeks from the start of the thesis, dissertation, or research project.~~

~~10.2.2~~10.2.5 Students undertaking a thesis, dissertation, or research project of 60 credits or more will have at least two supervisors:

- At least one supervisor will have experience of supervising candidates to the successful completion of a Master's or Doctoral research component;
- One supervisor will be designated as the principal supervisor, responsible for regular and frequent supervision~~;~~; and
- Where appropriate, the composition of the supervisory team should take account of the nature of the research, including any significant cultural dimensions, and may include a supervisor or adviser with relevant cultural expertise.

10.2.6 Students undertaking a research project worth fewer than 60 credits may be assigned a single supervisor where this is appropriate to the nature and level of the research.

- ~~Except for external supervisors or advisers, all supervisors shall be recorded in the MIT and Unitec Register of Supervisors;~~
- ~~A candidate undertaking a research project worth fewer than 60 credits may have one supervisor.~~

~~10.2.3~~10.2.7 ~~I~~fWhere a supervisor is unavailable and their absence would unreasonably disadvantage student progress, ~~a substitute~~an alternative supervisor will be appointed by MIT and Unitec.

~~10.2.4~~10.2.8 Where concerns arise regarding the supervisory relationship, the matter may be reviewed by ~~student work is not progressing satisfactorily due to an ineffective relationship with their supervisor(s),~~ the ~~Director Research and Enterprise~~School. Where necessary, alternative supervisory arrangements, including the appointment of a suitably qualified replacement supervisor, may be approved.~~may arrange for a suitably qualified replacement.~~

10.3. Ethical approval for student research

10.3.1 Ethics approval is required for all research, including coursework research, that involves:

- Human or animal subjects;
- Collaborative research between staff and students (to ensure the ethical implications of their relationship are appropriately considered);
- Te Ao Māori and Treaty of Waitangi dimension;

Any use of MIT and Unitec data that is not publicly available. If this data relates to personal or commercially sensitive information, the confidentiality and privacy implications must be considered by the Legal Director. Additionally, if access to the MIT and Unitec student management system is required, approval must be obtained from the General Manager, Academic Services and the Privacy Officer.

10.3.2 Research involving Māori participants, communities or Mātauranga Māori must demonstrate appropriate cultural and ethical considerations, including relevant tikanga, consultation with Māori stakeholders where appropriate, and protection of Māori knowledge;

Formatted: 2.1.1 sub para

10.3.3 Research must not commence without written ethics approval from the MIT and Unitec Ethics Committee.

- For standardised research projects conducted as part of coursework, the teacher responsible for the course will seek ethical approval for the entire course;
- For research that varies from student to student, particularly in higher-level courses, individual approval may be required.

For advice on when and how to seek ethical approval, contact the teacher responsible for your course. A teacher will supervise each student research project that requires ethical approval. See the MIT and Unitec Guidelines for Ethical Approval for further information.

11. Assessment (including Assessment Concessions, Examinations and Academic Integrity)

11.1. Assessment information

11.1.1 Students will be advised at the start of a course about:

- Assessment information and requirements (including learning outcomes, assessment type, assessment weighting, assessment conditions, submission requirements including any mandatory assessments, academic integrity, extensions, late submissions including any penalties, resubmissions, permissible use of ~~Generative AI (~~Artificial Intelligence~~)~~, etc.;
- Assessment timetables;
- Assessment mark and course grade values (including pass requirements);
- How assessment outcomes will be reported;
- How to raise a concern or make a complaint regarding an academic decision and associated appeals provisions; and
- Arrangements ~~for the~~relating to the retention, return, or disposal of assessment evidence where applicable.

11.1.2 Students must familiarise themselves with the assessment rules and procedures for their course.

11.1.3 Students are responsible for satisfying all summative assessment requirements and ensuring they attempt and complete required assessments at the scheduled time and/or place.

11.2. Changes to summative assessment after the course start date

11.2.1 MIT and Unitec will not make changes to summative assessment requirements after a course begins, except in exceptional circumstances. Any such changes will be notified in writing to students enrolled in the course and will not disadvantage any student.

11.3. Summative assessment in te reo Māori

11.3.1 Students wishing to undertake summative assessment in te reo Māori should notify the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager; and the Director Māori Education in writing at enrolment.

Requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. A request will be approved where an assessor and moderator with te reo Māori fluency and subject matter expertise are available. The assessor and moderator must be approved by the Head of School; or Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager; and the Director Māori Education or delegate.

This provision does not apply where proficiency in English or another language is a required learning outcome for the course.

11.3.2 The Head of School; Deputy Head of School; Academic Programme Manager; or delegate will advise the student in writing of the outcome of their request to complete an assessment in te reo Māori as soon as practicable. Standard withdrawal, and refund provisions continue to apply while a request is under consideration and after a decision has been made (see section 6: Withdrawals and section 8: Refunding fees).

Decisions may be made after the commencement of the course where this is necessary to confirm the availability of appropriately qualified assessors and moderators. Notwithstanding section 11.1.1, where a request is approved, assessment information in te reo Māori may be provided after the start of the course.

11.3.3 Any re-sit or resubmission must be completed in the language in which the assessment, or part thereof, was initially submitted.

~~11.3.2 Summative assessment may be completed in te reo Māori, provided an assessor approved by MIT and Unitec for language fluency and subject expertise is available. This does not apply where English or other language capability is specifically required.~~

~~11.3.3 Students wishing to undertake assessments in te reo Māori should notify the *[Delegated Authority]* in writing at enrolment.~~

~~11.3.4 The *[Delegated Authority]* will respond in writing to the request before the start of the course.~~

11.4. Assessment support for students with permanent disabilities or impairment

11.4.1 Students seeking assessment support for ~~with~~ a permanent disability or impairment ~~who are seeking assessment support must should~~must register with Disability ~~Support or~~ Access~~4Success~~ Services as early as practicable and normally within two weeks of the start of the programme (excluding Supported Learning programmes where support arrangements are established through the admission and enrolment process).

Information that is relevant to approved ~~me.~~ assessment support will be shared with relevant programme staff to ensure support is provided consistently. Students will be advised who their information will be shared with at the time of registration.

Information about assessment support, eligibility requirements, available support arrangements, and how to apply is available on the MIT and Unitec websites and from Disability Access Services, AskMe! and Student Central.

11.4.2 Assessment support will be provided through reasonable adjustments and support measures that enable equitable participation in assessment while maintaining academic standards and assessment integrity, and in a manner consistent with applicable Programme Regulations, learning outcomes, competency requirements, and any professional, accreditation, or regulatory standards. Where a requested support arrangement cannot be accommodated, alternative support measures will be considered where appropriate.

Assessment support may include a range of reasonable adjustments and support measures. Examples are set out in section 11.5.16.

~~11.4.1~~11.4.3 Where appropriate, approval for ~~alternative examination arrangements~~assessment support will be granted for the duration of the programme. If time limits apply, this will be clarified at the start of the programme, and students will be informed accordingly.

~~11.4.2~~11.4.4 Students ~~who have~~experiencing a temporary disability ~~or~~, impairment, illness, injury, or other short-term circumstance that affects assessment ~~and who wish to apply for an alternative assessment must follow the~~must apply under the Assessment Concession process (see section 11.5 Assessment concessions).

11.5. Assessment concessions (where personal circumstances affect completion of an assessment)

General

11.5.1 Students may be granted an assessment concession where circumstances beyond their control have adversely affected their ability to prepare for, undertake, complete, submit, or perform in an assessment (e.g. illness, injury, bereavement, or other exceptional circumstances).

11.5.2 Assessment concessions are intended to ensure that students are not unfairly disadvantaged by such circumstances while maintaining the integrity of assessment and academic standards.

11.5.3 The availability of, and any conditions applying to, assessment concessions will be communicated to students through relevant course information and assessment requirements.

11.5.4 Assessment concessions are not an entitlement and will be approved on a case-by-case basis, considering:

- The nature, timing and impact of the circumstances;
- The requirements and conditions of the assessment;
- Advice from the academic staff member responsible for the course;
- The need to maintain academic integrity and standards;
- Any restrictions or requirements contained in the Programme Regulations;
- Any external regulatory, accreditation, or professional body restrictions or requirements; and
- Any other relevant matters.

11.5.5 Depending on the circumstances, an assessment concession may include one or more of the following:

- An extension of time to complete an assessment (see sections 11.5.9 – 11.5.14: Extensions);
- Assessment assistance (see sections 11.5.15 – 11.5.19: Assessment assistance);
- A further assessment opportunity or resubmission (see sections 11.5.20 – 11.5.24); or
- An aegrotat pass (see section 11.5.25 – 11.5.32).

11.5.6 Students seeking an assessment concession must complete the Application for Assessment Concession form and:

- Specify the nature of the circumstances and their impact on the student's ability to undertake, complete, or perform in an assessment;
- Describe the concession sought, where known;
- Include appropriate supporting evidence where relevant (e.g., a medical certificate, professional report, statutory declaration, or other evidence acceptable to MIT and Unitec);

- Be submitted within the specified timeframe relevant to the type of concession sought.

Application for Assessment Concession forms are available on the MIT and Unitec website. Completed forms and supporting information are to be submitted to relevant contact noted on the form.

11.5.7 MIT and Unitec may at its discretion determine that a different assessment concession from that requested by the student is more appropriate in the circumstances and offer that concession as an alternative.

11.5.8 In exceptional circumstances, the decision maker authorised to grant the relevant assessment concession may approve the concession without requiring a formal application from the student. Any concessions granted under this section will be communicated directly to affected students.

Extensions

11.5.9 A short extension of up to five (5) calendar days may be approved at the discretion of the academic staff member responsible for the course.

Short extensions do not require a formal assessment concession application and may be granted without the student demonstrating that they have been affected by circumstances beyond their control. Students seeking a short-term extension should contact the academic staff member responsible for the course to discuss their request.

11.5.10 Students may apply for an extension to an assessment deadline if they are affected by legitimate circumstances beyond their control (e.g., illness, injury, bereavement).

Some courses or assessments may not allow extensions; where this is the case, it will be specified in course information.

11.5.11 Applications for an extension must:

- Be submitted as soon as practicable after a student becomes aware they may need a concession, and before the assessment due date. Late applications may still be considered where the circumstances reasonably prevented earlier submission of the application.
- Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.6).

11.5.12 Extension requests are approved at the discretion of:

- The academic staff member responsible for the course, where the assessment will be completed before the course end date.
- The Programme Committee, where the assessment will be completed up to three (3) months after the course end date.
- The General Manager, Schools or Director, Schools and Performance, and the General Manager, Academic Services; or delegate, where the assessment will be completed more than three (3) months after the course end date.

11.5.13 In exceptional circumstances (e.g., due to student incapacitation or administrative delays), MIT and Unitec may grant an extension without a student request. These are approved by the: Programme Committee; Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager, depending on the situation.

11.5.14 All approved extensions will be confirmed in writing, including the revised due date.

Assessment assistance (where personal circumstances affect completion of an assessment)

11.5.15 Assessment assistance may be available for students experiencing a temporary disability, impairment, illness, injury or other short-term circumstance that affects their ability to take an assessment.

Students with a permanent disability or impairment should apply for assessment support under section 11.4.

11.5.16 Assessment assistance may include but is not limited to one or more of the following:

- Adapted assessment tasks that enable fair and valid assessment, and do not affect the integrity of the assessment;
- Additional time (normally not exceeding 20 minutes for each hour of an examination or test);
- Breaks during a test or examination;
- Assistive technology;
- Alternative room;
- Assistance by a reader and/or writer;
- Assistance by a New Zealand Sign Language interpreter.

11.5.17 Applications for assessment assistance must:

- Be submitted as soon as practicable after a student becomes aware they may need a concession, and at least ten (10) working days before the assessment takes place (or fifteen (15) working days for examinations). Late applications may still be considered where the circumstances reasonably prevented earlier submission and assistance can be reasonably arranged.
- Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.6).

11.5.18 Requests for assessment assistance are approved at the discretion of the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager; and Manager, Disability Access Services or delegate. Assessment assistance may be approved for an individual assessment, or for the duration of a course or programme where appropriate.

11.5.19 All approved assessment assistance arrangements will be confirmed in writing including conditions and timeframes.

Further assessment opportunities and resubmissions (where personal circumstances affect completion of an assessment)

11.5.20 A further assessment opportunity or resubmission opportunity may be approved where circumstances beyond a student's control have adversely affected the student's performance in an assessment.

This opportunity is separate from opportunities for further assessment or resubmission granted to students in situations where they have failed an assessment (see section 11.13: Further Assessment opportunities and resubmissions for failed assessments).

11.5.21 A further assessment opportunity or resubmission may take the form of:

- A resubmission of an assessment already submitted;
- Completion of a replacement assessment;
- A further test or examination (may also be referred to as a resit);
- A repeat practical assessment; or

- Another assessment method approved by the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager.

11.5.22 Applications for further assessment and resubmissions must:

- Be submitted as soon as practicable after a student becomes aware they may need a concession, and no later than five (5) working days after receiving the assessment outcome. If circumstances prevent this, requests may still be considered.
- Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.6).

11.5.23 Requests for further assessment opportunities and resubmissions are approved at the discretion of the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager.

11.5.24 All approved further assessment opportunities or resubmissions will be confirmed in writing, including the new timeframes.

Aegrotat Pass (AP)

11.5.25 An aegrotat pass may be awarded where exceptional circumstances beyond a student's control have prevented successful completion or performance in an assessment and there is sufficient evidence that the student would otherwise have passed the course.

11.5.26 Students may be considered for an aegrotat pass only where:

- The course is achievement based - Aegrotat passes apply only to achievement-based courses and may not be available in all courses or programmes.
- Programme Regulations permit the awarding of an aegrotat pass;
- No reasonable alternative assessment concession is available to the student; and
- The student is enrolled in the course and has paid all fees

Students will not be considered for an aegrotat pass if they fail to present or undertake an assessment due to unfamiliarity with assessment requirements.

11.5.27 Unless otherwise specified in Programme Regulations, students may be considered for a maximum of one aegrotat pass per 120 credits of enrolment. In exceptional circumstances, this limit may be exceeded with the approval of the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic on the recommendation of the Programme Committee and Head of School.

11.5.28 Wherever practicable, students must:

- Attempt the assessment where they can do so despite the circumstances. Where their performance has been materially affected by those circumstances, they may apply to be considered for an aegrotat pass based on impaired performance; and
- Exhaust reasonable alternatives for completing the assessment before seeking consideration for an aegrotat pass. This includes applying for any available assessment concession such as an extension, assessment assistance, or further assessment opportunity or resubmission.

11.5.29 Applications for an Aegrotat pass must:

- Be submitted as soon as practicable after a student becomes aware they may need a concession, and no later than five (5) working days after the date of the affected assessment. If circumstances prevent this, requests may still be considered after the due date.
- Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.6).

Aegrotat passes will not be considered without appropriate evidence, e.g., a medical certificate.

11.5.30 The Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager will determine whether an application for an aegrotat pass meets the criteria for consideration and will accept or decline the application after the application is received. The final decision on whether to award an aegrotat pass is made by the Programme Committee at the end of the course, once all assessments have been completed, and if the student has failed the course.

11.5.31 Having considered the advice of the academic staff member(s) responsible for the course, the Programme Committee may, at its discretion, grant an aegrotat pass if the application meets the requirements set out in section 11.5.6 and it is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that:

- The student has failed the course;
- The student has successfully completed assessments that contribute at least 40% of the total course assessment weighting;
- The course includes more than one summative assessment;
- The student would have passed the course if not for the stated circumstances beyond their control; and
- The student would have achieved all course learning outcomes, if not for the circumstances beyond their control.

For the avoidance of doubt, students who fail to complete a compulsory component of a course will not be eligible to be considered for an aegrotat.

11.5.32 If granted, the grade recorded on the student's academic transcript will be AP (aegrotat pass). If declined, the actual grade achieved will be recorded.

~~Assessment concessions (where personal circumstances affect completion of an assessment)~~**General**

~~11.4.3 Students may be granted an assessment concession where circumstances beyond their control have adversely affected their ability to prepare for, undertake, complete, submit, or perform in an assessment (e.g. illness, injury, bereavement, or other exceptional circumstances).~~

~~11.4.4 Assessment concessions are intended to ensure that students are not unfairly disadvantaged by such circumstances while maintaining the integrity of assessment and academic standards.~~

~~11.4.5 The availability of, and any conditions applying to, assessment concessions will be communicated to students through relevant course information and assessment requirements.~~

~~11.4.6 Assessment concessions are not an entitlement and will be approved on a case-by-case basis, having regard to:~~

- ~~The nature, timing and impact of the circumstances;~~
- ~~The requirements and conditions of the assessment;~~
- ~~Advice from the academic staff member responsible for the course;~~
- ~~The need to maintain academic integrity and standards; and~~
- ~~Any restrictions or requirements contained in the Programme Regulations;~~

- Any external regulatory, accreditation, or professional body restrictions or requirements;and
- Any other relevant matters.

11.4.7 Depending on the circumstances, an assessment concession may include one or more of the following:

- An extension of time to complete an assessment (see sections 11.5.10 – 11.5.15: Extensions);
- Assessment assistance (see sections 11.5.16 – 11.5.20: Assessment assistance);
- A further assessment opportunity or resubmission (see sections 11.5.21 – 11.5.25); or
- An aegrotat pass (see section 12.5.26 – 11.5.33).

11.4.8 Students seeking an assessment concession must complete the Application for Assessment Concession form and:

- Specify the nature of the circumstances and their impact on the student's ability to undertake, complete, or perform in an assessment;
- Describe the assistance or outcomeconcession sought, where known;
- Include appropriate supporting evidence where relevant (e.g., a medical certificate, professional report, statutory declaration, or other evidence acceptable to MIT and Unitec);
- Be submitted within the specified timeframe relevant to the type of concession sought

Application for Assessment Concession forms are available on the MIT and Unitec website. Completed forms and supporting information are to be submitted to relevant contact noted on the form.

11.4.9 MIT and Unitec may at its discretion determine that a different assessment concession from that requested by the student is more appropriate in the circumstances and offer that concession as an alternative.

11.4.10 In exceptional circumstances, the relevant decision maker, according to the type of concession being granted, may grant an assessment concession without requiring a formal application from the student. These opportunities will be communicated directly to affected students.

11.4.11 Outcomes of assessment concession applications will be communicated to the student in writing, including any conditions and timeframes.

Extensions

11.4.12 A short extension of up to five (5) calendar days may be approved at the discretion of the academic staff member responsible for the course.

These extensions do not require a formal assessment concession application. Students seeking a short-term extension should contact the academic staff member responsible for the course to discuss their request.

11.4.13 Students may apply for an extension to an assessment deadline if they are affected by legitimate circumstances beyond their control (e.g., illness, injury, bereavement).

Some courses or assessments may not allow extensions; where this is the case, it will be specified in course information.

11.4.14 Applications for an extension must:

- Be submitted as soon as practicable after a student becomes aware they may need a concession, and wherever possible no later than five (5) working days before the assessment due date. If circumstances prevent this, requests may still be considered after the due date.
- Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.6).

11.4.15 Extension requests are approved at the discretion of:

- The academic staff member responsible for the course, where the assessment will be completed before the course end date.
- The Programme Committee, where the assessment will be completed up to three (3) months after the course end date.
- The General Manager, Schools and the General Manager, Academic Services or delegate, where the assessment will be completed more than three (3) months after the course end date.

11.4.16 In exceptional circumstances (e.g., due to student incapacitation or administrative delays), MIT and Unitec may grant an extension without a student request. These are approved by the: Programme Committee; Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager, depending on the situation.

11.4.17 All approved extensions will be confirmed in writing, including the revised due date.

Assessment assistance

11.4.18 Assessment assistance may be available for students experiencing a temporary disability, impairment, illness, injury or other short term circumstance that affects their ability to take an assessment.

Students with a permanent disability or impairment should apply for assessment support under section 11.4.

11.4.19 Assessment assistance may include but is not limited to one or more of the following:

- Adapted assessment tasks that enable fair and valid assessment, and do not affect the integrity of the assessment;
- Additional time (normally not exceeding 20 minutes for each hour of an examination or test);
- Breaks during a test or examination;
- Assistive technology;
- Alternative room;
- Assistance by a reader and/or writer;
- Assistance by a New Zealand Sign Language interpreter.

11.4.20 Applications for assessment assistance must:

- Be submitted as soon as practicable after a student becomes aware they may need a concession, and at least ten (10) working days before the assessment takes place (or fifteen (15) working days for examinations).
- Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.6).

11.4.21 Requests for assessment assistance are approved at the discretion of the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager; and Manager, Disability Access Services or delegate. Assessment assistance may be approved for an individual assessment, or for the duration of a course or programme where appropriate.

11.4.22 All approved assessment assistance arrangements will be confirmed in writing including conditions and timeframes.

Further assessment opportunities and resubmissions

11.4.23 A further assessment opportunity or resubmission opportunity may be approved where circumstances beyond a student's control have adversely affected the student's performance in an assessment.

11.4.24 A further assessment opportunity or resubmission may take the form of:

- A resubmission of an assessment already submitted;
- Completion of a replacement assessment;
- A further test or examination (may also be referred to as a resit);
- A repeat practical assessment; or
- Another assessment method approved by the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager.

11.4.25 Applications for further assessment and resubmissions must:

- Be submitted as soon as practicable after a student becomes aware they may need a concession, and wherever possible no later than five (5) working days after receiving the assessment outcome. If circumstances prevent this, requests may still be considered.
- Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.1 and 11.5.26).

11.4.26 Requests for further assessment opportunities and resubmissions are approved at the discretion of the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager.

11.4.27 All approved further assessment opportunities or resubmissions will be confirmed in writing, including the new time frames.

Aegrotat pass

11.4.28 An aegrotat pass may be awarded where exceptional circumstances beyond a student's control have prevented successful completion or performance in an assessment and there is sufficient evidence that the student would otherwise have passed the course.

11.4.29 Students may be considered for an aegrotat pass only where:

- The course is achievement based - Aegrotat passes apply only to achievement-based courses and may not be available in all courses or programmes.
- Programme Regulations permit the awarding of an aegrotat pass;
- No alternative assessment concession is available to the student; and
- The student is enrolled in the course and has paid all fees

Students will not be considered for an aegrotat pass if they fail to present or undertake an assessment due to unfamiliarity with assessment requirements.

11.4.30 Unless otherwise specified in Programme Regulations, students may be considered for a maximum of one aegrotat pass per 120 credits of enrolment. This means a student must be enrolled in a programme of at least 120 credits to qualify for an aegrotat pass.

11.4.31 Wherever practicable, students must:

- Attempt the assessment where they are able to do so despite the circumstances. Where their performance has been materially affected by those circumstances, they may apply to be considered for an aegrotat pass on the basis of impaired performance; and
- Exhaust reasonable alternatives to completing the assessment before seeking consideration for an aegrotat pass. This includes applying for any available assessment concession such as an extension, assessment assistance, or further assessment opportunity or resubmission.

- Applications to be considered for an Aegrotat pass must:
  - Be submitted as soon as practicable after a student becomes aware they may need a concession, and wherever possible no later than five (5) working days after the date of the affected assessment. If circumstances prevent this, requests may still be considered after the due date.
  - Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.6).

  Aegrotat passes will not be considered without appropriate evidence, e.g., a medical certificate.

Formatted: 2.1.1 sub para

11.4.32 The Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager will determine whether an application for an aegrotat pass meets the criteria for consideration and will accept or decline the application after the application is received. The final decision on whether to award an aegrotat pass is made by the Programme Committee at the end of the course, once all assessments have been completed, and if the student has failed the course.

11.4.33 Having considered the advice of the academic staff member(s) responsible for the course, the Programme Committee may, at its discretion, grant an aegrotat pass if it is satisfied that:

- The student would otherwise fail the course;
- The student has successfully completed assessments that contribute at least 40% of the total course assessment weighting;
- The course includes more than one summative assessment;
- The student would have passed the course if not for the stated circumstances beyond their control; and

For the avoidance of doubt, students who fail to complete a compulsory component of a course will not be eligible to be considered for an aegrotat.

11.4.34 If granted, the grade recorded on the student's academic transcript will be AP (aegrotat pass). If declined, the actual grade achieved will be recorded.

11.4.35 Students whose ability to prepare for or complete an assessment is impacted by circumstances beyond their control (e.g., illness, injury, bereavement, or other situations) may be eligible for an assessment concession. Concessions may include one or more of the following:

- An extension of time to complete an assessment (see sections 11.5.3 – 11.5.8: Extensions);
- Assessment assistance (see sections 11.5.9 – 11.5.13: Assessment assistance);

- An opportunity for further assessment or resubmission (see section 11.13: Further assessment and resubmission);
- Aegrotat pass (see section 12.7: Aegrotat Pass).
- Affected students should contact the staff member responsible for their course as soon as possible to discuss their options. Students seeking an assessment concession must complete the *Application for Assessment Concession* form. Applications must state the type of concession(s) being requested and include relevant supporting documentation (e.g., medical certificate, professional report, or other appropriate evidence).

Application for Assessment Concession forms are available on the MIT and Unitec website. Completed forms and supporting information are to be submitted to the [Designated Contact].

Exception: In some cases, MIT and Unitec may offer an assessment concession directly to students (e.g., an extension, further assessment, or resubmission opportunity). These opportunities will be communicated directly to affected students. staff member responsible for the course, or school contact.Extensi

Short-term extensions of five (5) calendar days or fewer may be granted at the discretion of the staff member responsible for the course. These extensions are managed outside the formal assessment concession process.

Students seeking a short-term extension should contact the staff member responsible for their course to discuss their request.

Students may apply for an extension to an assessment deadline if they are affected by legitimate circumstances beyond their control (e.g., illness, injury, bereavement). Some courses or assessments may not allow extensions; where this is the case, it will be specified in course information.

11.4.36 Applications for an extension must:

- Be submitted as soon as possible after a student becomes aware they may need an extension. Wherever possible, applications for an extension should be submitted before the assessment due date. If circumstances prevent this, requests may still be considered after the due date.
- Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.1 and 11.5.2).

11.4.37 Extension requests are approved at the discretion of:

- The staff member responsible for the assessment, if the assessment will be completed before the course end date.
- The Programme Committee, tthe assessment will be completed up to three months after the course end date.
- The General Manager, Schools and the General Manager, Academic Services , if tthe assessment will be completed more than three months after the course end date.

11.4.38 In exceptional circumstances (e.g., due to student incapacitation or administrative delays), MIT and Unitec may grant an extension without a student request. These are approved by the Programme Committee or Head of School, Deputy Head of School or Academic Programme Manager, depending on the situation.

11.4.39 Short-term extensions of five (5) calendar days or fewer may be granted at the discretion of the staff member responsible for the course. These extensions are managed outside the formal assessment concession process.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 3.25 cm, No bullets or numbering

~~*Students seeking a short-term extension should contact the staff member responsible for their course to discuss their request.*~~

~~11.4.40 All approved extensions will be confirmed in writing, including the revised due date.~~

~~Assessment assistance~~

~~11.4.41 Assessment assistance may be available for students with impairments or conditions such as a disability, illness, or injury who need assistance to take an examination, test, or other form of assessment.~~

~~11.4.42 Assessment assistance may include but is not limited to one or more of the following:~~

- ~~Adapted assessment tasks that enable fair and valid assessment, and do not affect the integrity of the assessment;~~
- ~~Additional time (normally not exceeding 20 minutes for each hour of an examination or test);~~
- ~~Breaks during a test or examination;~~
- ~~Assistive technology;~~
- ~~Alternative room;~~
- ~~Assistance by a reader and/or writer;~~
- ~~Assistance by a New Zealand Sign Language interpreter.~~

~~11.4.43 Applications for assessment assistance must:~~

- ~~Be submitted at least ten (10) working days before the assessment takes place (or 15 working days for examinations).~~
- ~~Use the *Application for Assessment Concession form* (see section 11.5.1 and 11.5.2).~~

~~11.4.44 Requests for assessment assistance are approved at the discretion of the Head of School, or Deputy Head of School, or Academic Programme Manager~~ and ~~Co-ordinator Disability Support in consultation with relevant staff. The *[Delegated Authority]* may approve assistance for the duration of a programme or course where they consider it appropriate.~~

~~11.4.45 All approved applications for assessment assistance will be confirmed in writing. that students complete summative assessments with the help of an extension (see sections 11.5.3 to 11.5.8), assessment assistance (see Section 11.5.9 to 11.5.13), or a further assessment or resubmission opportunity (see Section 11.5.13), rather than applying for an aegrotat pass; andHead of School, or Deputy Head of School, or Academic Programme Manager~~

~~11.5.~~11.6. Academic integrity

~~11.5.1~~11.6.1 Students must follow any direction given by the assessor or assessment supervisor and any rules that apply (e.g., rules specifying the type of equipment and technology that may be used, time limits and the need for silence).

~~11.5.2~~11.6.2 Students must act honestly in all assessments. All work submitted for summative assessment must:

- ~~reflect~~ Reflect ~~their~~ the student's own learning;
- ~~be written, authored, or created by them~~Represent the student's own work (be written, authored, or created by them); and
- ~~be their own work~~Accurately acknowledge the contribution of others where used.

The use of work, ideas, words, images or other material created by others must comply with the referencing and acknowledgement requirements set out in ~~(unless formally referenced and acknowledged - see~~ section 11.7 Plagiarism~~)~~.

Work must not be submitted elsewhere in any other programme or course unless otherwise permitted in writing by the staff responsible for both the initial assessment and the subsequent assessment.

~~11.5.3~~11.6.3 Notwithstanding section 11.6.2, work may be presented by a group of students for summative assessment where this is specified in the assessment information.

~~11.5.4~~11.6.4 MIT and Unitec ~~treats~~treat academic misconduct very seriously. Academic misconduct is defined in the Glossary (see section 25: Glossary) and includes any attempt by students to gain an unfair advantage in a summative assessment, such as cheating, plagiarism, unpermitted use of Artificial Intelligence, or sharing of information about an assessment. Suspected incidents of misconduct will be addressed as outlined in section 15: Student misconduct. If an investigation is required, the investigation will be carried out ~~in accordance with~~under section 16: MIT and Unitec investigation procedure~~s~~.

~~11.6.~~11.7. Plagiarism

~~11.6.1~~11.7.1 Plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct (see section 15: Student misconduct) and is forbidden.

~~11.6.2~~11.7.2 Plagiarism involves using someone else's work, including work generated by ~~artificial~~ Artificial ~~intelligence~~Intelligence, without indicating that the ideas are not your own. It can be intentional or unintentional and includes paraphrasing or copying information from other sources (e.g., from books, journal articles, electronic sources such as ~~Generative AI~~Artificial Intelligence, the internet or databases, sound recordings, films, other students, or your own previous work) without proper acknowledgment or referencing.

11.7.3 All third-party material used for assessment, including content, ideas, or outputs generated with the assistance of Artificial Intelligence tools, must be formally referenced and acknowledged. ~~Guidelines for appropriately referencing and acknowledging other people's work are available from the library.~~ Guidelines for referencing and acknowledging the work of others, including Artificial Intelligence assisted content, are available from the library.

~~11.6.3~~11.7.4 MIT and Unitec regularly use similarity-checking software (e.g., Turnitin) or other methods to confirm that an assessment is the work of the student and has not previously been submitted for assessment (see section 11.6: Academic integrity). Work may be retained in a similarity-checking database for on-going comparison with other work submitted.

~~11.6.4~~11.7.5 By enrolling in a course at MIT and Unitec, students consent to the use of reasonable methods to confirm the integrity of assessments. This includes the submission of their work to similarity-checking software. Refusal to permit the use of, or submission of work in a manner that prevents or materially impairs the effective use of, such software may result in students being unable to complete their course or programme.

~~11.7.~~11.8. Late or non-submission of an assessment, or failure to attend a practical assessment, test, or examination

~~11.7.1~~11.8.1 Students may be penalised for the late submission of an assessment if they have not been granted an extension. Penalties may include a reduction of marks or non-marking of an assessment.

~~11.7.2~~11.8.2 In some cases, late or non-submission of an assessment or failure to attend a practical assessment, test, or examination may result in students failing the course (e.g., where the assessment is compulsory or makes up a significant number of marks for the course).

~~11.7.3~~11.8.3 Schools will establish a fair and consistent means of calculating penalties and consequences for late or non-submission of an assessment. Penalties and consequences for late or non-submission of an assessment, or failure to attend a practical assessment, test or examination will be communicated to students in course information at the start of the course.

~~11.7.4~~11.8.4 For postgraduate research courses, unless an extension has been granted by ~~the Supervisor or Head of School, or Deputy Head of School, or Academic Programme Manager, or delegate~~the appropriate delegated authority no late work will be accepted for marking, except in exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student (see section 11.5.~~3~~9 – 11.5.~~8~~14: Assessment Concessions - extensions).

~~11.7.5~~11.8.5 Students will not be disadvantaged or penalised for the late submission of an assessment or failure to complete a test or examination where this is because of an MIT and Unitec technology failure or other MIT and Unitec issue.

~~11.8.~~11.9. Examinations (excluding theses, dissertations, and research projects)

This section applies to all assessments identified in course information as examinations or assessments conducted under examination conditions.

~~11.8.1~~11.9.1 Examination weeks will be published and made available to students before the online enrolment portal opens. Students will be informed about examination dates and times at least six weeks before the examination.

~~11.8.2~~11.9.2 If students have two or more examinations scheduled at the same time (a clash), they must inform the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager in writing as soon as ~~possible~~ practicable (ideally at least 20 working days before the examinations) so alternative arrangements can be made.

11.9.3 Except as outlined in section 11.9.2, examinations must be completed at the time outlined in the published timetable. Students can only sit an examination at another time if prior approval has been granted through an Assessment Concession (see section 11.5.~~3 - 11.5.8~~). In such cases, the examiner may allow students to sit the examination at a different place and/or a different time. Unless exceptional circumstances apply, the examination must be completed within three weeks of the initial examination. An alternative examination will be used in such instances.

In exceptional circumstances, including serious illness or injury, the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager may approve a later examination date.

A Confidentiality Agreement must be signed by students sitting an identical exam before the time/date specified on the examination timetable.

~~11.8.3~~11.9.4 Examination methods at MIT and Unitec include:

Paper-based examinations:

- Open Book - Students may bring physical books or notes into the examination. No electronic materials are permitted. Prepared resources must not be attached to the answer booklet.
- Restricted Book - Students may only bring examiner-approved physical resources into the examination. The examiner will specify whether annotations are permitted.
- Closed Book - Students may not bring any written, printed, or electronic resources into the examination.

Digital examinations:

- Digital Closed Book - Examinations take place on a secure digital platform with internet access disabled. An Exam Code may be issued to restrict access to the internet.
- Digital Restricted Book - Examinations take place on a secure digital platform with internet access restricted, except for online resources approved by the examiner. Limited paper-based resources may also be allowed by the examiner. The examiner will specify whether annotations are permitted.

Other examination methods

- Examinations may be conducted using alternative formats (e.g., oral, practical, performance-based, or innovative digital methods), where approved by the Programme Committee.

~~11.8.4~~11.9.5 Students will be notified in advance of ~~the~~ an examination of items they are permitted to bring into the examination room.

~~11.8.5~~11.9.6 Examinations will be held with an invigilator or examiner present.

Entering and leaving the examination room

~~11.8.6~~11.9.7 Only students registered for the named examination(s) and staff authorised by the course examiner, exam supervisor or invigilator are permitted to enter the examination room.

~~11.8.7~~11.9.8 Students may enter the examination room up to 15 minutes before the scheduled start time.

~~11.8.8~~11.9.9 Students may not enter the examination room after half of the examination time has elapsed (not including reading time).

~~11.8.9~~11.9.10 Students may not leave or return to the examination room before half of the examination has elapsed (not including reading time) unless the invigilator or supervisor gives permission, and the student has surrendered their examination materials (e.g., answer booklets, notes or digital submission in progress).

~~11.8.10~~11.9.11 If students request a toilet break:

- ~~During writing time: An~~An invigilator or supervisor must accompany them. Students must empty their pockets and show they are not carrying any unauthorised materials or devices.
- ~~During reading time: Toilet breaks are not allowed.~~
- Students must not access any unauthorised materials, devices, or communication during toilet breaks.

~~11.8.11~~11.9.12 Students may not leave the examination room in the final 15 minutes of the examination.

~~11.8.12~~

Student identification and anonymous marking of examinations

~~11.8.13~~11.9.13 Students must:

- Bring their student ID card to the examination and display it clearly on their desk;

  For digital examinations, identity verification will additionally include logging in with student account credentials, or a unique Exam Code where applicable.
- Complete the attendance slip provided and display it alongside their student ID; and
- Enter only their student ID number on the examination booklets or digital submissions. Names must not appear unless the digital platform requires it.

Students without student ID cards may still be permitted to sit an examination if their identity can be verified by providing another official photo ID (e.g., driver's license, passport), or course examiner verification. Students whose identity is unable to be confirmed may be refused entry to the examination.

~~11.8.14~~11.9.14 Students may be recorded at any time during examinations for the purposes of identity verification and academic integrity or other misconduct issues. Monitoring may include face recognition technology and/or by identification through log-in credential.

Expectations of students during examination

~~11.8.15~~11.9.15 Students must:

- Comply with all instructions given by the invigilators and supervisors, and those outlined in examination materials or displayed in the examination room; and
- Behave in a way that does not disrupt the examination process, distract other students, or breach any of the rules outlined in any MIT and Unitec ~~Student R~~regulations or policies.

~~11.8.16~~11.9.16 During examinations, students must not:

- Communicate verbally, non-verbally or digitally with anyone other than the invigilator or supervisor;
- Lend, borrow, or share materials with another student;
- Use or attempt to use unauthorised electronic devices, storage media, or communication technologies; or
- Remove from the examination room any question papers, answer scripts or other resources provided for use during the examination or any other material that is the property of MIT and Unitec (unless expressly permitted).

~~11.8.17~~11.9.17 If students are suspected of breaching any examination regulations or causing any incident which may have negatively affected the examination process:

- The student will normally be permitted to complete the examination; and
- The invigilator will document the incident in detail using an *Incident Report* form which will be sent to the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager; and examiner after the examination.

~~11.8.18~~11.9.18 If a student refuses to follow any direct instructions from an invigilator or supervisor, or behaves in a disruptive manner, the examiner, exam invigilator or supervisor~~, in consultation with the examiner,~~ may require the student to leave the examination. Once removed, they may not return.

~~11.8.19~~11.9.19 Students must stop writing immediately when the invigilator announces the end of the examination unless they have been granted additional time as part of assessment support (see section 11.4: Assessment support) or an assessment concession (see section 11.5.~~9~~15- 11.5.~~13~~19 ~~–~~: Assessment concessions – assessment assistance). If students carry on writing after the end of the examination has been announced, the invigilator will complete an *Incident Report* form, which will be sent to the examiner.

~~11.8.20~~11.9.20 For digital examinations, the system will usually automatically submit saved answers at the end of the allotted time. Any attempt to circumvent this process, including by entering the exam late, will be considered academic misconduct.

~~11.8.21~~11.9.21 Students who enter the exam late must finish at the time set by the examiner and will not be granted additional time.

~~11.8.22~~11.9.22 All incident reports in relation to students disobeying the examination regulations will be dealt with ~~in accordance with~~as set out in MIT and Unitec misconduct provisions (see section 15: Student misconduct).

~~11.8.23~~11.9.23 Students will have time to read the examination question paper before the examination begins. However, extra time to read over their answers or make any amendments or additions to their answers is not allowed unless ~~special assistance~~assessment support (see section 11.4: Assessment support or ~~alternative arrangements~~assessment assistance ~~have been approved~~ (see section 11.5.~~9~~15 – 11.5.~~13~~19: Assessment concessions - Assessment assistance) has been approved.

~~11.9.~~11.10. Postgraduate thesis, dissertation, and research project assessment

11.10.1 Theses, dissertations, and research projects will not be accepted for examination unless students are enrolled on the relevant course when they submit the work, and provided all documentation required by MIT and Unitec for examinations, including declarations of authorship and academic integrity, confirmation of ethics compliance, and permissions relating to the storage and dissemination of the work.

~~11.9.1 *a signed Examination Declaration form is provided at the time of submission.*~~

~~*Examination Declaration*~~*Required forms are available on the MIT and Unitec website.*

~~11.9.2~~11.10.2 Theses, dissertations, and research projects of 60 credits or more will be assessed by at least two examiners, including one independent external examiner. Supervisors or advisers cannot be examiners of research they have supervised or advised on.

~~11.9.3~~11.10.3 Research components of less than 60 credits must be assessed by a person who has not acted as the student's supervisor or adviser and must be moderated by a person other than the assessor, the candidate's supervisor, or adviser.

~~11.9.4~~11.10.4 Examiners must have relevant qualifications and experience. At least one examiner must be a specialist in the study area. At least one examiner must have substantial experience examining postgraduate candidates.

~~11.9.5~~11.10.5 Matters of academic integrity will be dealt with ~~in accordance with~~as set out in section 11.6: Academic integrity.

~~11.9.6~~11.10.6 Examiners will assess the student's work and will recommend a grade to the Programme Committee (for work of less than 90 credits) or to the Postgraduate Research Committee (for work of 90 credits or more). They may recommend that the work be:

- Accepted and a grade awarded;
- Accepted with minor amendments, then a grade awarded;
- Rejected and given a grade, but allowed to be revised, resubmitted, and re-examined with the award of a minimum pass grade; or
- Failed with no right of resubmission.

11.10.7 Where the recommended grades of examiners differ~~,~~:

- For work of less than 90 credits, t~~t~~he Programme Committee will determine the final grade; and
- For work of 90 credits or more, ~~(for work of less than 90 credits) or to~~ the Postgraduate Research Committee ~~(for work of 90 credits or more)~~ will determine the final grade.

~~To reach a decision~~In determining the final grade, the Programme Committee or Postgraduate Research Committee will consult with the examiners and may appoint an independent adjudicator.

11.10.8 Any candidate who is required to re-submit or significantly revise a postgraduate research thesis, dissertation, or research project must do so within three (3) months from the date of notification of the result. Where supervisory support is required during this period, the candidate may be required to re-enrol and pay the applicable fees. International students must maintain an appropriate enrolment for the duration of the resubmission or revision period.

~~11.10.~~11.11. Re-counts and the return of assessment evidence

~~11.10.1~~11.11.1 ~~**Assessments**~~ **Non-examination assessments** (~~other~~ excluding ~~than examinations and~~ postgraduate thesis, dissertation, and research projects)~~ after summative assessment, students~~ following the release of an assessment outcome, students:

- Will receive their marked assessment and outcome, unless return risks its security (e.g., where the same assessment may be used more than once). In such cases, students will receive feedback but must return all materials, including their marked assessment;
- Will receive feedback on what was expected and how results were determined to help monitor their progress;
- May apply for a re-count of marks to check that all questions have been marked, and no counting errors were made. A re-count may lead to no change or either a raising or a lowering of the original mark. Applications must be submitted within ten (10) working days of receiving an assessment outcome. Re-marks are not available.

To apply for a re-count of marks, students must submit a completed Re-count Application form to ~~course lecturer~~the academic staff member responsible for the course or their delegate. Forms are available on the MIT and Unitec website. Outcomes are typically communicated within five (5) working days.

~~11.10.2~~11.11.2 **Examinations –** within ten (10) working days of receiving examination results, students:

- May apply for a copy of their marked examination script or to view their marked script, unless return risks its security (e.g., where the same assessment may be used more than once).
- May apply for a re-count of marks to check that all questions have been marked, and no counting errors were made. Applications must be submitted within ten (10) working days of receiving an assessment outcome. Re-marks are not available.

After ten (10) working days, examination scripts (or copies) will be available, but re-counts will not be considered.

To request a copy of their examination script, to view their marked script, or to apply for a re-count of marks, students should submit a completed Examination Script Request form to the~~:~~ ~~Course~~ academic staff member responsible for the course~~Lecturer,~~; Campus Admin team; or Exams Office. Forms are available on the MIT and Unitec website.

~~11.10.3~~11.11.3 **Postgraduate theses, dissertations, and research projects** – There is no re-count opportunity for postgraduate thesis, dissertation, or research project. Students may appeal a decision under provisions detailed in section 14: Student concerns and complaints (including academic decisions).

~~11.10.4~~11.11.4 Students who have concerns about the marking of their assessment should address this ~~in accordance with~~ as set out in the MIT and Unitec student concerns and complaints process (see section 14: Student concerns and complaints (including academic decisions).

~~11.10.5~~11.11.5 MIT and Unitec will retain copies of all marked assessments, including practical assessments and examination scripts for at least twelve (12) months after course completion, unless a longer retention period is required by an external authority. After this period assessment evidence may be destroyed, and copies will no longer be available.

~~11.11.~~11.12. Notification of summative assessment outcomes

~~11.11.1~~11.12.1 All summative assessments other than postgraduate thesis, dissertations, and research projects will be marked, and students notified of outcomes within 15 working days of the assessment due date. Students will be notified where this is not possible. Timeframes for postgraduate thesis, dissertations and research projects will be advised to students.

11.13. Further assessment opportunities and resubmissions (excluding opportunities as part of an assessment concession)

11.13.1 This section applies only to further assessment opportunities and resubmissions made available following failure of an assessment. It does not apply where a further assessment opportunity or resubmission is approved as an assessment concession under section 11.5.

11.13.2 Students who fail an assessment may be granted one opportunity for further assessment or resubmission, unless otherwise specified in the Programme Regulations or assessment conditions for an NZQA Standard.

11.13.3 The availability and conditions applying to further assessment opportunities and resubmissions will be specified in relevant course information and assessment requirements.

11.13.4 Where a further assessment opportunity or resubmission is available, eligible students will be notified of the opportunity. Students are not required to apply for a further assessment opportunity or resubmission. The academic staff member responsible for the course will record the details of all further assessment opportunities and resubmissions provided.

11.13.5 Unless otherwise specified in the Programme Regulations, the maximum mark available for a further assessment opportunity or resubmission under this section is the minimum pass mark.

For the avoidance of doubt, this provision does not apply to further assessments or resubmission opportunities granted as an assessment concession under section 11.5 of these Regulations.

11.13.6 Students whose assessment result is affected by academic misconduct are not normally eligible for a further assessment opportunity or resubmission. An exception may be approved only in exceptional circumstances by ~~the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager~~the person imposing the misconduct penalty (see section 15.4: Penalties for student misconduct).

11.13.7 All approved further assessment opportunities or resubmissions will be confirmed in writing, including the new timeframes.

~~Furtherassessment and resubmission~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2.09 cm, No bullets or numbering

- ~~Students who fail an assessment may be granted one opportunity for further assessment or resubmission. , unless otherwise specified in the Programme Regulations or assessment conditions for an NZQA Standard. Head of School, Deputy Head of School or Academic Programme Manager~~

~~11.11.2 Unless otherwise indicated in the Programme Regulations, the maximum mark available for a further assessment or resubmission is the minimum pass mark.~~

~~11.11.3 Applications for further assessment or resubmission must:~~

- ~~Be submitted within five (5) working days of receiving the marked assessment.~~

~~Details around fees, restrictions, or limitations for further assessment or resubmissions are provided in the Programme Regulations and course information.~~

~~11.11.4 Further assessment and resubmission requests are approved at the discretion of the Head of School, Deputy Head of School or Academic Programme Manager.In certain circumstances (e.g., for assessment or skill standards), MIT and Unitec may offer students a further assessment or resubmission opportunity without requiring a formal request. Where this applies, details will be outlined in the relevant course information and communicated to affected students.~~

~~11.11.5 All approved opportunities for further assessment or resubmission will be confirmed in writing, including the new time frames.~~

~~11.11.6 Unless otherwise indicated in the Programme Regulations, the maximum mark available for a further assessment or resubmission is the minimum pass mark.~~

~~11.12.~~11.14. Moderation

11.14.1 Summative assessments submitted by students may be subject to internal and external moderation. Presentations and/or practical assessments may be recorded or photographed and retained as evidence for moderation purposes.

11.15. Retention of assessment evidence

11.15.1 MIT and Unitec will retain assessment evidence, including evidence subject to internal or external moderation, for the period required by applicable statutory or regulatory requirements. Once the required retention period has expired, evidence will be destroyed.

~~11.12.1~~

~~11.13.~~11.16. Complaints about academic decisions

~~11.13.1~~11.16.1 Complaints about an academic decision may be made as outlined in section 14: Concerns and complaints (including academic decisions). “Academic decision” is defined in the glossary, and includes decisions around extensions, allocation of grades, and the granting of credit.

12. Assessment results and grades

12.1. Marks and grades

12.1.1 Assessment at MIT and Unitec may be achievement or competency based. MIT and Unitec marks and grades that are applicable to each grading system are listed in sections 12.~~2~~3 and 12.~~3~~4 below. Not all grades listed are applicable to all assessments or courses.

12.1.2 The grading system applicable to each assessment, course, or programme, whether achievement-based or competency-based, is outlined in the Programme Regulations. Any exceptions to the standard grading systems described in this section, such as those mandated by external regulatory bodies, are also specified in the Programme Regulations.

Legacy grade tables may apply for some programmes. Where this is the case, students will be notified in course information. For the avoidance of doubt, legacy and unified programmes will continue to use their approved grade tables outlined in the Programme Regulations.

12.2. All learning outcomes must be achieved

12.2.1 To pass a course and be awarded credit, a student must successfully achieve all course learning outcomes at the required level. This requirement applies in addition to any other course or programme pass requirements, including any specified minimum pass mark.

~~12.2.~~12.3. Results used for assessments

~~12.2.1~~12.3.1 The following tables set out the results that are used for assessments within a course:

~~12.2.2~~12.3.2 Where a competency-based summative assessment system is used (including NZQA Assessment Standards and Skill Standards), one of the following results will be specified:

Code	Meaning	Credit status
A or P	Achieved / Pass	Credits earned
C	Competent *(available for skill and assessment standards)*	Credits earned
E	Excellence Pass *(available for skill and achievement standards only)*	Credits earned
M	Merit Pass *(available for skill and achievement standards only)*	Credits earned
F, N, NA, or NC	Fail / Not achieved / Not yet competent	No credits earned
I	Incomplete	No credits earned

~~12.2.3~~12.3.3 Where an achievement-based summative assessment system is used, one of the following results will be specified:

Code	Meaning	Credit status
A	Pass with distinction	Credits earned
B	Pass with merit	Credits earned
C	Pass	Credits earned
D	Fail	No credits earned
E	Fail	No credits earned

Code	Meaning	Credit status
F	Fail	No credits earned

~~12.2.4~~12.3.4 For achievement-based summative assessment, MIT and Unitec may, at its discretion, grant results that distinguish between levels of achievement within each passing grade as follows:

Code	Mark Range	Meaning	Credit status
A+	90-100	Pass with distinction	Credits earned
A	85-89		
A-	80-84		
B+	75-79	Pass with merit	Credits earned
B	70-74		
B-	65-69		
C+	60-64	Pass	Credits earned
C	55-59		
C-	50-54		
D	40-49	Fail	No credits earned
E	0-39		

~~12.3.~~12.4. Grades used for courses

~~12.3.1~~12.4.1 Where a competency-based summative assessment system is used (including NZQA Standards), one of the following course grades will be specified on the student's academic transcript:

Code	Meaning	Credit status
A, C, or P	Competent / Achieved / Pass	Credits earned
E	Excellence Pass	Credits earned
M	Merit Pass	Credits earned
CT	Credit transfer	Credits earned
CC or CR	Cross credit or Credit Recognition	Credits earned
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning	Credits earned
F, N, NA, or NC	Fail / Not achieved / Not yet competent	No credits earned
I	Incomplete	No credits earned
W, WD	Withdrawn from course	No credits earned
NC, DNC	Did Not Complete course	No credits earned

Notes: Courses may utilise a two-point, three-point or four-point competency-based system. This will be stated in the Programme Regulations.

~~12.3.2~~12.4.2 Doctoral theses employ a Pass or Fail grade only. No other grade may be awarded.

~~12.3.3~~12.4.3 Where an achievement-based summative assessment system is used, one of the following course grades will be specified on the student's academic transcript:

Code	Meaning	Credit status
A	Pass with distinction	Credits earned
B	Pass with merit	Credits earned
C	Pass	Credits earned
AP	Aegrotat Pass	Credits earned
X	Exemption	Credits earned
CT	Credit Transfer	Credits earned
CC or CR	Cross Credit or Credit Recognition	Credits earned
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning	Credits earned
CP	Conceded Pass	Credits earned
D	Fail	No credits earned
E	Fail	No credits earned
F	Fail	No credits earned
FCW	Failed Course Work	No credits earned
FF	Failed Final	No credits earned
W, WD	Withdrawn from Course	No credits earned
NC, DNC	Did Not Complete Course	No credits earned

~~12.3.4~~12.4.4 For achievement-based summative assessment, MIT and Unitec may, at its discretion, grant grades that distinguish between levels of course achievement within each passing grade as follows:

Grade	Mark Range	Meaning	Credit status
A+	90-100	Pass with distinction	Credits earned
A	85-89		
A-	80-84		
B+	75-79	Pass with merit	Credits earned
B	70-74		
B-	65-69		
C+	60-64	Pass	Credits earned
C	55-59		
C-	50-54		
AP	Aegrotat Pass	Pass	Credits earned
X	Exemption		
CT	Credit Transfer		
CC or CR	Cross Credit or Credit Recognition		
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning		
CP	Conceded Pass		
D	40-49	Fail	No credits earned
E	0-39		
F	Not passed compulsory assessment		
W	Withdrawn from course		
NC, DNC	Did Not Complete the course		

~~12.3.5~~12.4.5 Grades of CT, CC, and RPL will be awarded for courses completed through RPKS (see section 3: Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills (RPKS)). ~~Exceptions, allowing achievement grades to be awarded for some courses, may be approved by the *[Delegated Authority]* where deemed appropriate.~~

~~12.4.~~12.5. Attendance only criteria

~~12.4.1~~12.5.1 Attendance only criteria will be specified as follows:

Grade	Meaning	Credit status
A or AO	Attended / Attendance only (pass)	No credits earned
NA or NC	Not attended / Did not complete the course (fail)	No credits earned

~~12.5.~~12.6. Grade point average

~~12.5.1~~12.6.1 If grade point average (GPA) is used in a programme, ~~it~~this must be stated in the Programme Regulations.

12.6.2 A GPA is the average value of a student's accumulated final achievement-based grades. Only courses which award achievement-based grades are included in GPA calculations. Courses assessed solely on a competency basis are excluded from GPA calculations. Grade-point averages are used for validating eligibility for several awards of excellence such as Honours and Senior Scholar.

~~12.5.2~~12.6.3 A GPA is calculated by multiplying the grade points achieved for each course by the credit value of that course, adding these values together, and dividing the result by the total number of credits included in the calculation.~~adding up all accumulated final grades and dividing that figure by the number of credits awarded.~~

~~12.5.3~~12.6.4 The following grade points are used at MIT and Unitec to calculate GPA:

Used in GPA calculation		
Grade	Meaning	Grade points
A+	Pass with distinction	9
A	Pass with distinction	8
A-	Pass with distinction	7
B+	Pass with merit	6
B	Pass with merit	5
B-	Pass with merit	4
C+	Pass	3
C	Pass	2
C-	Pass	1
D	Fail	0
E	Fail	0
F	Fail	0
FCW	Failed Course Work	0
FF	Failed Final	0

Used in GPA calculation		
NC, DNC	Did Not Complete Course	0
CP	Conceded pass	0

Not used in GPA calculation	
W, WD	Withdrawn from course
AP	Aegrotat pass
X	Exemption
CT	Credit transfer
CC or CR	Cross credit or Credit Recognition
	Competency-based assessment results

~~12.5.4~~12.6.5 Where students have repeated a course, then the highest grade is included in the calculation and the other grade(s) for the course are excluded.

~~12.6.~~12.7. Conceded Pass (CP)

~~12.6.1~~12.7.1 Unless otherwise stated in the Programme Regulations, students who marginally fail an achievement-based course (achieving 45% overall grade or more) with a grade of D, F, FF, or FCW may be considered for a Conceded Pass, if:

- The student has submitted all assessments for the course;
- The award of a conceded pass will enable the student to complete the programme;
- The failed result was achieved in the final two enrolment periods for the programme;
- The student achieved an overall grade point average (GPA) of 4 (an average of B-) or better for their programme, the calculation excluding the course for which a CP is being considered (see section 12.~~5~~6: Grade point average);
- The course is not a compulsory or core part of the programme (i.e. elective courses only) and does not contribute to the student's major; and
- The student has achieved all Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPOs) for the related qualification.

~~12.6.2~~12.7.2 Conceded Passes are considered and granted at the discretion of the Programme Committee. Programme Committees, at their discretion, may impose additional restrictions on the granting of a Conceded Pass, such as attendance requirements, minimum pass levels for progression, etc. For the avoidance of doubt, conceded passes apply only to achievement-based courses.

~~12.6.3~~12.7.3 Students will be granted no more than one Conceded Pass for a programme. No applications from the students will be received.

~~12.6.4~~12.7.4 Conceded Passes apply only to the programme for which they are granted and cannot be transferred unless recommended by the Programme Committee and approved by the Chair of the Academic Committee. Approval is not required if a programme is nested within another programme e.g., a diploma that is equivalent to the first year of a degree. A student may be granted no more than one Conceded Pass for a programme equivalent to three years full-time

study or less, including any Conceded Pass that is transferred or credited into that programme.

12.7.5 Students may choose to decline a Conceded Pass, however, if they re-enrol in the course and fail again, they cannot reclaim the Conceded Pass.

12.8. Aegrotat Pass (AP)

~~12.6.5~~12.8.1 Where an aegrotat pass is granted under section 11.5, the grade AP will be recorded on the student's academic transcript.

~~12.7.~~12.9. Academic transcript

~~12.7.1~~12.9.1 The Academic Registry ~~or Academic Registry and Graduation Office~~ issues official academic transcripts to students upon request. An administration fee ~~may~~ will be charged.

The information contained in the academic transcript is a complete record of study, including passes and fails in all courses studied.

~~12.7.2~~12.9.2 Academic transcripts and results notices are issued by MIT and Unitec as confirmation of achievement or eligibility to graduate. Letters or statements of completion will not usually be provided.

~~12.8.~~12.10. Advice to external organisations/people

~~12.8.1~~12.10.1 Students must provide written permission to MIT and Unitec before their results can be shared with any other person or organisation, unless legally required or permitted; specified in an existing agreement between MIT and Unitec, the student and the person or organisation; or as provided in section 19.3: Granting of posthumous awards.

~~12.9.~~12.11. Credit

~~12.9.1~~12.11.1 Students will receive credit for a course when they have successfully completed the course requirements specified in the Programme Regulations. Credit may also be granted for successfully completing an NZQA Standard or for prior knowledge and skills (see section 3: Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills (RPKS)). Credit is granted after the Programme Committee, or delegate approves the final grade.

~~12.9.2~~12.11.2 To be granted credit, students must be enrolled (in the course, NZQA Standard or for RPKS) and have paid all fees or have arrangements agreed with MIT and Unitec to pay and be following those arrangements (see section 4.3: Consequences of unpaid fees).

13. Insufficient academic progress

13.1. General

13.1.1 These provisions apply to all students enrolled in assessed courses. They are intended to ensure that students who have made insufficient academic progress receive academic advice and support for their future studies.

Students who are at risk of making insufficient academic progress should seek advice and support from: Student Support; International Student Support; ~~, or~~ the Academic Lead, Student; or ~~Student Success or~~ the Academic Programme Manager.

13.1.2 Programme Regulations may specify the maximum number of repeat enrolments (e.g., for practice or clinical based courses which are regulated by external bodies).

13.2. Academic progress requirements

13.2.1 Unless otherwise stated in the Programme Regulations, students are considered to have made insufficient academic progress if they have:

- Failed the same course two or more times;
- Failed more than 50 per cent ~~or more~~ of their enrolled credits in ~~an enrolment~~a ~~12-month~~12-month period, (for full-time students); or

- Failed more than 50 per cent ~~or more~~ of their enrolled credits in their two most recent enrolment periods of study, (for part-time students).

13.2.2 For Postgraduate thesis, dissertation or research projects, progress is reported regularly by the principal supervisor. Students may be considered to have made insufficient academic progress if they have not:

- Maintained regular and frequent contact with the supervisor through formal scheduling (for example, on-site or distance tutorial or seminar meetings) and ~~not been~~remained accessible at reasonable times to receive advice;
- Maintained progress in ~~accordance~~ line with the agreed stages and timing of the research and project report, including ~~not provided~~failing to provide written work, and other evidence of progress;
- Responded to supervisor written feedback on any inadequacy of progress and/or any work that is below acceptable standards.

13.3. Consequences of insufficient academic progress

13.3.1 Students who have made insufficient academic progress will normally be subject to a period of exclusion from study, unless exceptional circumstances apply

Students who have made insufficient academic progress will be advised in writing by the Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager. The notification will include the duration of any exclusion period, the requirements for returning to study, and the process for requesting consideration of exceptional circumstances.

13.3.2 Following a period of exclusion, students are not entitled to re-enrol automatically. Applications to re-enrol will be considered subject to the following provisions:

- A student who has made insufficient academic progress for the first time may re-enrol provided they agree to an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) developed by the Head of School, Deputy Head of School, Academic Programme Manager or delegate. The implementation of the ILP will be overseen by a member of teaching staff.
- A student who has made insufficient academic progress for a second time may only be permitted to re-enrol with the approval of the Head of School.
- ~~will not be allowed to re-enrol without approval from the *[Delegated Authority]*. In such cases, students will be advised in writing by the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; or Academic Programme Manager that they have made insufficient academic progress and outlining the process for returning to study~~Programme Committee~~General Manager, Schools or Director, Schools and Performance~~the A student who has made insufficient academic progress for a third time or seeks to enrol in a course they have previously failed for a third time, may only be permitted to re-enrol with the approval of the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic (or delegate). Approval will normally be granted only in exceptional circumstances where there is evidence the student is likely to succeed in subsequent enrolments.

~~13.3.1~~13.3.3 Decisions ~~to allow students~~on applications to re-enrol after insufficient academic progress will be based on ~~their~~ the student's likelihood of success in subsequent enrolments. When considering the application, ~~When making this determination, the decision maker will consult with the student, and the *[Designated Contact]* (for Level 7 and above programmes), and will consider any evidence the decision maker considers relevant. At their discretion,~~ the decision maker may approve:

- Further re-enrolment on either a full-time or part-time ~~re-enrolment~~basis (with no reduction required to the student's study load);

- ~~Part-time r~~Re-enrolment on a reduced study load (e.g. part-time);
- Enrolment in a different or lower-level programme or course;
- Re-enrolment with conditions imposed;
- A further period of exclusion before the student may apply to re-enrol.

~~Students will not usually be permitted to re-enrol after making insufficient academic progress for a third time. Decisions to allow a further enrolment will only be made by the *[Delegated Authority]* based on exceptional circumstances.~~

~~13.3.2~~13.3.4 ~~O~~The outcome~~s~~ of any application to re-enrol ~~will be~~ following insufficient academic progress will be communicated to ~~students~~ the student in writing and ~~will be reported~~notified ~~to the: Head of School; Deputy Head of School; Academic Programme Manager; or delegate~~to relevant ~~,~~staff.

~~13.3.3~~13.3.5 ~~I~~f ~~students are~~Where a student is permitted to re-enrol following insufficient academic progress, the Head of School or Academic Programme Manager or delegate will ensure ~~they are~~the student is provided with appropriate support, which may include ~~for their on-going studies, including~~ an ~~individual learning plan~~ILP and other interventions to support academic success.

13.3.6 Where a student who has made insufficient academic progress applies for admission to a different programme, admission is not automatic. Before approving admission, the person authorised under section 13.3.2 to approve re-enrolment must consider the student's academic history, including any previous findings of insufficient academic progress, and be satisfied the student has a reasonable likelihood of success in the proposed programme.

13.3.7 Where permission to re-enrol is refused, the decision-maker will advise the student in writing of the decision and any period of exclusion that applies. At the end of the exclusion period, the student may apply to re-enrol. Any such application will be considered by the person authorised under these *Regulations* to approve re-enrolment at the level above the original decision-maker.

13.3.8 A student may apply for reconsideration of a decision to exclude them for insufficient academic progress or to refuse permission to re-enrol. Any such application will be determined by the person authorised under these *Regulations* to approve re-enrolment at the level above the original decision-maker.

~~13.3.4~~13.3.9 Insufficient academic progress may impact access to loans and allowances if students do not meet StudyLink's satisfactory progress requirements. This may apply even where MIT and Unitec has allowed the student to re-enrol.

Further information on eligibility for loans and allowances is available from StudyLink.

14. Student concerns and complaints (including academic decisions)

14.1. General provisions

14.1.1 MIT and Unitec treats concerns and complaints seriously and is committed to offering students fair, effective, and culturally appropriate procedures for raising and resolving issues. Students are encouraged to raise a concern or complaint when they have an issue.

- Concerns involve students seeking an informal resolution for a situation where they believe appropriate standards have not been met.
- Complaints involve students seeking formal redress through MIT and Unitec's formal complaints resolution process. Concerns, and complaints are defined more fully in section 25: Glossary.

14.1.2 Student Support and International Student Support ~~or Student Success~~ are available to advise, assist and support students throughout the process of raising and seeking resolution of concerns and complaints.

~~14.1.2~~

14.1.3 ~~Additional support and guidance are available from Student Support or Student Success.~~Student concerns or complaints about staff conduct may be dealt with ~~in accordance with~~in line with MIT and Unitec staff discipline policies and procedures.

14.2. Concerns

14.2.1 In the first instance, students ~~must~~ should seek to address their concerns informally with those directly involved, for example by talking to the staff member involved. Students may seek advice, support, or assistance with this process from: ~~or to~~ the Academic Lead, Student (via AskMe! or Student Central), Academic Programme Manager, Student Support ~~Experience and Success, Student Success, Student Advocates or the~~ , or International ~~Office~~Student Support ~~. If needed, students may seek assistance from these staff~~.

Where students are unable to resolve their concern informally, or do not feel safe in doing so, they may make a complaint (see section 14.3: Complaints).

14.2.2 Where students raise a concern, staff may escalate it to the level of a complaint (see section 14.3: Complaints) where they deem the issue to be serious and/or unsuitable for informal resolution. Privacy implications will be considered in these situations.

14.3. Complaints

14.3.1 Students may make a complaint where:

- They do not feel safe raising a concern with those directly involved;
- ~~•~~ They consider that their concern ~~:~~ is
- ~~•~~ ~~Is~~ of a serious nature ~~e~~ (including concerns relating to safety, discrimination, harassment, significant misconduct, or other matters not reasonably suitable for informal resolution) or ~~;~~
- ~~i~~s not suitable for informal resolution; or ~~;~~
- They consider that their concern ~~H~~has not been resolved to their satisfaction following informal processes.

Complaints are to be made using the online Student~~s Complaints~~ Feedback form available on the MIT and Unitec ~~website, and~~website and are to include: the student's name and contact details; the nature of the complaint; steps already taken to address the issue; and the resolution sought (e.g., the form of redress or change to an academic decision).

14.3.2 Time limits for submitting complaints are as follows:

- **Academic decisions:** Complaints will only be accepted if received by MIT and Unitec within ~~ten~~ five (~~10~~5) working days following notification of the decision to the student. ~~This~~

~~period will be extended by five (5) working days where the student notifies MIT and Unitec in advance to the *[Designated Contact]* that they are considering making a complaint.~~

- **All other complaints**: Complaints will only be accepted where received by MIT and Unitec within twenty (20) working days of the incident or issue giving rise to the complaint.

These ~~This period~~timeframes will be extended by five (5) working days where the student notifies the ~~and Unitec in advance to Student Experience and Success, or the~~ Complaints team ~~(via email complaints@unitec.ac.nz)~~ in advance of the deadline, that they are considering making a complaint.

The Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success; or delegate may agree to extend these periods in exceptional circumstances.

MIT and Unitec complaints procedures are available to all MIT and Unitec students, and former students, subject to the time limits set out in this section. The Regulations that applied at the time ~~the student was enrolled~~the incident occurred will apply to the situation.

14.3.3 Complaints investigations will be carried out ~~in accordance with~~as set out in section 16: MIT and Unitec Investigation procedure.

14.3.4 MIT and Unitec may decline to investigate a complaint where it is impracticable, inappropriate, or outside the scope of these *Regulations* to do so. Examples include but are not limited to complaints about external bodies or decisions, complaints about student conduct that occurred outside of MIT and Unitec and has no direct relationship to the complainant's study, complaints where a significant period of time has elapsed since the alleged conduct or incident, and/or complaints filed anonymously.

~~14.3.3~~

~~14.3.4~~14.3.5 Students who are not satisfied with the outcome of a formal complaint may apply to appeal the outcome if the grounds for appeal set out in ~~in accordance with~~ section 17: Appeals are met.

15. Student misconduct

15.1. General

15.1.1 Incidents of student misconduct will be addressed to maintain academic standards and ensure a safe and effective learning environment at MIT and Unitec. This includes addressing any form of unacceptable or improper behaviour by students, such as disciplinary issues and academic misconduct (cheating). For full definitions and examples of student misconduct, refer to section 25: Glossary.

Student concerns or complaints about staff conduct should be raised ~~in accordance with~~as set out in section 14: Student concerns and complaints and will be dealt with in ~~accordance~~ line with MIT and Unitec staff discipline policies and procedures.

15.1.2 Students who help or encourage others to engage in misconduct will be treated as if they committed misconduct themselves.

15.1.3 Students who breach any Aotearoa New Zealand laws will be reported to the Police and/or other appropriate authorities.

~~15.1.3~~15.1.4 When managing misconduct involving students enrolled in the School of Secondary-Tertiary Studies or Supported Learner programmes, MIT and Unitec may implement additional support, intervention, reintegration, and educational planning measures appropriate to the student's age, needs, and circumstances. These measures supplement, and do not replace, the misconduct and investigation processes set out in these *Regulations*.

15.2. Urgent immediate action in the event of student misconduct

15.2.1 **Removal from class ~~or~~, campus, work/clinical experience or practicum:** In cases of alleged misconduct where it is considered necessary to maintain order, safety, or an effective learning environment:

- The academic staff memb~~teach~~er in charge of a class may dismiss a student~~s~~ from attending class (including online) for up to two (2) working days.
- The Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success; General Manager, Schools; Director, Schools and Performance; and/or Campus Security may remove students from campus for up to two (2) working days.

In exceptional circumstances, the dismissal period may be extended by the: Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; or Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success, to a maximum of five (5) working days in total.

Removal under this section is a short-term interim measure intended to address an immediate risk or disruption and is distinct from a suspension under section 15.2.2.

15.2.2 **Suspension:** In serious cases of alleged misconduct where it is considered necessary to maintain order, safety or an effective learning environment, the: Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success; General Manager, Schools; or Director, Schools and Performance may suspend students from attending classes and/or the campus, or any defined campus area~~.~~, pending the outcome of a misconduct investigation.

A suspension under this section is a precautionary measure and not a disciplinary penalty. It does not imply that misconduct has been established.

A suspension may remain in place for as long as is reasonably necessary to complete the investigation and determine the outcome.

~~to allow a misconduct investigation to take place and a decision to be made.~~ Where deemed appropriate to the circumstances, only the: Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; or Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success may issue a formal written trespass notice to any student.

~~15.2.2~~15.2.3 If a student is removed from class or campus, or suspended under sections 15.2.1 and/or 15.2.2, the alleged incident will immediately be referred for a full investigation following the MIT and Unitec investigation process (see section 16: ~~Investigation~~ MIT and Unitec Investigation procedure).

15.3. Decision to investigate alleged misconduct

~~15.3.1~~ Alleged incidents of misconduct will be reported in writing to the relevant Head of School or delegate or other appropriate senior manager, ensuring no conflict of interest. They will assess whether the alleged conduct constitutes misconduct. If it does, an investigation will be conducted following the MIT and Unitec investigation process (see section 16: MIT and Unitec Investigation procedure).

~~15.3.3~~15.3.2 The decision to investigate alleged incidents of misconduct by students enrolled in ~~special educational needs~~Supported Learning programmes (as defined in section 25: Glossary) will be made by the Head of School in consultation with staff familiar with the student. They will consider whether the alleged misconduct is a direct consequence of the student's circumstances. This determination may be made in consultation with the student's family/whanau and caregivers.

15.4. Penalties for student misconduct

15.4.1 If the outcome of an investigation confirms that a student has committed misconduct, the relevant decision maker will determine the appropriate penalty.

15.4.2 Penalties for proven misconduct will be imposed consistently, considering all the circumstances of the individual incident. In deciding what penalty is to be imposed, decision makers will give regard to:

- The seriousness of the misconduct;
- Previous incidents of proven misconduct by the student;
- The ~~best~~ welfare, wellbeing and re-integration of the student concerned;
- The wider implications of the behaviour and proposed penalty on other students; and
- Any factors mitigating the student's actions such as an expression of contrition~~, payment of full restitution~~, willingness to engage in corrective action including payment of restitution, a willingness to seek medical treatment or other professional counselling, age or other circumstances.
- ~~.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 3.25 cm, Hanging: 0.75 cm, No bullets or numbering

15.4.3 One or more of the following penalties may be imposed for misconduct:

Penalty	Decision maker who may impose the penalty
▪ A written reprimand and/or warning detailing further penalties to be applied if the student re-offends.	Chief Executive Officer; Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success;
▪ The imposition of such a sum of money or action considered reasonable restitution for the damage caused.	
▪ Requirement to complete a personal development activity (e.g., anger management course)	

Penalty	Decision maker who may impose the penalty
In the case of academic misconduct: ▪ a mark of zero, or no pass for the assessment ~~(e.g., students found cheating in an examination will automatically receive a mark of zero)~~; ▪ ~~othera~~ reduced mark for the assessment or grade for the course; and ▪ for competency-based assessment, a further *assessment under controlled conditions may be possible upon payment of an administration fee.* *NB These penalties may impact student academic progress (see section 13: Insufficient Academic Progress)*	General Manager, Schools; Director, Schools and Performance; or Head of School.
▪ Suspension from attendance at MIT and Unitec or any of its classes for such period as determined appropriate (including without limitation, issuing a written trespass notice if this is considered appropriate in the circumstances)	Chief Executive Officer; ~~Deputy Chief Executive, Academic or Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success~~
▪ Cancellation of enrolment (exclusion)	~~Deputy Chief Executive, Academic or Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success~~
▪ Refusal of enrolment (exclusion) for such a period as determined appropriate (including permanently)	
▪ Refusal to grant an award, or revocation of an award already granted, if satisfied that the student has made any untrue or misleading statement or is guilty of any breach of regulations or dishonest practice in relation to the award (see section 19.2.4: Eligibility for awards).	Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; or Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success. ~~Chief Executive Officer~~
Additional penalties which may be imposed for students from the School of Secondary Tertiary Studies:	
▪ Return to a secondary school or other suitable provider recommended by the Principal, School of Secondary Tertiary Studies.	Principal; or Deputy Principal, School of Secondary Tertiary Studies
▪ Stand down period (such period should incorporate support for the re-integration of the student into the programme).	
▪ Daily report for a period determined appropriate.	

15.5. Appeal of student misconduct decisions

15.5.1 Students who have had a penalty imposed by MIT and Unitec for misconduct may be able to appeal the decision where they satisfy the requirements set out in section 17: Appeals.

15.6. Student misconduct records

15.6.1 Where a student is found to have committed misconduct, this decision, including any penalties imposed, will be kept on their record. Where a student is found to have committed misconduct, this may impact their future study opportunities with MIT and Unitec and other institutions (see section 2.9: Refusal or cancellation of enrolment).

15.6.2 Where an allegation of misconduct is not proven, or a decision is overturned on appeal, no record will be kept on student's record.

16. MIT and Unitec investigation procedure

16.1.1 MIT and Unitec student complaint and misconduct investigations will be conducted in ~~accordance~~ line with the principles of natural justice. Investigations will be carried out by a competent, impartial, independent person who has not previously been involved in the matter.~~:~~

If students believe the investigator is unsuitable or that there may be a conflict of interest (e.g., the investigator is involved in the matter or is closely related to someone involved), they should raise this with the: Head of Student Experience and Success; Director, Student Success; General Manager, Schools; or the Director, Schools and Performance.

16.1.2 All parties involved in the investigation, ~~(~~whether as complainant or respondent,~~)~~ will have a fair opportunity to be heard and, where relevant to the ~~on the matter with the right to (as relevant to the~~ nature of the investigation~~)~~, have the right to:

- Be informed of the nature of any allegation against them, including the evidence on which the allegation is based. The identity of the person making the allegation will ordinarily be disclosed unless there is a lawful or safety-related reason not to do so;
- ~~and, where appropriate and lawful, the name identity of the person making the allegation;~~
- Be treated with courtesy, respect, and in a culturally appropriate manner;
- Be treated fairly and without prejudgment while the matter is being investigated;
- ~~Be treated as innocent until proven guilty;~~
- Have the matter dealt with in a timely and sensitive manner;
- Respond to the allegation, explain their position, and be listened to;
- Have access to advice and support throughout the process;
- Receive adequate written notice of any meeting or hearing;
- Be free from intimidation, harassment, threat of recrimination or any other type of ~~vengeful~~ retaliatory~~activity~~ behaviour that may result from the investigation;
- Have written material and investigation information provided in a form they can reasonably understand, including using interpreters, translators, plain-language or accessible formats, communication support, and other reasonable adjustments where required;
- ~~Have written material available in a form that they can understand, if necessary, by giving access to interpreters and translators;~~
- Be advised of the outcome of an investigation process, subject to the Privacy Act 2020 or any confidentiality requirements; and
- Where the complainant or respondent is a student, ~~A~~appeal the outcome of the investigation where grounds exist (see section 17: Appeals).

16.1.3 Staff and students are required to:

Formatted: Indent: Left: 4 cm, No bullets or numbering

- Provide full and accurate information to the person investigating the matter;
- Maintain confidentiality to ensure the integrity of the investigation process; and
- Follow the MIT and Unitec investigation process in good faith (including attending investigation meetings as required).

16.1.4 Where a complaint includes allegations that may constitute student misconduct, MIT and Unitec may refer the matter for consideration under section 15: Student misconduct. The complaint and misconduct matters may be investigated concurrently where appropriate. Any finding of misconduct or imposition of a misconduct penalty must be determined in line with section 15: Student misconduct and associated requirements of natural justice.

~~16.1.4 Investigations will be dealt with promptly. Wherever possible, investigations will be completed, and outcomes communicated to students within 30 working days of the complaint being received by MIT and Unitec or the misconduct allegation being made. If this time frame cannot be met, students will be advised in writing by the appointed investigator.~~

16.1.5 Where a matter is to be investigated, students will be:

- Advised in writing as soon as ~~possible~~ practicable that the matter is to be investigated;
- Informed of the person/s appointed to investigate and decide the matter;
- Provided with all relevant information, considering any ~~considering any~~ applicable relevant legal rights and responsibilities (e.g., privacy or health and safety requirements); and
- Invited to attend a meeting to provide an explanation or information relevant to the investigation. If students are unable to attend in person, they may choose to attend remotely ~~via~~ through online methods or to respond to the allegation in writing.

  Students may be accompanied by an adviser ~~or~~, ~~support person~~whānau member, or other support person of their choosing, subject to any requirements necessary for the fair and orderly conduct of the process.

  ~~.~~

*Staff from: ~~Student Experience and Success, or Student Success~~Student Support; International Student Support; or ~~or~~ Student Advocates ~~or the International Office~~ are available to advise, assist and support the **student** throughout the process (including attending the meeting where requested).*

16.1.6 Failure by students to attend the meeting will not prevent a decision being made. Where students fail to attend the meeting, the outcome of the investigation will be forwarded to them in writing (see section 16.1.~~10~~9).

16.1.7 At the meeting:

- The investigator will outline the timeline and steps of the investigation process; and
- Students will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond to any allegations, present their point of view, and provide any supporting evidence.

16.1.8 Following the meeting the investigator will:

- Consider all the information presented and any explanations or comments from the student before any decision is made.
- Provide each party with a written summary of the matters discussed ~~and evidence considered~~ at their meeting with the investigator.

16.1.9 Students will be advised in writing of the outcome of the investigation. The advice will include:

- In the case of proven misconduct, any penalties to be imposed (see section 15.4: Penalties for student misconduct);
- In the case of upheld complaints, any appropriate and available ~~remedy/ies~~remedy or remedies to be applied; and
- ~~Appeal~~ Information about the student's right to appeal, the timeframe for lodging an appeal, appeals procedures, and the availability of assistance from the Student Advocacy and Appeals Advisor or Student Advocate~~appeal procedures~~ (see section 17: Appeals).

The outcome will also be communicated to relevant staff, including the Academic Registry, ~~Student Experience and Success~~Student Support~~,~~, and International ~~Office, Student Success,~~ Student Support ~~and Scholarship Manager and/or International Director, Student Success~~.

16.1.10 Investigations will be dealt with promptly. Wherever possible, investigations will be completed, and outcomes communicated to students within 30 working days of the complaint being received by MIT and Unitec or the misconduct allegation being made. If this timeframe cannot be met, students will be advised in writing by the appointed investigator.

16.1.11 MIT and Unitec will take reasonable steps to make ~~reasonable~~ fair adjustments to investigation, complaint, and appeal processes where required to enable effective participation by students.

~~16.1.12 ame cannot be met, students will be advised in writing by the appointed investigator.~~

Formatted: 02_Header

17. Appeals

17.1. ~~First r~~Right of appeal

17.1.1 Students may appeal the outcome of a complaint or misconduct investigation if they have followed all relevant MIT and Unitec procedures to resolve the issue and one or more of the following grounds exist:

- There is evidence of a procedural flaw in the investigation process that could materially affect the outcome;
- New or additional information has become available (which was previously unavailable and could not reasonably have been made available at the time the disputed decision was made) that could materially affect the outcome;
- The decision reached is manifestly (clearly) at odds with the evidence provided ~~(for misconduct decisions)~~; and/or
- The penalty imposed was out of proportion to the nature of the misconduct and the circumstances of the case ~~(for misconduct decisions).~~

~~Note:~~ Appeals will only be considered where one or more of the above grounds exist.

~~For clarity, o~~Only the outcome of a complaint or misconduct investigation ~~are appealable~~may be appealed. If students believe they have been treated unfairly, they should first follow the concerns and complaints procedures set out in section 14: Student concerns and complaints (including academic decisions).

Note: An Appeal considers whether the original matter was investigated correctly and in line with MIT and Unitec policy. It does not ordinarily reconsider the substance of the matter except to the extent necessary to determine whether a ground for appeal has been established.

~~17.2.~~ ~~First a~~Appeals will be considered by the: Deputy Chief ~~Executive~~Executive, Academic; Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success; or delegate. An appeal must be decided by a person who is independent of the original decision-making process.~~Second right of appeal~~

Formatted: 2.1.1 sub para, Indent: Left: 3.25 cm

~~17.2.1 Students may appeal the outcome of a first appeal (see section 17.1: First right of appeal) on the grounds that there was a procedural flaw in the assessment of the first appeal by the [*Delegated Authority*] that could materially affect the outcome.~~

Formatted: Space Before: 12 pt

~~17.2.2 Second rights of appeal are not available for decisions that relate to academic assessment outcomes (i.e. the marking of assessments).~~

~~17.2.3 Chief Executive Officer Chief Executive Officer~~

~~17.2.5 Second appeals will be considered by *[Delegated Authority]* (or nominee).~~

~~17.2.6 The *[Delegated Authority]* (or nominee) will consider whether there has been a procedural flaw in the investigation of the appeal and may, at their discretion:~~

- ~~Cancel the appeal decision and refer the matter back to the *[Delegated Authority]* for further assessment; or~~
- ~~Uphold the decision.~~

~~17.2.7 The decision of the *[Delegated Authority] (or nominee)* shall be final.~~

~~17.3.~~17.2. Appeal process

17.2.1 Appeals must be submitted within ~~seven~~five (~~7~~5) working days of the student being notified of an appealable decision. This period can be extended by:

- ~~a~~An additional five (5) working days if the student notifies the Student Advocacy and Appeals Advisor, or Student Advocate, in writing, in advance, that they are considering an ~~appeal.~~appeal; or
- A maximum of an additional twenty (20) working days if the student has, in advance, filed a request for information with MIT and Unitec and is awaiting a response to the information request.

In exceptional circumstances, and with the approval of the: Deputy Chief Executive, Academic; or Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success, appeals may be accepted after ~~12 working days~~the timeframe specified above.

~~17.3.1~~17.2.2 All appeal applications are to be made using the *Notice of Appeals* form, which will include:

- The grounds for appeal (see sections 17.1.1~~ and 17.2.1~~). The Student Advocacy and Appeals Advisor ~~(advocacy@manukau.ac.nz)~~ or Student Advocate ~~(appeals@unitec.ac.nz) is available~~are available to provide students with advice regarding whether grounds for appeal exist.
- The nature of the appeal;
- Steps already taken to address the issue, and any relevant evidence along with a copy of the appealable outcome decision; and
- The resolution sought.

*The Notice of Appeals form is available on the MIT and Unitec website and is to be submitted through the Student Advocacy and Appeals Advisor or Student Advocate who will lodge the application on behalf of the **student**.*

~~17.3.2~~17.2.3 Upon receiving an appeal application, the ~~[Delegated Authority] (or nominee~~decision maker~~)~~ will review the application to determine whether the grounds for appeal are met:

- Where the grounds for appeal **are not met**, the student will be informed in writing of the decision and the reasons as soon as practicable. This decision is final (subject to section 17.~~4~~3: Further avenues for redress); or
- Where the grounds for appeal **are met**, receipt of the appeal will be acknowledged in writing as soon as practicable, along with further information on the next steps in the process.

~~17.4.~~17.3. Appeal decisions

~~17.4.1~~17.3.1 Appeals will be considered and decided as promptly as possible.

~~17.4.2~~17.3.2 Prior to any decision being made, students will have the opportunity to submit any explanations, reasons, or facts relevant to the appeal.

Students may be asked to appear in person, in which case they may be accompanied by an adviser or support person (MIT and Unitec will provide a support person if requested).

~~17.4.3~~17.3.3 Every appeal will be considered on its merits.

~~17.4.4~~17.3.4 When determining the outcome of the appeal, decision makers may:

- Uphold the appeal and require any appropriate and available remedy to settle the appeal (including reconsideration of the matter);
- Vary the decision (including in the case of misconduct decisions, imposing any other penalty that is authorised under section 15: Student misconduct); or
- Dismiss the appeal and uphold the original decision.

17.3.5 Students will be advised in writing of the outcome of their appeal as soon as practicable. The outcome will also be communicated to relevant staff including the: Academic Registry; Student ~~Experience and S~~uccess~~s~~upport; ~~the~~ International ~~Office (where relevant)~~Student Support; ~~the Appeals mailbox; Student Success;~~ and the ~~Deputy Chief Executive, Academic~~original decision maker.

~~17.4.5~~17.3.6 The decision of the appeal is final and concludes all internal review and appeal processes.

~~17.5.~~17.4. Further avenues for redress

~~17.5.1~~17.4.1 If students are not satisfied with the outcome of the appeals process, they can raise their concerns about the quality of education and pastoral care at MIT and Unitec with NZQA. If NZQA does not resolve the issue, students can also make a complaint to the Disputes Tribunal of New Zealand, the Human Rights Commission, or the Office of the Ombudsman.

*While students have the right to raise their concerns with external parties, MIT and Unitec strongly recommends that **students** first use MIT and Unitec's internal dispute resolution processes.*

Further information regarding how to make a complaint to NZQA or external parties, is available on the NZQA website~~, or from Student Experience and Success, or Student Success.~~.

18. Maximum time for completion of a programme

18.1. Maximum timeframes

18.1.1 The maximum period for completion of a programme is specified in the Programme Regulations.

19. Awards and graduation

19.1. Awards granted by MIT and Unitec

19.1.1 The following awards may be granted by MIT and Unitec:

Formal awards - NZQA approved qualifications and credentials listed on the NZQCF

- Doctoral Degree
- Master's Degree

- Postgraduate Diploma
- Postgraduate Certificate
- Bachelor Honours Degree
- Graduate Diploma
- Graduate Certificate
- Bachelor's Degree
- Level 7 Diploma
- New Zealand Diploma (Levels 5-7)
- New Zealand Certificate (Levels 1 – 6)
- Micro-credential.

Informal awards – MIT and Unitec Credential

- Short Course (including Certificate of Attendance, Certificate of Achievement)
- Certificate of Proficiency.

19.2. Eligibility for awards

19.2.1 Students will only be granted an award for a programme in which they are enrolled, including where they have met the requirements for the programme through recognition of prior knowledge and skills (see section 3: Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills (RPKS)).

19.2.2 Awards are granted upon the successful completion of a programme, as specified in the relevant Programme Regulations.

19.2.3 Students must have paid all outstanding fees and return all borrowed MIT and Unitec assets or equipment related to the programme before they will be eligible to be ~~granted~~ issued an award for that programme (see section 4.3: Consequences of unpaid fees).

19.2.4 MIT and Unitec may refuse to grant or may revoke any award if satisfied that a student made any untrue or misleading statement or is guilty of any breach of regulations or dishonest practice in relation to the award (see section 15: Student misconduct).

19.2.5 MIT and Unitec may make provision for additional non-formal awards recognising outstanding achievement at a course or programme level.

19.3. Granting of posthumous awards

19.3.1 MIT and Unitec may grant an award or recognise programme completion posthumously where students have met all requirements and are eligible for the award. Decisions regarding the granting of posthumous awards will be made in discussion with family/whanau of the student.

19.4. Certificates (testamurs)

19.4.1 The graduand's legally documented name, as recorded in MIT and Unitec official records, will appear on their certificate.

19.4.2 Where graduands wish to modify their name, they must provide appropriate evidence of the name change ~~within~~ at least~~ten (10) working days of completing their programme~~ two (2) months before graduation (see section 2.2: Student Names and Gender Information).~~Name and gender changes).~~

19.4.3 A derivation of the graduand's legal name may be approved to appear on their certificate where the General Manager, Academic Services or delegate is satisfied that the student is able to be identified by the derivation. Examples of a derivation include but are not limited to ~~dropping of a middle name/s~~ omission of one or more middle ~~or~~names or including a birth name as well as a married name (birth name to be added in brackets).

19.4.4 MIT and Unitec awards will be conferred in the following format:

Award	**Certificate / testamur**
Formal awards granted upon the attainment of a qualification or credential listed on the NZQCF	
▪ Doctoral Degree ▪ Master's Degree ▪ Bachelor's Degree ▪ Bachelor Honours Degree ▪ Level 7 Diploma	A ~~certificate~~ testamur under the MIT and Unitec common seal, signed by the Chair of Council and Chief Executive, stating that the award has been conferred. For Bachelor Honours degrees, the certificate will also state the class of honours (if any) granted.
▪ Postgraduate Diploma ▪ Postgraduate Certificate ▪ Graduate Diploma ▪ Graduate Certificate ▪ Level 6 Diploma ▪ Level 5 Diploma ▪ Certificates (Levels 1 – 6)	A ~~certificate~~ testamur or certificate under the MIT and Unitec common seal, signed by the: Chief Executive; and Deputy Chief Executive, Academic stating that the award has been conferred.
▪ Micro-credential *(including Certificate of Achievement)*	A certificate signed by the Deputy Chief Executive, Academic (or ~~nominee~~delegate).
Informal awards granted upon completion	
▪ Short Course *(Including Certificate of Attendance)* ▪ Certificate of Proficiency	A certificate signed by the Head of School (or ~~nominee~~delegate).

19.4.5 Certificates may be issued immediately on completion of all requirements in a programme. Where a graduation ceremony is held, graduates will be invited to attend, and ~~certificates~~ testamur will be issued at the ceremony.

19.4.6 Lost or damaged certificates will be reissued by MIT and Unitec on request.

To apply for a reissued certificate, students should submit a completed Academic Record or Replacement Certificate Request form to Academic Registry, or Academic Registry and Graduation. Forms are available on the MIT and Unitec website. A fee will be charged.

19.5. Graduation ceremonies and the conferral/issue of awards

19.5.1 Graduation ceremonies for the ceremonial conferral of awards will take place as follows:

Award	**Ceremony detail**
▪ Doctoral Degree ▪ Master's Degree ▪ Bachelor Honours Degree ▪ Bachelor's Degree	▪ Awards will be conferred at a ceremony ~~determined by~~determined~~by~~ the Chair of the Council of MIT and Unitec. ▪ Where the Chair of Council of MIT and Unitec is absent from a ceremony, the Chair of the Council may authorise another person to confer these awards.

▪ Level 7 Diploma ▪ NZ Diploma Level 5-7 ▪ NZ Certificates (Levels 1 - 6)	▪ The words used by the Chair of the Council of MIT and Unitec or such other person as may have been appointed by the Chair of the Council to confer the award will be as follows: *"By the authority vested in me by the Council of Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec and by resolution of the Academic Committee confirming that the requirements of the qualification and Institute have been met, I [Name] confer [the award stated] upon the recipients listed in the programme, or in absentia."* ~~*By the authority vested in me by the Council of MIT and Unitec, I [Name] confer [the award stated] upon those who have satisfied the requirements of this Institute."*~~
▪ Postgraduate Diploma ▪ Postgraduate Certificate ▪ Graduate Diploma ▪ Graduate Certificate	▪ Awards will be conferred at a ceremony determined by the Chief Executive Officer. ▪ Where the Chief Executive Officer is absent from a ceremony, the Chief Executive Officer may authorise another person to confer these awards. ▪ The words used by the Chief Executive Officer, or such other person as may have been appointed by the Chief Executive Officer to confer the award will be as follows: *"By the authority vested in me by the Council of Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec and by resolution of the Academic Committee confirming that the requirements of the qualification and Institute have been met, I [Name] confer [the award stated] upon the recipients listed in the programme, or in absentia."* ~~*"By the authority vested in me by the Council of MIT and Unitec, I [Name] confer [the award stated] upon those who have satisfied the requirements of this Institute."*~~

19.5.2 The Head of School will issue the following awards in the manner they deem appropriate:

- Micro-credential (including Certificate of Achievement);
- Short Course (including Certificate of Attendance, Digital Badge); and
- Certificate of Proficiency.

These awards are not awarded at formal MIT and Unitec graduation ceremonies.

19.5.3 Students who have completed an award that is eligible to be conferred at a graduation ceremony (see section 19.5.1) will be invited to attend a scheduled ceremony and must register their intention to graduate as requested by the Events Manager, or Academic Registry, or Graduation Office. Students who do not register to attend a ceremony will be graduated in absentia unless an application to defer graduation is received within the published timeframe. Graduation may be deferred by no more than one year.

19.6. Academic dress

19.6.1 The academic dress requirements for graduation ceremonies at MIT and Unitec are outlined in Appendix One.

20. Intellectual property

20.1.1 Ownership of intellectual property created by students during their enrolment at MIT and Unitec will be determined according to the relevant *MIT or Unitec Intellectual Property Policy.*

20.1.2 In most cases students will own the intellectual property they create, unless:

- The Intellectual property is created mainly under the direction or with the help of MIT and Unitec staff with little original input from the student;
- The intellectual property is created using existing intellectual property owned by MIT and Unitec;
- The intellectual property is created or commissioned with funding or resources provided by MIT and Unitec;
- An external party funds the development, making them the presumed owner unless agreed otherwise in writing;
- The intellectual property is part of a joint project, requiring a written agreement on ownership before starting; and/or
- The intellectual property is created with another student or staff member, requiring a written agreement on ownership before starting.

21. Information and communications technology systems use

21.1.1 The use of MIT and Unitec information and communication technology systems (ICTS) is governed by the MIT and Unitec *Acceptable Use Policy* and *Information Security Policy.*

21.1.2 MIT and Unitec ICTS is to be used by students for academic purposes and in a way that is:

- Aligned with MIT and Unitec teaching and learning objectives;
- Responsible, ethical, and legal, and respectful of others' rights;
- Efficient and guards against damage or disruption; and
- Protects MIT and Unitec information from unauthorised access and use. MIT and Unitec passwords and access information are to be kept secure.

Any loss, theft, or misuse of MIT and Unitec ICTS is to be reported to the Director, Digital Strategy and Experience.

21.1.3 Prohibited uses of MIT and Unitec ICTS include:

- Illegal activities and purposes;
- Use that interferes with the reasonable use of ICTS resources by other ICTS users;
- Using another person's identity or role, including electronic signature, login, or ICTS access;
- Communicating on behalf of an ~~organization~~ organisation without authority;
- Accessing, altering, or damaging MIT and Unitec or others' ICTS resources without permission;
- Violating intellectual property rights, copyright laws, or licensing agreements;
- Unlawfully breaching an individual's privacy; and
- Bullying, harassing or victimising others.

21.1.4 MIT and Unitec will monitor the use of its ICTS whether accessed on-site or remotely. Information obtained may be used for troubleshooting, system management, and, if necessary, preventative or disciplinary action

21.1.5 Any information created or stored on MIT and Unitec ICTS resources may be subject to disclosure by MIT and Unitec under legislation such as the Official Information Act or the Privacy Act, or during the discovery process if there is litigation in progress.

22. Comments and feedback

22.1.1 MIT and Unitec is committed to continuous improvement and welcomes student comments and feedback. Feedback can be provided directly to MIT and Unitec staff or by using the online *Student Feedback* form available on the MIT and Unitec website.

Also see section 14: Student concerns and complaints for information about raising a concern or making a complaint.

22.1.2 Students will be asked to express their views and provide feedback about MIT and Unitec programmes and services. Feedback may be collected through surveys, questionnaires, and other methods. Published results will maintain the confidentiality of individual students. Outcomes will be used to improve MIT and Unitec programmes and services and may be reported to MIT and Unitec staff and external agencies. Reports may also be made available to students.

22.1.3 Employers, providers of further education to MIT and Unitec graduates, and other stakeholders may be asked to provide feedback on MIT and Unitec programmes. Requests for feedback will focus on how well graduates meet the graduate outcomes for their qualification and how effectively programmes have prepared graduates for work or further study. Published results will maintain the confidentiality of individual graduates. Feedback received will be used to improve MIT and Unitec programmes and services and may be reported to MIT and Unitec staff and external agencies. Reports may be made available to students.

23. Health and safety

23.1.1 MIT and Unitec is committed to providing and maintaining a safe and healthy work and learning environment for all staff, students, contractors, and other visitors complying with relevant legislation and codes, such as the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, and conforming to relevant standards, guidelines and good practice.

23.1.2 Creating and maintaining a safe and healthy place to work and learn is a shared responsibility of staff and students.

23.1.3 Students are expected to act in a safety conscious manner to protect themselves and others. This includes:

- Actively engaging in health and safety activities;
- Asking questions when unsure about safety matters; and
- Promptly reporting any health and safety concerns or incidents.

23.1.4 Students must follow all safety instruction(s) provided by MIT and Unitec staff, including (but not limited to):

- Following safe work practices and wearing required personal protective equipment such as safety glasses, prescribed footwear, and protective clothing in designated areas;
- Reporting any incidents, accidents and near misses to staff; and
- Complying with evacuation procedures during emergencies or drills

23.1.5 Smoking, including vaping and the use of e-cigarettes, or similar devices (see section 25: Glossary for a definition of smoking) is prohibited across all MIT and Unitec campuses in line with the MIT and Unitec *Smoke Free Environment Policy.*

24. MIT and Unitec communications with students

24.1.1 All student-facing regulations, policies and procedures are available on the MIT and Unitec website.

24.1.2 All written communications from MIT and Unitec to students will be sent by email to their student email ~~account~~ and nominated personal email addresses, or delivered directly by hand, with receipt recorded.

25. Glossary

Term	Definition
Academic Committee	The Academic Committee of MIT and Unitec established in accordance with clause 18 of Schedule 11 of the Education and Training Act 2020.
Academic decision	A decision made on a matter that has an academic outcome for students. Academic decisions cover a wide range of matters; examples include but are not limited to enrolment; waiver of pre-requisites; extensions of time; marking and assessment outcomes; allocation of grades; and the granting of credit.
Academic misconduct (cheating) *(Formerly known as misconduct during assessment)*	Includes attempting to gain an unfair advantage in a summative assessment. Academic misconduct is a form of student misconduct (see definition of student misconduct). Examples of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to: ▪ Copying information from another student (current or past), either in whole or in part, with or without their consent; ▪ Allowing another student to copy their assessment (in part or whole);

Term	Definition
	▪ Facilitating the electronic transfer, or giving soft copies, of their assessment work to others; ▪ Providing copies of the summative assessment (in part or whole) to others with the intention the assessment will be used for cheating; ▪ Providing copies of their summative assessment (in part or whole) to another student; ▪ Failing to exercise reasonable care and responsibility in protecting their work from being accessed by other students. This includes giving someone the opportunity to copy their work; ▪ Using or having access to prohibited resources or reference material during a test or examination; ▪ Communicating with others during a test/examination to transfer information (except where required to do so as part of the summative assessment); ▪ Accessing or taking test examination question papers (or copies) (in part or whole) without approval; ▪ Failing to follow the invigilator's instructions; ▪ Submitting all or part of a previously completed assessment without permission; ▪ Using material from a commercial essay or assignment writing service; ▪ Plagiarism (i.e., using the work of another without proper attribution); ▪ Falsifying research results; ▪ Working together on a summative assessment when it should be individual work; ▪ Presenting someone else's work as their own for summative assessment; ▪ Any action aimed at defeating the purpose of the summative assessment; ▪ Breaching any rule or regulation relating to assessment; ▪ Academic or research practices that bring or are likely to bring MIT and Unitec into disrepute; ▪ Misrepresenting a disability, temporary illness or injury or exceptional circumstances to seek assessment assistance or an aegrotat pass; ▪ Impersonating someone else or having someone else take an assessment for them; and ▪ Damaging or hiding learning resources to prevent others from using them. **Note:** These examples of academic misconduct are for guidance only. Other behaviours may also be considered academic misconduct.
Academic transcript	The official record of a student's study at MIT and Unitec. Academic transcripts record all outcomes from courses studied by the student, including pass and fail results.
Achievement-based assessment	Where a set of criteria is defined for a particular course or learning outcome and the student's level of achievement is assessed against these criteria. Achievement-based summative assessment is recognised through the allocation of a mark or grade.

Term	Definition
Achievement standard	A nationally registered, coherent set of learning outcomes and associated assessment criteria, together with technical and management information that supports delivery and assessment. Achievement standards specify three levels of performance: Achieved, Merit, and Excellence, and the method of assessment, which may include national external assessment. Achievement standards are derived from the New Zealand Curriculum and are usually associated with NCEA and secondary school delivery. NZQA (2023). *Glossary*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz
Admission	The process of being assessed and approved for participation in a programme or course for which entry is restricted.
Aegrotat pass	A pass granted to students at course level where, in specified circumstances beyond their control, they are unable to undertake or are impaired in the completion of an achievement-based summative assessment and their calculated mark results in an overall pass for the course.
Appeal	A request for an independent review of a decision made following a complaint or misconduct investigation. An appeal can only be made on specified grounds, such as a significant procedural error, important new information becoming available, a decision that is inconsistent with the evidence, or (for misconduct cases) an inappropriate penalty. An appeal is not simply a request for a different outcome because the student disagrees with the original decision.
Approved translator	A translator recognised by MIT and Unitec as suitably qualified to provide certified translations of official documents.
Artificial Intelligence	Technologies that perform tasks which ordinarily require human intelligence, including generating, analysing, interpreting, organising, or transforming information and content. Artificial Intelligence tools may produce text, images, audio, video, computer code, data, recommendations, or other outputs in response to user instructions or other inputs.
Assessment	The collection and evaluation of evidence to establish the level of an individual's performance against a set of learning outcomes.
Assessment concession	An approved adjustment to an assessment or assessment conditions, made in response to circumstances beyond a student's control, to enable equitable participation in assessment while maintaining academic standards and required learning outcomes.
Assessment criteria	The criteria against which the standard of performance required to meet one or more stated learning outcomes is assessed.
Assessment evidence	Student work on which assessment decisions are based (regardless of format or medium). Assessment evidence includes, but is not limited to, examination scripts, tests, quizzes, portfolios, evidence of practical tasks, and assignments.
Assessment of Prior Learning (APL)	Also known as recognition of prior learning.

Term	Definition
Attendance	Physical presence at a class, workshop, practicum, work placement, or other learning opportunities, or virtual presence through engagement in an online environment (synchronous).
Award	As defined in section 10(1) of the Education and Training Act 2020: *'award means—* *a) a certificate, diploma, degree, or other qualification listed on the Qualifications and Credentials Framework:* *(b) a certificate or other document granted in recognition of a student's achievement in and completion of a micro-credential…"* *Education and Training Act 2020*. New Zealand Legislation. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www.legislation.govt.nz
Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's degrees are Level 7 qualifications listed on the NZQF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz.
Bachelor Honours Degree	Bachelor Honours Degrees are Level 8 qualifications listed on the NZQF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz
Bullying	Repeated and unreasonable behaviour directed towards a person or group, that can lead to physical or psychological harm. ▪ Repeated behaviour is persistent and can include a range of actions over time. ▪ Unreasonable behaviour covers actions which a reasonable person would not do in similar circumstances, including victimising, humiliating, intimidating, or threatening a person. A single incident may not be considered bullying but can escalate if ignored. A single incident may be classified as Bullying if physical assault is involved. Bullying can be intentional, where the actions are intended to cause fear or distress, whether or not the behaviour did have that effect. Bullying can also be unintentional, where actions which, although not intended to cause fear or distress, cause and should reasonably have been expected to cause that effect, especially if the person has been informed to cease their actions causing harm. Examples include but are not limited to: ▪ threats and intimidation; ▪ manipulation and coercion; ▪ abusive or degrading language or gestures; ▪ spreading misinformation or malicious rumours; ▪ belittling remarks either to another person or behind their back; ▪ unreasonable nit-picking and fault finding; ▪ shouting, yelling, or using a raised voice or unpleasant tone; ▪ deliberately excluding, isolating, or marginalising a person;

Term	Definition
	▪ unjustified threats of disciplinary sanction; and ▪ disciplinary sanction imposed without reasonable justification. For the avoidance of doubt, fair disciplinary processes undertaken in accordance with MIT and Unitec *Student Regulations* are not considered Bullying.
Campus	All land and premises in the possession or occupation of MIT and Unitec.
Certificate/testamur	The document that shows that a qualification has been awarded to an individual student. NZQA (2023). *Glossary*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz *See also definition for New Zealand Certificate set out below.*
Certificate of Achievement	Certificates of Achievement are awards issued by MIT and Unitec in recognition of student achievement, which at MIT and Unitec generally emphasise technical and/or practical knowledge and skills. All MIT and Unitec Certificates of Achievement are formally assessed.
Certificate of Attendance	Certificates of Attendance are informal awards issued by MIT and Unitec in recognition of student attendance at non-credit bearing short courses. Certificates of Attendance are usually provided for non-assessed learning opportunities where a minimum level of attendance is specified, and the student has met that requirement. Also known as a Certificate of Participation.
Certificate of Proficiency (CoP)	Informal awards issued in recognition of student achievement in assessed courses or NZQA standards selected from a programme leading to a qualification listed on the New Zealand Qualifications and credentials Framework. Certificates of Proficiency are credit-bearing and may be cross-credited to relevant programmes. All Certificates of Proficiency are formally assessed in that student progress is assessed in a manner that determines completion. For enrolment, COP students must meet the relevant entry criteria for the programme in which the COP sits.
Chief Executive Officer	The person appointed by the Council as Chief Executive of MIT and Unitec pursuant to section 280(a) of the Education and Training Act 2020.
Competency-based assessment	The gathering and judging of evidence to decide if a person has achieved a standard of competence.
Complaint	A formal written expression of dissatisfaction from a student who: ▪ Believes they have been unfairly treated by MIT and Unitec (including in relation to an academic decision or other matter), or who is making a complaint against another student, and as a result considers there has been a direct and significant adverse impact on them; and ▪ Seeks redress through the MIT and Unitec formal complaints resolution process.

Term	Definition
Conceded pass (CP)	A pass that may be granted to students where they have marginally failed a course.
Concerns	A matter where it is likely that resolution can be obtained by direct, informal consultation with the people concerned. A situation where a student considers appropriate standards have not been met but the impact on them has not been great. Concerns may escalate to a complaint where not resolved or deemed serious.
Conflict of interest	A situation where a staff member's duties or responsibilities could be affected, or perceived to be affected, either directly or indirectly (e.g., through a family member, associated entity, or external agency) by some other interest or duty they may have.
Co-requisite	A course that must be completed simultaneously with another specified course unless students have previously passed the co-requisite course. *Most co-requisite courses contain important or complementary knowledge or skills which are essential for success in the course.*
Council	The governing body of MIT and Unitec constituted in accordance with Schedule 11 of the Education and Training Act 2020.
Course	The smallest component of a programme. A specified course or collection of courses forms a programme. A course may include one or more NZQA Standards which may or may not add up to the total value of the course. A course may also be called a paper, module, or unit of study.
Course engagement	Student engagement with a course evidenced by a student ~~having undertaken any~~undertaking one or more of the following activities, either in person, online, or through the MIT and Unitec learning management systems (LMS): ▪ ~~Attended~~ Attending or participating in a class or classes, workshop, practicum or work placement, or other learning ~~opportunity~~activity, (on campus or online); ▪ ~~Submitted~~ Submitting an assessment, ~~and/or~~ coursework, or other required learning activity, including, where relevant, a literacy or numeracy assessment~~.~~; or ▪ Participating in, or completing learning, assessment, or course-related activities through the LMS.
Credit	A value assigned to a segment of learning that reflects the estimated student time/effort required to satisfactorily meet the assessment requirements. One credit generally represents 10 notional hours.
Credit transfer (CT)	The granting of credit for successfully completing a course that is an exact match to the required level, learning and outcomes. Credit Transfer is one method for recognising prior knowledge and skills (RPKS) along with cross credit (CC) and recognition of prior learning (RPL).

Term	Definition
Cross credit (CC) *(Formerly known as credit recognition)*	The granting of credit for having successfully completed a similar course at the same or higher level, credits, and learning outcomes. Determined through an equivalence mapping exercise from the academic transcript and learning outcomes already achieved. Cross credit is one method for recognising prior knowledge and skills (RPKS) along with credit transfer (CT) and recognition of prior learning (RPL).
Did Not Complete the course (DNC)	The grade assigned when a student has stopped attending a course but has not withdrawn from the course during the withdrawal period.
Directory of Assessment and Skill Standards (DASS)	The NZQA managed and hosted directory containing all achievement standards, unit standards and skills standards (NZQA Standards).
Discrimination	Where a person is treated less favourably than another person in the same or similar circumstances because of any of the prohibited grounds, as set out in the Employment Relations Act 2000 and the Human Rights Act 1993 and may be unlawful in accordance with this legislation. Examples include but are not limited to: ▪ sex, which includes pregnancy and childbirth; ▪ gender identity; ▪ marital status; ▪ belief; ▪ ethical belief; ▪ colour; ▪ race; ▪ ethnic or national origins, which includes nationality or citizenship; ▪ disability; ▪ age; ▪ political opinion; ▪ employment status; ▪ family status; ▪ sexual orientation; and ▪ union involvement.
Doctoral degree	Doctoral degrees are Level 10 qualifications listed on the NZQCF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz
Domestic tertiary student	As defined in section 10(1) of the Education and Training Act 2020, domestic tertiary student means an individual: *(a) who is:*

Term	Definition
	i. a New Zealand citizen; or *ii. the holder of a residence class visa granted under the Immigration Act 2009 who satisfies the criteria (if any) prescribed by regulations made under subsection (2);* *iii. a person of a class or description of persons required by the Minister, by notice in the Gazette, to be treated as if they are not international students; and* *(b) who is a tertiary student enrolled at an institution or a registered establishment.* *Education and Training Act 2020.* New Zealand Legislation. Retrieved February 2025, from www.legislation.govt.nz
EFTS (Equivalent Full-Time Student)	An equivalent full-time student (EFTS) is a measure of consumption of education (or the size of a qualification in relation to workload). One EFTS unit is defined as the learner workload that would normally be carried out in a single academic year (12-month period) by a learner enrolled full-time and usually equates to 120 credits on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework (NZQCF). Tertiary Education Commission (n.d.). *Glossary*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www.TEC.govt.nz
Engagement/engaged	See definition of course engagement.
Enrolment	The process of allocating to an eligible student a place in a programme or training scheme or course.
Enrolment period	The period during which courses are offered. Usually, a semester, trimester, quarter, or full year. An enrolment period is determined by the length and delivery pattern of each programme.
Entry requirements	Requirements that must be met for students to be enrolled into a programme at MIT and Unitec. These are the requirements that are deemed necessary to ensure students have a reasonable chance of successfully completing the programme. Entry requirements, which may include pre-requisites, are set out in the Programme Regulations.
Equivalence assessment	The process of assessing whether a learner's prior knowledge, skills, or competencies, gained through formal, non-formal, or informal learning is equivalent to those of a specific course. This assessment is conducted to determine eligibility for the granting of credit through the Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills (RPKS) process.
Ethics Approval	Ethics approval ensures that research is conducted ethically, and the rights and safety of participants are protected. It involves a review of proposed research projects by the Ethics Committee. This approval is mandatory for all research projects that ~~involve:~~involve human or animal subjects; both MIT and Unitec staff and students (to ensure the ethical implications of the relationship between staff and students are appropriately considered); a Te Ao Māori or Treaty of Waitangi dimension; or any use of MIT and Unitec data which is not in the public domain.
Ethics Sub-Committee	The sub-committee established by the MIT and Unitec Academic Committee to provide advice and assistance to the Academic Committee with respect to ethical standards in research and to review and approve all proposed research to be undertaken by MIT and Unitec staff and students involving: human or animal

Term	Definition
	subjects; both MIT and Unitec staff and students (to ensure the ethical implications of the relationship between staff and students are appropriately considered); a Te Ao Māori and Treaty of Waitangi dimension; or any use of MIT and Unitec data that is not in the public domain.
Examination	Examinations are a formal assessment of student knowledge, usually focusing on theoretical knowledge. These are identified as examinations or assessments conducted under examination conditions within the course descriptors in the Programme Approval Document and course information.
Exceptional circumstances/grounds	Unusual or unforeseen situations that justify a departure from standard rules or procedures. These may include personal, academic, or contextual factors that significantly impact a student's ability to meet normal requirements and require individual consideration. When requesting consideration on these grounds, students may be asked to provide relevant evidence.
Exclusion	The cancellation of a student's enrolment, or the refusal to enrol a student at MIT and Unitec on any of the grounds set out in the *Student Regulations*. Exclusion may be permanent or for a fixed term.
Exemption (X)	This grade is assigned when either: ▪ Recognition (but not a cross credit) for a substantially equivalent prescribed course for which the student must then choose an alternative course of study; or ▪ Is given for a lower-level NZQA standard when a similar higher-level standard has been successfully achieved.
Failed course work (FCW)	This grade is assigned when students achieve an overall course result of 50 per cent or higher but fail to meet the minimum mark in one or more compulsory summative assessments, excluding the final examination.
Failed final (FF)	This grade is assigned when students achieve an overall course result of 50 per cent or higher but less than 40 per cent in the final examination.
Fees	Fees charged by MIT and Unitec, including but not limited to tuition fees, resource fees, student services fees, administration fees, NZQA fees on-charged to students, and sundry fees.
Formal award	An award leading to a qualification or credential listed on the NZQCF.
Formal learning	Study undertaken either at MIT and Unitec or another approved educational institution.
Formative assessment	An assessment designed to contribute to students' awareness, ability, knowledge, or competence. Formative assessment is intended to provide developmental feedback to the student on their progress and enables teachers to monitor student learning and modify their teaching practice to address issues. Formative assessment is not intended to contribute to a student's academic grade.
Full-time student	The StudyLink definition of full-time student will apply.

Term	Definition
Further assessment	The opportunity for students to undertake a further assessment (such as completing a further examination, test, assignment etc.) to meet course requirements. **Note**: Further assessment which involves undertaking a further examination or test may also be referred to as a "resit."
Grade	The overall level of achievement for a course is usually determined by combining the marks from individual assessment items that make up the course. A mark is a level of achievement for an assessment item (e.g., a mark of 15/20).
Graduand	A person who has completed the requirements for an MIT and Unitec award but has not had their award ceremonially conferred either in person or in absentia.
Graduate	A person who has had an award granted and conferred.
Graduate Certificate	Graduate Certificates are Level 7 qualifications listed on the NZQF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz
Graduate Diploma	Graduate Diplomas are Level 7 qualifications listed on the NZQCF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz
Graduate Profile Outcomes	Define the minimum level of skills, knowledge, understanding and attributes a graduate awarded a qualification can demonstrate.
Harassment	Any unwelcome or unjustified behaviour which is serious or repeated and which another person finds offensive or humiliating. Harassment includes racial harassment and sexual harassment. **Racial harassment** occurs when a complainant is subjected, for reasons of race, colour, nationality, or ethnic origin, to behaviour that might reasonably be perceived by the complainant to be offensive or unwelcome. Racial harassment can include but is not limited to any of the following: ▪ telling offensive jokes involving race, colour, ethnic origin, or nationality; ▪ teasing or comments about cultural differences; ▪ offensive labels; and ▪ making derogatory remarks about groups, or the attributes of groups, based on race, colour, ethnic origin, or nationality. **Sexual harassment** means any form of sexual or gender-oriented attention or behaviour that is unwanted, and which is personally offensive to the recipient. Sexual harassment occurs where: ▪ a request is made for contact or activity of a sexual nature which contains an implied or overt promise of preferential treatment or detrimental treatment. ▪ an MIT and Unitec community member is subjected to language, visual or physical behaviour of a sexual nature that is unwelcome or offensive to that person and has

Term	Definition
	a detrimental effect on that person's employment, job performance, job satisfaction, study, or standing in the MIT community. Examples of sexual harassment include, but are not limited to: ▪ unwanted and unacceptable comments about an individual's body or appearance; ▪ persistent sexual innuendo, sexual or smutty jokes, name calling, persistent and unwelcome questions about a person's private life, requests for dates or sexual activity, wolf whistles; ▪ offensive facial, hand, or body gestures; ▪ unwanted or unwelcome verbal, electronic or visual sexual contact; and ▪ unwelcome or unwanted physical contact.
Inclusive	An environment that ensures all students, can fully participate, engage, and succeed. It involves removing barriers to access and achievement, affirming diverse identities, and providing experiences that are equitable, culturally responsive, and accessible to all.
Individual Learning Plan (ILP)	A personalised plan designed to address the specific academic needs of an individual student. For late enrolment, an ILP helps to quickly identify and bridge any gaps in a student's knowledge and skills due to their delayed start.
Informal award	An award that is **not** listed on the NZQCF.
Information & Communication Technology Systems (ICTs)	MIT and Unitec telecommunications, computer systems, and audio-visual systems.
Intellectual property	Any work in which intellectual property rights exist including, but not limited to: ▪ Course materials; ▪ Research data and outputs; ▪ Assessment materials; ▪ Administrative materials; ▪ Computer software, videos, and recordings; ▪ Creative, literary works, artwork; ▪ Discoveries/innovations/inventions; ▪ Patents, copyright, designs, trademarks; ▪ Patentable and potentially patentable subject matter and associated know-how; ▪ Plant variety; and ▪ MIT and Unitec data.
Intellectual property rights	Rights in any patent, rights in a trademark, copyright, moral rights, rights in a design, know-how, confidential information, and all or any other intellectual or industrial property rights, whether or not registered.
International student	Any student who is not a domestic student.
Learning Management System (LMS)	Digital platforms used to support teaching, learning, communication, assessment, and course administration. Examples include Canvas, Moodle, and any replacement system adopted by MIT and Unitec.

Term	Definition
Learning outcome	An expected result of learning in terms of skills and knowledge. NZQA (2023). *Glossary*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz
Level	The level of courses or programme as defined by NZQA. Levels are based on complexity, with Level 1 the least complex and Level 10 the most complex. All qualifications on the NZQCF are assigned to one of the 10 levels. NZQA (2023). *Glossary*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz
Manifestly at odds with the evidence provided	A decision that no reasonable decision-maker could have reached based on the evidence available at the time, because it is clearly inconsistent with, unsupported by, or contrary to that evidence.
Mark	A level of achievement for an assessment item (e.g., a mark of 15/20 for an assessment). A grade is the overall level of achievement for a course, which is usually determined by combining the marks from individual assessment items that make up the course.
Master's Degree	Master's Degrees are Level 8 qualifications listed on the NZQCF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz
Micro-credential	Micro-credentials are units of learning that lead to the formal award of a credential listed on the NZQCF. Micro-credentials are NZQA approved and are usually no more than 40 credits. Micro-credentials are defined in section 10(1) of the Education and Training Act 2020 as study or training that (a) leads to an award; but (b) does not, of itself, lead to an award of a qualification listed on the NZQCF. For the purposes of these *Regulations*, the term 'programme' is deemed to include all MIT and Unitec educational offerings (including programmes, micro-credentials, and short courses) unless expressly excluded.
Misconduct (student)	Includes any behaviour that: ▪ Breaches MIT and Unitec's statutes, regulations, policies, or rules; ▪ Violates any New Zealand laws or legislation; ▪ Brings or has the potential to bring MIT and Unitec into disrepute; ▪ Interferes with MIT and Unitec educational objectives; ▪ Disregards the rights of others; or ▪ Compromises the safety of persons or property; This misconduct can occur ▪ On or near campus; ▪ During any official MIT and Unitec activity (e.g., practicum, off-campus visits, work-experience, or online activities); or ▪ In relation to a student's status as a student of MIT and Unitec. Examples of student misconduct include, but are not limited to: ▪ Breaching MIT and Unitec statutes, regulations, policies, or rules;

Term	Definition
	▪ Failing to comply with directions from staff to maintain safety, order, or discipline; ▪ Acting in a disorderly, reckless, offensive, or obscene manner; ▪ Smoking (including the use of e-cigarettes, vaping, and similar devices) in non-smoking areas; ▪ Failing to comply with penalties applied under the *Student Regulations*; ▪ Academic misconduct (cheating); ▪ Committing any criminal offence; ▪ Possessing or consuming alcohol (except as part of teaching activities or with the approval of authorised MIT and Unitec staff), drugs or any other mind-altering substance (other than those medically prescribed); ▪ Possessing firearms (including an air gun, paint ball gun etc.) or weapons; ▪ Behaving in a way detrimental to MIT and Unitec proper conduct, reputation, or order; ▪ Interfering with the studies, duties, or activities of any other student or staff member; ▪ Failing to comply with safety instructions given by an authorised person; ▪ Refusing to leave a class or activity when requested by staff due to safety or disruption concerns; ▪ Failing to pay a penalty or complete an action imposed as restitution under the *Student Regulations*; and ▪ Falsifying evidence or not disclosing required information for entry requirements. **Note:** These examples are for guidance only. Other behaviours may also be considered misconduct.
Moderation	The process of checking and ensuring that summative assessment activities are fair, valid, and consistent with the required standard across a number of assessors or assessing organisations.
Natural justice	Transparency and fairness of procedure and freedom from bias on the part of the person making the decision/judgment. https://www.justice.govt.nz/about/glossary/. Retrieved October 2025
New Zealand Certificate	Level 1-6 qualifications listed on the NZQF at levels 1-6 and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz.
New Zealand Diploma	Level 5-7 qualifications listed on the NZQF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz.
New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)	The Government agency that: ▪ Manages the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework; ▪ Runs the assessment system for secondary schools;

Term	Definition
	▪ Independently checks the quality of tertiary education providers, other than universities; ▪ Administers the Code of Pastoral Care; ▪ Recognises overseas qualifications; ▪ Manages standard setting for some NZQA Standards and qualifications. NZQA (n.d.), retrieved fromhttp://www.nzqa.govt.nz/about-us/our-role/
New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework (NZQCF)	The comprehensive list of all quality-assured qualifications and credentials in New Zealand. The NZQCF is managed and maintained by NZQA. Formerly the NZQF
NZQA Fees	NZQA fees, including credit reporting fees.
NZQA Standard	Achievement, unit, and skills standards listed on the NZQA Directory of Assessment and Skills Standards.
Part-time student	The StudyLink definition of part-time student will apply.
Plagiarism	Using someone else's work, ideas, or expression without indicating they are not one's own. It may be either intentional or unintentional. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to, doing any of the following **without giving credit or appropriately acknowledging/referencing the source:** ▪ Paraphrasing/rewriting someone else's ideas; ▪ Copying information (e.g., from books, journal articles, electronic sources such as the internet or databases, ~~AI~~Artificial Intelligence-generated content, sound recordings, films, another student); ▪ Self-plagiarism of one's own previous work.
Postgraduate Certificate	Level 8 qualifications listed on the NZQCF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz.
Postgraduate Diploma	Level 8 qualifications listed on the NZQCF and have the meaning and characteristics ascribed to them by NZQA. NZQA (2016). *The New Zealand Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz.
Pre-requisite	One or more specified courses, or programmes that must be successfully completed before students are permitted to proceed to another course.
Procedural flaw	A failure to follow the requirements of these *Regulations*, applicable policies, or the principles of procedural fairness when making a decision, and where that failure may have materially affected the outcome of the matter.
Programme	As defined in section 10(1) of the Education and Training Act 2020: *"A programme of study or training that leads to a qualification listed on the Qualifications and Credentials Framework."*

Term	Definition
	Education and Training Act 2020. New Zealand Legislation. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www.legislation.govt.nz A programme is a coherent arrangement of learning or training, made up of one or more courses. *For the purposes of these Regulations, the term 'programme' is deemed to include all MIT and Unitec educational offerings (including programmes, micro-credentials, and short courses), unless expressly excluded.*
Programme Committee	A committee established by the MIT and Unitec Academic Committee for each programme or group of related programmes with responsibility for monitoring and reviewing the quality of the programme(s) and the treatment and progress of students in the programme(s).
Programme Document	The definitive document for each programme, which sets out authoritative information about the programme including the regulations, course outlines, and delivery information.
Programme Regulations	Regulations that prescribe requirements for entry into and completion of a programme and courses making up the programme. ~~. A summary of the r~~Regulations for each programme ~~is~~ are available from the School or the MIT and Unitec website.
~~**Programmes for students with special educational needs**~~**Supported Learning programmes**	Programmes for which eligibility for enrolment includes having an intellectual disability and/or additional learning support needs, and which provide tailored educational support, pathways, and learning experiences to promote participation, achievement, independence, and inclusion. Supported Learning programmes recognise learner strengths and aspirations and seek to remove barriers to participation, achievement, and inclusion.~~Programmes that include as a requirement for entry that students must have an intellectual disability and/or other special learning needs.~~
Qualification	A qualification listed on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework, which may include qualifications offered by universities.
Recognition of prior learning (RPL)	The process involving formal assessment of a student's relevant and current knowledge and skills (which may have been obtained through formal training or on the job or life experience) to determine achievement of learning outcomes for the purpose of awarding credit towards a qualification. NZQA (2023). *Glossary*. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www2.nzqa.govt.nz Recognition of prior learning does not include credit transfer (CT) or cross credit (CC). Also known as assessment of prior learning. Recognition/Assessment of prior learning is one method for recognising prior knowledge and skills (RPKS) along with credit transfer and cross credit (CC). Also known as Assessment of Prior Learning (APL).
Re-count	The re-checking of the numerical accuracy of an assessment result. This involves verifying that: ▪ All parts of the assessment were marked ▪ Marks were correctly totalled ▪ The final grade was accurately recorded and reported.

Term	Definition
	It does not involve re-marking/re-evaluating the quality of the work or challenging academic judgment.
Refund period	The period, subject to specified conditions, in which students may receive a full or partial refund of fees as set out in the *Student Regulations.*
Re-mark	The re-evaluation of an assessment.
Remove/removal	To prevent students from attending class and/or the campus or any defined campus area for a period not exceeding two (2) working days for alleged misconduct. In exceptional circumstances, dismissal may be extended to a period not exceeding five (5) working days.
Resource fees	Non-teaching related fees paid by students to cover specific course-related costs (e.g., tools).
Respondent	The person responding to a concern, complaint, or allegation of misconduct.
Resubmission	A further opportunity for students to meet assessment criteria and requirements by submitting a revised version of an assessment after it has been initially marked.
Selection criteria	The criteria on which applicants are selected for entry into a programme where there are more applicants who meet the entry requirements than places available.
Short course	At MIT and Unitec, the term 'short course' refers collectively to all learning and training that leads to an informal award. Short courses are not approved by NZQA, do not lead to the award of a qualification listed on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework, and are usually (but not always) less than 40 credits. Short courses may be assessed or non-assessed. Short courses are typically not TEC funded. For the purposes of these *Regulations*, the term 'programme' is deemed to include all MIT and Unitec educational offerings (including programmes, micro-credentials, short courses), unless expressly excluded.
Skill standard	As defined in section 10(1) of the Education and Training Act 2020, means: a. a specification of skills, the levels of performance in those skills, and the learning outcomes associated with those skills; and b. in relation to any vocational education and training (or proposed vocational education and training), means a specification of some or all of the skills in which training is (or is proposed to be) received, the levels of performance in those skills intended to be attained by people receiving the training, and the learning outcomes associated with those skills. *Education and Training Act 2020.* New Zealand Legislation. Retrieved February 25, 2025, from www.legislation.govt.nz

Term	Definition
Smoke and smoking	The act or habit of inhaling or exhaling of the smoke of tobacco, drugs or vapour through cigarettes, pipes, or cigars. This includes the use of e-cigarettes, vaping, or similar devices that simulate the smoking experience.
Student	Any person who is: ▪ enrolled, or in the process of applying to be enrolled, in a programme delivered by MIT and Unitec; or ▪ participating in any programme or course delivered by MIT and Unitec (if this does not include a person who is acting in a teaching or instructing capacity).
Student services fee	A compulsory charge covering the provision of student services.
Summative assessment	A formal assessment event that contributes to a student's final course mark/grade and which has a bearing on whether credit is attained.
Sundry fees	Fees that are not specific to a particular course, including but not limited to fines, cross credit fees, credit transfer fees, recognition of prior learning fees, qualification fees and fees charged on behalf of a third party.
Suspension/suspend	To prevent students from attending classes and/or the campus or any defined campus area for a set time due to alleged misconduct. Suspension conditions may vary depending on the nature and seriousness of the alleged misconduct.
Teacher/s (Academic Staff)	Staff whose duties include, or who directly assist staff whose duties include all of the following in some measure: lecturing, lesson preparation, student assessment, pastoral care, and whose duties may also include: research, curriculum development, teacher development, or staff who directly advise those described above on academic matters.
Testamur	See certificate
Transfer	The process of withdrawing from a course, programme or institution, and moving to another.
Tuition fees	Teaching related fees.
Unit standard	A nationally registered, coherent set of learning outcomes and associated performance criteria, together with technical and management information that supports delivery and assessment. All unit standards are registered on the Directory of Assessment and Skill Standards (DASS).
Withdrawal	When a student has stopped attending a course and has submitted an *MIT and Unitec Withdrawal and Transfer Application* form or has been withdrawn by MIT and Unitec.

26. Document management and control

Category	Academic	**Consultation Scope**	Academic Committee / Staff
Policy Owner	DCE Academic	**Approval Bodies**	Council
Policy Contact Person	Legal Director, Tāmaki	**Review Dates**	Before 1 January 2027

27. Amendment history

Document Version	Effective Date	Approver	Amendment details
V1.0	1 January 2026	Council	New regulations
V1.1	16 February 2026	DEC Academic	Minor editorial amendments
V2.0	1 January 2027		

APPENDIX ONE - MIT AND UNITEC ACADEMIC DRESS

1. Graduands of MIT and Unitec (former MIT business division)

a. Graduands of the MIT and Unitec (former MIT business division) are to wear the academic dress appropriate to their award at graduation ceremonies, as specified below:

Award	Academic dress
▪ Master's Degree	▪ Cambridge Bachelor of Arts gown. ▪ Hood lined with satin coloured green PMS329 and edged with satin coloured gold PMS124C. ▪ Black trencher with a tassel coloured green PMS329.
▪ Postgraduate Diploma ▪ Postgraduate Certificate	▪ Cambridge Bachelor of Arts gown. ▪ Hood lined with satin coloured green PMS329 and edged with satin coloured navy blue PMS288C. ▪ Black trencher with a tassel coloured green PMS329.
▪ Bachelor Honours Degree	▪ Cambridge Bachelor of Arts gown. ▪ Hood lined with satin coloured green PMS329 and edged with satin coloured light green PMS324C. ▪ Black trencher with a tassel coloured green PMS329.
▪ Bachelor's Degree	▪ Cambridge Bachelor of Arts gown. ▪ Hood lined with satin coloured green PMS329. ▪ Black trencher with a tassel coloured green PMS329.
▪ Level 7 Diploma ▪ Graduate Diploma	▪ Cambridge Bachelor of Arts gown. ▪ Scarf lined with satin coloured green PMS324C.
▪ Graduate Certificate	▪ No specific requirements.
▪ Level 6 Diploma ▪ Level 5 Diploma	▪ May appear dressed in a Cambridge Bachelor of Arts gown as decreed.
▪ Certificates (Levels 1 – 6)	▪ No specific requirements.
▪ Micro-credentials (including Certificate of Achievement) ▪ Short courses (including Certificate of Attendance, Digital Badge) ▪ Certificate of Proficiency	▪ No specific requirements.

b. The academic dress for members of MIT and Unitec (former MIT business division) Graduation Ceremony will be as follows:

- The Chair of Council will wear the academic dress of the person holding the position of Chair together with the MIT and Unitec stole for the Chair of Council;
- The Chief Executive will wear the academic dress of the person holding the position of Chief Executive together with the MIT and Unitec stole for the Chief Executive; and
- Members of MIT and Unitec staff and Council attending or participating in public ceremonies with prescribed academic dress may choose to wear the academic dress appropriate to their degree.

2. Graduands of MIT and Unitec (former Unitec business division)

Members of staff of MIT and Unitec (former Unitec business division) attending or taking part in public ceremonies for which academic dress is prescribed shall wear the academic dress of their degrees. The academic dress worn by persons who have had their degrees conferred by Unitec shall conform to the specifications set out below. The official robes for the principal office holders at any public ceremony for which academic dress is prescribed shall conform to the specifications set out below.

Award	Academic dress
▪ Diplomas	▪ Black gown with open sleeves of the same style as the Cambridge University Bachelor of Arts gown
▪ Degree of Bachelor	▪ Black gown with open sleeves of the same style as the Cambridge University Bachelor of Arts gown ▪ A black mortar-board cap with a black tassel. ▪ A black hood in the Cambridge style, standard size. ▪ The hood will have a V-band on the neck in cream with a green raparapa pattern. ▪ The hood will have the standard Unitec two-part neckband with the off-white embroidered raparapa design on green background on the wearer's left side, and green embroidered raparapa design on off-white background on the right side. ▪ The hood will be fully lined with the approved colour for the discipline.
▪ Degree of Bachelor with Honours	▪ Black gown with open sleeves of the same style as the Cambridge University Bachelor of Arts gown. ▪ A black mortar-board cap with a black tassel. ▪ A Unitec green hood, in the Cambridge style, standard size. ▪ The hood will have the standard Unitec two-part neckband with the off-white embroidered raparapa design on green background on the wearer's left side, and green embroidered raparapa design on off-white background on the right side. ▪ The hood will be fully lined with the approved colour for the discipline.
▪ Graduate Diplomas	▪ Black stole with a strip of discipline colour approximately 2 cm tall across the bottom edge of the stole.
▪ Postgraduate Diplomas	▪ Bottle green stole with yellow raparapa placed on the end of the stole and a strip of discipline colour approximately 2 cm tall across the bottom edge on the other side of the stole. ▪ If the diplomate is not a graduate, the stole will be worn over a black gown with open sleeves of the same style as the Cambridge University Bachelor of Arts gown.
▪ Degree of Master	▪ Black gown of the same style as the Cambridge University Master of Arts gown. ▪ A black mortar-board cap with a black tassel. ▪ A Unitec green hood in the Cambridge style, standard size, with a band in cream with a green raparapa pattern approximately 2.5 cm from the outer edge.

Award	Academic dress
	▪ The hood will have the standard Unitec two-part neckband with the off-white embroidered raparapa design on green background on the wearer's left side, and green embroidered raparapa design on off-white background on the right side. ▪ The hood will be fully lined with the appropriate colour for the discipline as listed below.
▪ Doctoral Degrees *(professional doctorates, e.g., Doctor of Computing)*	▪ Gown of the same style as the Cambridge University Master's gown in bottle green with 100mm facings in the colour of the discipline. ▪ A Tudor Bonnet in black velveteen with a cord and tassels. ▪ A hood in the Cambridge style, standard size, in bottle green cloth outer and satin lining in the colour of the discipline ▪ The hood will have the standard Unitec two-part neckband with the off-white embroidered raparapa design on green background on the wearer's left side, and green embroidered raparapa design on off-white background on the right side; the whole neck-band backed in the colour of the discipline overlapping the front part by approximately 8 mm along both edges.
▪ Doctor of Philosophy	▪ Gown of the same style as the Cambridge University Master's gown in bottle green cloth with 100 mm wide bone satin facings down either side of the front, with an 8 mm strip of red satin at the outside edges. ▪ A Tudor Bonnet in black velveteen with green cord and tassels. ▪ A hood in the Cambridge style, standard size, in bottle green cloth outer and red satin lining. ▪ The hood will have the standard Unitec two-part neckband with the off white embroidered raparapa design on green background on the wearer's left side, and green embroidered raparapa design on off white background on the right side; the whole neck-band backed in red satin overlapping the front part by approximately 8 mm along both edges. ▪ In addition to the academic dress listed a wearer may also wear a cloak and/or korowai.
▪ Honorary Degrees of Bachelor and of Master	▪ A scarlet-coloured gown in the style of the equivalent Cambridge degree. ▪ A black satin grosgrain trencher cap. ▪ The hood is that of the degree being conferred.
▪ Honorary Professional Doctorate	▪ Gown in the same colour and style as the Professional Doctorate. ▪ A Tudor Bonnet in black velveteen with red cord and tassels. ▪ A hood in the Cambridge style, standard size, all in satin the colour of the discipline (outer and lining). ▪ The hood will have the standard Unitec two-part neckband with the off-white embroidered raparapa design on green background on the wearer's left side, and green embroidered raparapa design on off-white background on the right side; the whole neck-band backed in satin the colour of the discipline overlapping the front part by approximately 8mm along both edges.
▪ Honorary Doctor of Philosophy	▪ Gown in the same colour and style as the Doctor of Philosophy. ▪ A Tudor Bonnet in black velveteen with red cord and tassels.

Award	Academic dress
	▪ A hood in the Cambridge style, standard size, all in red satin (outer and lining). ▪ The hood will have the standard Unitec two-part neckband with the off-white embroidered raparapa design on green background on the wearer's left side, and green embroidered raparapa design on off-white background on the right side; the whole neckband backed in red satin overlapping the front part by approximately 8 mm along both edges.

Discipline Colours for Hood Linings, Stole Edging and Facings	
~~Applied Animal Technology~~	~~Loden~~
Applied Science/Osteopathy	Jade
Applied Technology	Gold
Architecture	White
Architectural Studies	Steel
Arts Royal	Blue
Business	Hot Pink
Communication	Citrus
Computing and Computer Systems	New Coral
Construction	Burgundy
Construction Management	Silver
Design	Cobalt
Design Management	Slate
Design and Visual Arts	Bright Pink
Education	Lilac
Educational Management	Maize
Engineering	Irish Green
Engineering Technology	Mandarin
Health Science	Turquoise
Innovation and Entrepreneurship	Plum
International Communication	Citrus
Landscape Architecture	Violet
Nursing	Purple
Performing and Screen Arts	Cherry Red
Product Design	Bordeaux
Professional Accountancy	Petal
Project Management	Silver
Quantity Surveying	Burgundy
Resource Management	Rustic
Social Practice	Tango
Sport Bright	Blue

Discipline Colours for Hood Linings, Stole Edging and Facings	
Teaching (ECE)	Guardsman Red
Technology	Irish Green
Veterinary Nursing	Loden

MIT and Unitec (former Unitec business division) role holders

a) Chair of Council:

- The robe is a black gown with a wide, 7 cm front facing of bone satin, edged with 3cm bottle green satin, from neck to hem. Bottle green raparapa sits on the cream facing below the shoulder. The hem is edged with a wide 7 cm facing of bone satin. The sleeves are elbow length, lined with bone satin.
- Tudor Bonnet in bottle green velvet with gold cord and tassels.

b) Chief Executive Officer

- The robe is a black gown with a wide, 7 cm front facing of bone satin, edged with 3cm bottle green satin, from neck to hem. Bottle green raparapa sits on the cream facing below the shoulder. The sleeves are elbow length, lined with bone satin.
- A Tudor Bonnet in bottle green velvet with gold cord and tassels.

c) Unitec Council

- On Unitec academic occasions, council members may wear the academic dress relating to their degree. Those whose standing is other than a degree may wear a Cambridge gown

d) Professorial Scarves

- Those attaining the status of professor may wear the Unitec professorial scarf on formal academic occasions. This is a 10 cm wide bone satin scarf, embroidered with bottle green raparapa, with a fine gold braid linking the scarf at the chest. It is worn around the neck on top of the gown and hood and falls to the hem of the gown.
- Those attaining the status of adjunct professor may wear the Unitec adjunct professor's scarf on formal academic occasions. This is a 10 cm wide bottle green satin scarf, embroidered with bone raparapa, and with a fine gold braid linking the scarf at the chest. It is worn around the neck on top of the gown and hood and falls to the hem of the gown.

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Helen Perry, Head of Academic Quality

Subject: Learning and Teaching Policy and Procedures

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 21/10/2026

Recommendations

That the Academic Committee approves the Learning and Teaching Policy and related procedures:

- Learning and Teaching Policy
- Learning Design and Delivery Procedure
- Teaching Excellence Procedure
- Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure
- Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure
- Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Procedure

Background

Prior to the formation of the institute, the legacy organisations maintained separate policy frameworks relating to learning and teaching.

At MIT, this area was governed through the Learning and Teaching Policy and Procedures and the Staff Education Policy and Procedures. In contrast, Unitec did not maintain equivalent overarching learning and teaching or staff education policies. Instead, requirements relating to these areas were distributed across several procedures and guidance documents, including procedures addressing matters such as Academic Integrity.

Following the merger, MITU established the Teaching Excellence Framework Policy, providing an institution-wide framework for expectations relating to teaching practice. However, the broader policy environment relating to learning and teaching has continued to reflect a combination of legacy documents and processes.

Development of the New Policy Suite

To create a more cohesive and accessible framework, the relevant provisions from the legacy MIT policy suite, the Teaching Excellence Framework Policy, and associated Unitec procedures have been

reviewed and consolidated into a single integrated Learning and Teaching Policy and supporting procedures.

The new policy suite is intended to:

- Establish a single institutional framework for learning and teaching.
- Remove duplication and overlap across existing policies and procedures.
- Improve clarity and accessibility for staff.
- Align institutional expectations regarding teaching practice, assessment, learner support, academic integrity, and continuous improvement.
- Support consistent implementation of learning and teaching requirements across the institute.

Consultation

The proposed policy and procedures have been developed in consultation with the Learning and Teaching Committee. Feedback received through this process has informed the final drafts presented for approval.

Open Session:

This paper may be considered in open session.

Attachments

- Learning and Teaching Policy
- Learning Design and Delivery Procedure
- Teaching Excellence Procedure
- Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure
- Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure
- Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Procedure

Learning and Teaching Policy

Audience and scope

This policy applies to all staff involved in the design, delivery, support, leadership, quality assurance, enhancement, and management of learning and teaching activities at MITU, including academic staff, academic leaders, professional staff who support learning and teaching, and contracted teaching staff.

This policy applies to all learning and teaching activities delivered by or on behalf of MITU, including face-to-face, blended, online, workplace, subcontracted, and other approved modes of delivery.

Document management and control

Version number	V1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Head of Academic Quality

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
V1.0	01/01/2027	Head of Academic Quality	New Policy

Table of Contents

Audience and scope 1
Document management and control 1
Amendment history 1
Table of Contents 2
Learning and Teaching Policy 3
1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Mātāpono | Principles 3
3. Learning and Teaching 3
4. Academic Staff Capability 5
5. Hātepe | Procedures 6
6. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations 6
7. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes 7
8. Mana Tuku | Delegations 7
9. Kawenga | Responsibilities 7
10. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 7
11. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 8
12. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents 8

Learning and Teaching Policy

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this policy is to establish MITU's expectations for learning and teaching and academic staff capability, and to support the delivery of high-quality learning experiences that enable learner success.

1.2. This policy provides the framework for learning design and delivery, teaching excellence, academic staff capability and development, learner support, and the continuous enhancement of learning and teaching across MITU.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. Learning and teaching are core functions of MITU and will be delivered in ways that support learner success, achievement, progression and wellbeing.

2.2. Learning and teaching will reflect MITU's commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and support equitable outcomes for Māori learners.

2.3. Learning and teaching practices will recognise and support the diverse needs, experiences and aspirations of learners and promote equitable access, participation and success.

2.4. Learning and teaching will prepare learners for employment, professional practice, further study and lifelong learning.

2.5. Learning and teaching practices will be informed by evidence, scholarship, stakeholder feedback and continuous improvement.

2.6. Academic staff will develop and maintain the capability required to deliver high-quality learning and teaching.

2.7. MITU will foster a culture of teaching excellence through collaboration, professional learning, innovation, reflective practice and the application of the Teaching Excellence Framework.

3. Learning and Teaching

Learning design and delivery

3.1. Learning and teaching activities will:

a. align with approved curriculum, learning outcomes and graduate outcomes;

b. engage learners in meaningful and authentic learning activities;

c. support the application of knowledge and skills in a range of contexts;

d. promote learner success and achievement;

e. reflect relevant professional, disciplinary and industry expectations; and

f. be delivered in accordance with MITU learning and teaching requirements and standards.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Te Mana Akoranga and culturally responsive practice

3.2. Learning and teaching activities will:

a. give effect to **Te Tiriti o Waitangi** through learning and teaching practice;

b. reflect **Kaupapa Māori** and teaching practices informed by Māori ways of knowing, being and learning;

c. foster **Whanaungatanga** through meaningful relationships that support learner engagement, belonging, participation and success;

d. recognise and support Māori learner success and aspirations;

e. recognise and value diverse cultural perspectives, identities and experiences;

f. contribute to **Whai Hua** by promoting equitable access, participation, achievement and learner success;

g. contribute to **Whai Hiranga** through culturally responsive and evidence-informed learning and teaching practices that support educational excellence; and

h. reflect **Kia Kotahi te Angitū**, recognising that learner success is a shared responsibility between learners, staff, leaders and MITU.

Inclusive learning

3.3. Learning and teaching will be designed and delivered to promote inclusion, accessibility and participation.

3.4. Academic staff will take reasonable steps to remove barriers to learning and support equitable learner engagement and achievement.

Digital learning

3.5. MITU will provide digital learning environments that support learning, teaching and learner engagement.

3.6. All learners will have access to a consistent and effective digital learning environment that meets institutional standards.

Artificial intelligence and emerging technologies

3.7. MITU supports the appropriate and ethical use of artificial intelligence and emerging technologies in learning and teaching.

3.8. Academic staff will ensure that:

a. the use of artificial intelligence supports meaningful learning and learner development;

b. expectations regarding the use of artificial intelligence are clearly communicated to learners;

c. learning activities maintain academic integrity and authenticity; and

d. the use of artificial intelligence reflects relevant professional, ethical, cultural and regulatory expectations.

Learner Support

3.9. Academic staff contribute to learner success through the creation of supportive learning environments and the identification of learners who may require additional support.

3.10. MITU will maintain processes that enable learners to access appropriate learning and support services.

Continuous enhancement

3.11. MITU will continuously enhance learning and teaching through:

a. evaluation and review activities;

b. learner, graduate, industry and stakeholder feedback;

c. peer observation, peer review and professional dialogue;

d. scholarship and evidence-informed practice; and

e. professional learning and development.

4. Academic Staff Capability

4.1. Academic staff will:

a. maintain appropriate disciplinary, professional and industry expertise;

b. maintain educational capability and effective teaching practice;

c. engage in ongoing professional learning and development;

d. maintain **Puukenga** by developing capability in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Te Mana Akoranga, Māori learner success, whanaungatanga and culturally responsive practice; and

e. meet any qualification, accreditation, registration or capability requirements specified by MITU or relevant external bodies.

4.2. MITU will provide induction, professional learning opportunities, educational resources, cultural capability development opportunities, and other support to assist academic staff to develop and maintain **Puukenga** and apply Te Mana Akoranga principles within learning and teaching practice

Teaching Excellence

4.3. MITU will maintain a Teaching Excellence Framework comprising Teaching Excellence Standards and associated supporting documents.

4.4. The Teaching Excellence Framework provides the institutional framework for defining, developing, recognising and evaluating teaching excellence.

4.5. Academic staff whose role includes teaching will engage with the Teaching Excellence Framework as part of their professional practice and ongoing professional development.

4.6. The Teaching Excellence Standards will inform:

a. recruitment and appointment processes;

b. induction and mentoring activities;

c. professional learning and development;

d. performance planning and review;

e. progression and promotion processes;

f. recognition and reward of teaching excellence; and

g. evaluation and enhancement of teaching practice

4.7. MITU will ensure that the Teaching Excellence Standards are embedded within relevant policies, procedures, frameworks and guidance relating to learning and teaching.

4.8. Academic staff involved in specialist educational activities may be required to meet additional capability or qualification requirements specified in institutional procedures.

5. Hātepe | Procedures

5.1. The requirements of this policy will be supported by procedures and associated guidance relating to:

a. learning design and delivery;

b. teaching excellence;

c. academic staff capability and professional learning;

d. academic staff induction and mentoring; and

e. literacy and numeracy.

6. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

6.1. There are no exemptions or dispensations to this policy other than those

provided in associated procedures.

7. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

7.1. The extent to which this policy and associated procedures achieve their intended outcomes will be monitored by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

7.2. The Learning and Teaching Committee will report to the Academic Committee on the implementation and effectiveness of this policy and associated procedures and recommend any amendments required to support continuous improvement in learning and teaching.

8. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Endorse the Teaching Excellence Standards	Academic Committee	Learning and Teaching Committee
Approve and maintain the Teaching Excellence Matrix and associated implementation guidance	Learning and Teaching Committee	

9. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Academic Committee	Approves the Learning and Teaching Policy and provides governance oversight of learning and teaching at MITU.
Learning and Teaching Committee	Monitors the implementation and effectiveness of this policy, advises Academic Committee on learning and teaching matters, and oversees the Teaching Excellence Standards and Teaching Excellence Matrix.
Academic Leaders	Ensure learning and teaching activities within their area of responsibility comply with this policy and associated procedures and support continuous improvement in learning and teaching practice.
Academic Staff	Design, deliver, evaluate and continuously improve learning and teaching activities in accordance with this policy and associated procedures and maintain required academic and professional capability.

10. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

11. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

12. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- Learning Design and Delivery Procedure
- Teaching Excellence Procedure
- Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure
- Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure
- Literacy and Numeracy Procedure
- Te Mana Akoranga Policy

GLOSSARY OF MĀORI TERMS

The **Glossary of Māori Terms** provides a standardised bilingual reference for the consistent use of Te Reo Māori and English across MIT and Unitec policies, procedures and governance documents. It supports clear, consistent and culturally responsive documentation by promoting the use of agreed institutional terminology.

This glossary is intended to be a practical reference that promotes consistency, clarity and the appropriate use of bilingual terminology across MITU. It should be reviewed periodically to ensure it remains current and aligned with institutional practice.

ENGLISH	TE REO MĀORI
Accountability	Takohanga
Achievement / Delivery	Whakatutuki
Action Plan	Mahere Mahi
Activities	Ngā Mahi
Advice / Guidance	Tohutohu
Approval / Agreement	Whakaaetanga
Authorisation / Empowerment	Whakamana
Authority / Approval	Mana Tohu
Care, Respect, Hospitality	Manaakitanga
Compassion	Aroha
Correctness / Justice	Tika
Covenant / Agreement	Kawenata
Criteria	Paearu
Customary Practice / Correct Process	Tikanga
Decision	Whakatau

ENGLISH	TE REO MĀORI
Decision-making Authority	Mana Whakatau
Development	Whakawhanaketanga
Effectiveness	Whai Hua
Engagement / Contact	Whakapā
Equity	Ōritetanga
Equity / Fairness	Mana Taurite
Evaluation / Assessment	Aromatawai
Explanation	Whakamārama
Family Wellbeing	Whānau Ora
Focus	Aronga
Governance	Mana Whakahaere
Guideline	Aratohu
Guiding Principles	Mātāpono Arataki
Impact	Pānga
Implementation	Whakatinana
Implementation Strategy	Rautaki Whakatinana
Integrity / Honesty	Pono
Knowledge	Mātauranga
Long-term Vision	Pae Tawhiti
Management	Whakahaere
Monitoring	Aroturuki
Objective	Whāinga
Objectives	Ngā Whāinga
Obligation	Herenga
Operational Arrangements	Whakaritenga Mahi
Outcomes	Ngā Hua
Overview	Tirohanga Whānui
Performance Indicator	Tohu Mahi
Performance Target	Whāinga Paetae
Plan	Mahere
Policy	Kaupapa Here
Policy / Purpose / Initiative	Kaupapa
Practices	Ngā Tikanga
Principle	Mātāpono

ENGLISH	TE REO MĀORI
Procedure / Process	Hātepe
Process	Tukanga
Programme Management	Whakahaere Kaupapa
Protocol	Kawa
Purpose / Reason	Pūtake
Quality Management	Whakahaere Kounga
Recommendation	Tūtohunga
Reference	Tohutoro
Relationship / Connection	Hononga
Relationship Building	Whakawhanaungatanga
Report	Pūrongo
Requirements / Arrangements	Whakaritenga
Responsibility	Kawenga
Review	Arotake
Risk	Mōrearea
Risk	Tūraru
Risk Management	Whakahaere Mōrearea
Risks	Ngā Tūraru
Rule / Law	Ture
Scope	Whānuitanga
Self-determination / Leadership	Rangatiratanga
Spiritual Wellbeing	Wairua
Stewardship	Kaitiakitanga
Strategic Objective	Whāinga Rautaki
Strategic Plan	Mahere Rautaki
Strategy	Rautaki
Success Indicator	Tohu Angitu
Summary	Whakarāpopototanga
Sustainability	Toitūtanga
System	Pūnaha
Timeline	Rārangi Wā
Treaty of Waitangi	Te Tiriti o Waitangi
Unity	Kotahitanga
Values	Ngā Uaratanga

ENGLISH	TE REO MĀORI
Values	Uaratanga
Wellbeing	Hauora
Working Group	Rōpū Mahi
Whanaungatanga	Relationship

Learning Design and Delivery Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure applies to all MITU staff involved in the design, development, delivery, coordination, evaluation, review, support, leadership, quality assurance, and enhancement of learning and teaching activities, including academic staff, academic leaders, professional staff who support learning and teaching, and contracted teaching staff.

This procedure applies to all learning and teaching activities delivered by or on behalf of MITU, including face-to-face, blended, distance (including online), workplace, subcontracted, and other approved modes of delivery. It applies to learning design, course delivery, digital learning environments, learner feedback processes, and the continuous improvement of learning and teaching

Document management and control

Version number	V1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Head of Academic Quality

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
V1.0	01/01/2027	Head of Academic Quality	New Policy

Table of Contents

Audience and scope....1

Document management and control....1

Amendment history....1

Table of Contents....1

Learning Design and Delivery Procedures....3

1. Pūtake | Purpose....3
2. Mātāpono | Principles....3
3. Learning Design Expectations....3

4. Course Commencement Requirements 4
5. Digital Learning Environment Standards 4
6. Delivery Modalities 5
7. Learner Feedback 5
8. Consistency of Learner Experience 5
9. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations 6
10. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes 6
11. Mana Tuku | Delegations 6
12. Kawenga | Responsibilities 6
13. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 6
14. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 7
15. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents 7

Learning Design and Delivery Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. This procedure establishes MITU's requirements for the design, delivery, evaluation, and continuous enhancement of learning and teaching activities.

1.2. This procedure supports the implementation of the Learning and Teaching Policy and related procedures and ensures that learning and teaching activities are delivered consistently, effectively, and in accordance with the requirements of approved curriculum, learner needs, institutional standards, and relevant external requirements.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. MITU will ensure that:

a. learning activities are designed and delivered to support learner success and achievement;

b. learning design, resources, and delivery methods align with approved curriculum and learning outcomes;

c. learners are provided with a consistent, accessible, and effective learning experience;

d. digital learning environments support learner engagement and success;

e. learning and teaching practices are evaluated and continuously enhanced through evidence, feedback, and reflection; and

f. learning design and delivery reflect institutional commitments relating to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, **Kaupapa Māori**, learner wellbeing, inclusion, accessibility, **Whanaungatanga**, and **Whai Hua** equitable learner success.

3. Learning Design Expectations

Alignment

3.1. Learning activities, resources, teaching approaches, and assessment activities must align with:

- approved programme and course documentation;
- graduate outcomes, where applicable;
- course learning outcomes;
- relevant professional, regulatory, industry, and accreditation requirements; and
- institutional commitments relating to **Te Tiriti o Waitangi** and **Te**

Mana Akoranga principles.

Inclusion and Accessibility

3.2. Academic staff must take reasonable steps to ensure learning activities, resources, and environments:

- are accessible and support the participation of diverse learner groups;
- foster **Whanaungatanga** through respectful and inclusive learning environments; and
- contribute to equitable learner participation, achievement and **Whai Hua** success.

4. Course Commencement Requirements

Course Information

4.1. At the commencement of a course, learners must be provided with access to information regarding:

- course learning outcomes;
- assessment requirements;
- delivery arrangements and learner expectations;
- available learning and support services;
- relevant regulations, policies, and procedures; and
- any other information required under institutional standards.

Learner Orientation

4.2. Schools must ensure learners are provided with an appropriate introduction to:

- the course;
- relevant digital learning environments;
- learning resources;
- support services; and
- any programme-specific requirements.

5. Digital Learning Environment Standards

Digital Learning Environment

5.1. All active courses must maintain a published digital learning environment in accordance with MITU Digital Learning Standards.

5.2. As a minimum, the digital learning environment must provide learners with access to:

- course information;
- assessment information;
- communication channels;
- student feedback;
- online institute support e.g. student support services.

5.3. Schools and academic staff must ensure digital learning environments provide a consistent learner experience and comply with approved institutional standards.

6. Delivery Modalities

General requirements

6.1. Learning and teaching activities must be delivered through approved delivery modes including face-to-face, blended, distance (online), workplace, and other approved arrangements.

6.2. Academic staff must ensure that learning activities, resources, communication, learner support, and assessment arrangements are appropriate to the approved delivery mode and support learner engagement, participation, and success consistent with **Kia Kotahi te Angitū**.

7. Learner Feedback

Collection of Feedback

7.1. MITU must maintain mechanisms for obtaining learner feedback regarding learning and teaching activities.

Use of Feedback

7.2. Academic staff, Heads of School and Programme Committees must consider learner feedback as part of the ongoing evaluation and enhancement of learning and teaching, supporting a culture of continuous improvement consistent with **Whai Hiranga** and **Kia Kotahi te Angitū**.

Continuous Improvement

7.3. Where opportunities for improvement are identified, reasonable steps must be taken to address them through course, programme, school, or institutional improvement activities.

8. Consistency of Learner Experience

8.1. Academic staff must ensure that learners receive a learning experience that is consistent with approved curriculum and institutional standards.

Core Requirements

8.2. Consistency requirements must include:

- course information;
- learner communications;
- digital learning environments;
- assessment information;
- access to learning resources; and
- other requirements specified in institutional standards.

Flexibility

8.3. Schools and academic staff may determine discipline-specific and pedagogical approaches provided institutional standards and approved curriculum requirements are maintained.

9. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

There are no exemptions or dispensations to this procedure.

10. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

The extent to which the implementation of these procedures achieve their intended outcomes will be subject to evaluation and review by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

11. Mana Tuku | Delegations

There are no delegations this procedure.

12. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Learning and Teaching Committee	Monitors the implementation and effectiveness of this procedure and advises the Academic Committee on matters relating to learning design and delivery.
Head of School (or delegate)	Ensure learning and teaching activities within their area comply with this procedure, institutional standards, and approved curriculum requirements.
Academic Staff	Design, deliver, evaluate, and continuously improve learning and teaching activities in accordance with this procedure and associated standards and guidance.

13. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

See the Glossary of MIT&Unitec Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents

14. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

15. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- Learning and Teaching Policy
- Teaching Excellence Procedure
- Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure
- Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure
- Literacy and Numeracy Procedure
- Te Mana Akoranga Policy

Teaching Excellence Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure applies to all MITU staff involved in the design, delivery, support, leadership, evaluation, development, recognition, or management of learning and teaching activities, including academic staff, academic leaders, professional staff who support learning and teaching, and contracted teaching staff.

This procedure applies to the implementation, application, review, and maintenance of the Teaching Excellence Framework, Teaching Excellence Standards, and Teaching Excellence Matrix.

Document management and control

Version number	V1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Head of Academic Quality

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
V1.0	01/01/2027	Head of Academic Quality	New Policy

Table of Contents

Audience and scope 1

Document management and control 1

Amendment history 1

Table of Contents 1

Teaching Excellence Procedures 3

1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Mātāpono | Principles 3
3. Teaching Excellence Framework 4
4. Teaching Excellence Standards 4
5. Teaching Excellence Matrix 5

6. Application of the Teaching Excellence Framework....5
7. Recognition of Teaching Excellence....5
8. Teaching Enhancement Activities....6
9. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations.6
10. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes....6
11. Mana Tuku | Delegations....6
12. Kawenga | Responsibilities....7
13. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions....7
14. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation....7
15. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents....7

Teaching Excellence Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. This procedure establishes the requirements for the implementation, application, maintenance, and review of the MITU Teaching Excellence Framework.

1.2. This procedure supports the Learning and Teaching Policy by providing the operational requirements for the Teaching Excellence Framework, Teaching Excellence Standards, and Teaching Excellence Matrix, and for the recognition and enhancement of teaching excellence across MITU.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. MITU will ensure that:

a. teaching excellence is recognised, supported, and promoted across the institution;

b. teaching excellence is defined through a consistent institutional framework;

c. teaching excellence expectations are transparent and applied consistently;

d. teaching excellence is informed by evidence, learner feedback, reflective practice, scholarship, and continuous improvement;

e. the Teaching Excellence Framework supports academic staff development and learner success; and

f. Teaching Excellence Standards remain culturally responsive, academically robust, grounded in **Te Tiriti o Waitangi** and **Te Mana Akoranga**, and relevant to contemporary tertiary education.

3. Teaching Excellence Framework

Framework

3.1. MITU will maintain a Teaching Excellence Framework to define, support, evaluate, and recognise teaching excellence.

Components

3.2. The Teaching Excellence Framework comprises:

- Teaching Excellence Standards;
- a Teaching Excellence Matrix; and
- the systematic application of the Teaching Excellence Standards within institutional policies, procedures, frameworks, and decision-making processes.

3.3. The Teaching Excellence Framework is the institutional framework for defining expectations of teaching excellence and supporting continuous improvement in learning and teaching.

4. Teaching Excellence Standards

Standards

4.1. The Teaching Excellence Standards must:

- support learner success and achievement;
- reflect evidence-informed teaching practice;
- promote **Kaupapa Māori** and teaching practices informed by Māori ways of knowing, being, and learning;
- foster **Whanaungatanga** through learning and teaching practices that support learner engagement, belonging and success;
- support equitable learner outcomes;
- align with the Learning and Teaching Policy and **Te Mana Akoranga** principles; and
- remain relevant to contemporary tertiary education practice.

Review

4.2. The Learning and Teaching Committee will oversee the ongoing review and development of the Teaching Excellence Standards.

4.3. When reviewing the Standards, MITU will undertake appropriate consultation to ensure that they remain academically robust, culturally responsive, and informed by diverse disciplinary and pedagogical perspectives.

5. Teaching Excellence Matrix

Matrix

5.1. MITU will maintain a Teaching Excellence Matrix that describes progression within each Teaching Excellence Standard.

5.2. The Matrix provides progression criteria and supporting descriptors.

5.3. The Matrix supports the consistent interpretation and application of the Teaching Excellence Standards across MITU.

6. Application of the Teaching Excellence Framework

Institutional application

6.1. MITU will embed the Teaching Excellence Framework within relevant institutional processes.

Application areas

6.2. The Teaching Excellence Standards must be applied, as appropriate, within:

- recruitment and appointment processes;
- academic staff induction and mentoring;
- professional learning and development activities;
- performance planning and review processes;
- progression and promotion processes;
- recognition of teaching excellence initiatives; and
- evaluation and enhancement of teaching practice.

6.3. Heads of School must support and promote the consistent application of the Teaching Excellence Framework within their areas of responsibility.

6.4. Academic staff whose role includes teaching must engage with the Teaching Excellence Framework as part of their professional practice and professional development.

7. Recognition of Teaching Excellence

Recognition

7.1. MITU will maintain processes to recognise and celebrate teaching excellence.

7.2. Recognition activities may include:

- institutional teaching awards;
- external award nominations;

- formal recognition programmes;

7.3. Recognition activities must align with the Teaching Excellence Standards.

8. Teaching Enhancement Activities

Enhancement

8.1. MITU will support activities that promote the continuous enhancement of learning and teaching.

8.2. Teaching enhancement activities may include:

- teaching innovation initiatives;
- dissemination of effective practice;
- scholarship of teaching and learning activities;
- learner feedback activities.

8.3. Teaching enhancement activities must be informed by evidence, learner feedback, professional practice, and institutional priorities.

9. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

There are no exemptions or dispensations to this procedure.

10. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

The extent to which this procedure achieves its intended outcomes will be monitored by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

The Learning and Teaching Committee will report to the Academic Committee on the implementation and effectiveness of the Teaching Excellence Framework and recommend any amendments required to support continuous improvement in learning and teaching.

11. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated Authority	Supporting Endorsement
Amendments to the Teaching Excellence Standards.	Academic Committee	Learning and Teaching Committee
Approve the Teaching Excellence Matrix and associated implementation guidance.	Learning and Teaching Committee	None.
Approval of the Teaching Excellence Framework	Academic Committee	Learning and Teaching Committee

12. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Academic Committee	Approves the Teaching Excellence Framework and provides governance oversight of teaching excellence at MITU.
Learning and Teaching Committee	Oversees the implementation, application, maintenance, and review of the Teaching Excellence Framework, Teaching Excellence Standards, and Teaching Excellence Matrix.
Academic Leaders	Ensure the Teaching Excellence Framework is applied consistently within their areas of responsibility and support staff engagement with the Framework.
Academic Staff	Engage with the Teaching Excellence Framework as part of their professional practice and development.

13. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

See the Glossary of MIT&Unitec Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents

14. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

15. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- Learning and Teaching Policy
- Learning Design and Delivery Procedure
- Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure
- Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure
- Literacy and Numeracy Procedure
- Te Mana Akoranga Policy

Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure applies to all academic staff whose role includes teaching, learning support, curriculum development, academic leadership, or other responsibilities relating to learning and teaching at MITU, including permanent, fixed-term, casual, contract, adjunct, and sessional academic staff unless otherwise specified.

This procedure establishes MITU's requirements relating to academic staff qualifications, capability, industry and educational currency, professional learning, peer observation, communities of practice, and cultural capability.

Document management and control

Version number	V1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Head of Academic Quality

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
V1.0	01/01/2027	Head of Academic Quality	New Policy

Table of Contents

Audience and scope....1
Document management and control....1
Amendment history....1
Table of Contents....1
Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure....3
1. Pūtake | Purpose....3
2. Mātāpono | Principles....3
3. Teaching Qualification Requirements....4

4. Qualification Equivalencies 5
5. Professional Learning Expectations 5
6. Peer Observation and Professional Dialogue 6
7. Communities of Practice 6
8. Professional Learning Plans 7
9. Industry Currency 7
10. Educational Currency 8
11. Māori, Pacific and Cultural Capability 8
12. Mandatory Development Activities 9
13. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations 9
14. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes 10
15. Mana Tuku | Delegations 10
16. Kawenga | Responsibilities 10
17. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 11
18. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 11
19. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents 11

Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. This procedure establishes the requirements for maintaining and developing the capability of academic staff involved in learning and teaching activities at MITU.

1.2. This procedure supports implementation of the Learning and Teaching Policy by ensuring academic staff possess and maintain the educational, professional, disciplinary, cultural, and industry capabilities necessary to deliver high-quality learning and teaching and support learner success.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. MITU will ensure that:

a. academic staff are appropriately qualified and capable to undertake their teaching responsibilities;

b. capability expectations are clear, transparent, and consistently applied;

c. academic staff are supported to maintain and enhance capability throughout their employment;

d. professional learning is aligned to learner success, teaching excellence, and institutional priorities;

e. capability development reflects commitments to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, **Te Mana Akoranga**, equity, inclusion, cultural responsiveness, and learner success through **Whai hua** and **Whai hiranga**; and

f. academic staff engage in continuous professional learning and improvement.

3. Teaching Qualification Requirements

Recruitment and appointment

3.1. Heads of School and People and Culture must ensure that academic staff appointed to teaching roles possess the qualifications, experience, and capability required to undertake their academic responsibilities.

3.2. Academic staff appointed to teaching roles must:

- hold qualifications appropriate to the discipline in which they teach;
- possess relevant professional, industry, vocational, or scholarly experience;
- meet any accreditation, registration, licensing, or professional body requirements applicable to their discipline; and
- meet MITU teaching qualification requirements.

Teaching qualification requirements

3.3. Permanent and fixed-term academic staff whose role includes teaching must hold, or be actively working towards, an approved tertiary teaching qualification.

3.4. Unless otherwise approved under these procedures, the minimum teaching qualification requirement will normally be an NZQA-approved adult tertiary teaching qualification at Level 5 or above comprising at least 60 credits, or an approved equivalent.

Qualification completion requirements

3.5. Academic staff appointed without an approved teaching qualification must:

- be enrolled in an approved teaching qualification within six months of appointment; and
- complete the qualification within two years of appointment unless an approved extension has been granted.

Casual and contract academic staff

3.6. Heads of School must ensure that casual and contract academic staff possess qualifications and capability appropriate to the teaching activities they undertake.

3.7. Where casual or contract academic staff do not hold an approved teaching qualification, appropriate supervision, mentoring, and professional development support must be provided.

Monitoring

3.8. Heads of School must maintain current records of teaching qualifications and monitor progress toward qualification completion requirements.

4. Qualification Equivalencies

Recognition of equivalent qualifications

4.1. Applications for recognition of equivalency must be assessed against:

- qualification level;
- qualification credit value;
- relevance to tertiary education teaching practice;
- currency of the qualification; and
- demonstrated capability in learning and teaching.

Applications

4.2. The delegated authority, in conjunction with the Head of School, Education, is responsible for the recognition of teaching qualifications of an academic staff member.

4.3. Staff seeking recognition of an equivalent qualification must provide sufficient documentation to support their application. Evidence may include:

- transcripts;
- qualification documentation;
- curriculum information;
- professional teaching credentials; and
- any additional evidence required by MITU.

Reviews

4.4. Staff who are dissatisfied with an equivalency decision may request a review through institutional review processes.

5. Professional Learning Expectations

Ongoing professional learning

5.1. Academic staff must undertake ongoing professional learning to maintain and enhance professional capability.

5.2. Professional learning activities should support:

- teaching effectiveness;
- learner success and **Whai hua**;
- educational innovation;

- discipline-specific developments;
- professional practice;
- industry relevance;
- **Puukenga**, cultural capability, equity and inclusion; and
- institutional priorities.

5.3. Academic staff are expected to participate in professional learning activities identified through:

- professional learning plans;
- performance and development discussions;
- institutional initiatives;
- quality assurance activities;
- external accreditation requirements; and
- statutory or regulatory obligations.

6. Peer Observation and Professional Dialogue

General requirements

6.1. Academic staff must participate in peer observation and professional dialogue activities as part of their ongoing professional learning and capability development at least once annually.

6.2. Peer observation activities are intended to:

- support reflective practice;
- enhance teaching capability;
- encourage professional dialogue;
- support sharing of effective teaching practice;
- promote continuous improvement; and
- support culturally responsive teaching practice consistent with **Te Mana Akoranga** principles.

6.3. Peer observation activities must:

- support capability development;
- promote constructive professional feedback;
- encourage evidence-informed improvement; and
- be undertaken in accordance with approved institutional guidance.

6.4. Participation in peer observation activities may be recorded as evidence of professional learning and capability development.

7. Communities of Practice

7.1. MITU will support communities of practice that contribute to learning and

teaching excellence and academic capability development.

7.2. Communities of practice may be established to:

- promote collaboration;
- share effective teaching practice;
- support innovation;
- explore emerging developments in learning and teaching;
- address common challenges;
- support institutional priorities; and
- support the development of **Puukenga**, culturally responsive practice, and shared approaches to learner success.

7.3. Academic staff are encouraged to participate in communities of practice relevant to their role, discipline, or professional interests.

7.4. MITU may provide facilitation, professional learning opportunities, and resources to support communities of practice.

8. Professional Learning Plans

8.1. Academic staff must maintain a professional learning plan through the institutional performance and development processes where applicable.

8.2. Professional learning plans must identify:

- capability development priorities;
- planned professional learning activities;
- qualification and capability requirements relevant to the role;
- industry and educational currency activities;
- development goals relating to **Puukenga**, cultural capability, and learner success, where relevant; and
- institutional professional learning requirements.

8.3. Professional learning plans must be reviewed annually through institutional performance and development processes.

9. Industry Currency

9.1. Academic staff must maintain currency in industries, professions, occupations, or disciplines relevant to their teaching responsibilities.

9.2. Evidence of industry currency may include:

- professional practice;
- industry employment;
- consulting activities;
- participation in professional bodies;
- professional registration;

- industry engagement projects;
- industry placements; or
- other relevant activities.

9.3. Where external registration, certification, licensing, or accreditation is required, academic staff must maintain those requirements.

10. Educational Currency

10.1. Academic staff must maintain contemporary knowledge of learning and teaching practice.

10.2. Educational currency may be maintained through:

- professional learning activities;
- peer observation;
- communities of practice;
- scholarly activity;
- teaching innovation initiatives;
- conferences, seminars, and workshops;
- educational research; and
- other professional development activities.

10.3. Academic staff are expected to engage with developments in:

- learning design;
- assessment practice;
- educational technologies;
- digital learning;
- learner engagement;
- artificial intelligence and emerging educational technologies; and
- culturally responsive and evidence-informed teaching practice.

11. Māori, Pacific and Cultural Capability

11.1. Academic staff must develop and maintain **Puukenga** that supports:

- Te Tiriti o Waitangi commitments;
- Māori learner success;
- **Kaupapa Māori** and teaching practices informed by Māori ways of knowing, being and learning;
- Pacific learner success;
- culturally responsive teaching practice;
- inclusive learning environments;
- **Whanaungatanga** through meaningful relationships that support learner engagement, belonging and success; and

- equitable learner outcomes and **Whai hua**.

11.2. Academic staff must participate in professional learning activities required by MITU relating to:

- Te Tiriti o Waitangi;
- **Kaupapa Māori**;
- Māori pedagogies and ways of knowing, being, and learning;
- Pacific pedagogies and ways of knowing, being, and learning;
- cultural responsiveness;
- inclusive practice;
- **Whanaungatanga** and relationship-centred learning and teaching;
- learner success and **Whai hua**; and
- educational excellence and **Whai hiranga**.

11.3. MITU will provide opportunities and resources to support the development of Māori, Pacific, and cultural capability.

12. Mandatory Development Activities

12.1. Academic staff must complete mandatory professional learning and development activities specified by MITU.

12.2. Mandatory professional learning activities may arise from:

- legislative requirements;
- regulatory requirements;
- quality assurance requirements;
- external accreditation requirements;
- institutional priorities; or
- professional practice requirements.

12.3. Academic leaders must monitor completion of mandatory professional learning requirements and take reasonable steps to ensure compliance.

13. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

13.1. Delegated authority may approve variations to qualification completion timeframes or capability requirements where:

- exceptional circumstances exist;
- academic standards are maintained;
- learner interests are protected; and
- the variation does not conflict with regulatory or accreditation requirements.

14. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

The extent to which this procedure achieves its intended outcomes will be monitored by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

The Learning and Teaching Committee will report to the Academic Committee on matters relating to academic staff capability, professional development, and capability enhancement and recommend amendments where required.

15. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated Authority	Supporting Endorsement
Recognise teaching qualification equivalencies.	General Manager Academic Services or Director Te Puna Ako	Relevant Head of School recommendation.
Approve extensions to teaching qualification completion requirements.	General Manager Academic Services or Director Te Puna Ako	Recommendation from the Head of School.
Approve variations to capability requirements where exceptional circumstances exist.	General Manager Academic Services or Director Te Puna Ako	Recommendation from the Head of School.
Approve capability requirements for specialist educational activities.	General Manager Academic Services or Director Te Puna Ako	Recommendation from the Head of School and relevant academic advisors, where appropriate.

16. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Academic Committee	Provides governance oversight of academic staff capability and professional learning.
Learning and Teaching Committee	Monitors implementation and effectiveness of this procedure and advises Academic Committee on matters relating to academic staff capability and professional learning.
Heads of School and Academic Leaders	Ensure staff meet qualification and capability requirements and are supported to participate in professional learning and development.
Academic Staff	Maintain required qualifications, educational capability, industry currency, cultural capability, and engagement in professional learning activities.
People and Culture	Support implementation of qualification, induction, professional development, and capability requirements through employment and

Role	Responsibilities
	performance processes.

17. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

See the Glossary of MIT&Unitec Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents

18. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

19. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- Learning and Teaching Policy
- Learning Design and Delivery Procedure
- Teaching Excellence Procedure
- Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure
- Literacy and Numeracy Procedure
- Te Mana Akoranga Policy

Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure applies to all newly appointed academic staff whose role includes teaching, learning support, curriculum development, academic leadership, or other responsibilities relating to learning and teaching at MITU, including permanent, fixed-term, casual, contract, adjunct, sessional, and seconded academic staff.

This procedure also applies to staff responsible for supporting the induction, mentoring, development, and supervision of newly appointed academic staff.

Document management and control

Version number	V1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Head of Academic Quality

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
V1.0	01/01/2027	Head of Academic Quality	New Policy

Table of Contents

Audience and scope 1

Document management and control 1

Amendment history 1

Table of Contents 1

Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills Procedure ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Mātāpono | Principles 3
3. Learning Design Expectations ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

4. Course Commencement Requirements ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
5. Digital Learning Environment Standards ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
6. Delivery Modalities ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
7. Learner Feedback ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
8. Consistency of Learner Experience ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
9. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations.8
10. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes 10
11. Mana Tuku | Delegations 10
12. Kawenga | Responsibilities 10
13. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 11
14. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 11
15. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents 11

Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. This procedure establishes the requirements for the induction and mentoring of academic staff at MITU.

1.2. This procedure supports implementation of the Learning and Teaching Policy by ensuring newly appointed academic staff are provided with the knowledge, support, resources, and relationships necessary to undertake their roles effectively, contribute to learner success, and participate confidently within the MITU academic community.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. MITU will ensure that:

a. all newly appointed academic staff receive an appropriate induction;

b. induction supports effective learning and teaching practice;

c. induction reflects MITU's commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, **Te Mana Akoranga**, learner success, culturally responsive practice, and **Whai hua** equitable learner outcomes;

d. newly appointed academic staff are provided with appropriate mentoring and professional support;

e. induction requirements are proportionate to the nature and duration of employment;

f. staff transitioning into teaching roles are supported to develop effective teaching practice; and

g. induction promotes engagement with MITU values, expectations, and ways of working.

3. Induction Requirements

General

3.1. All newly appointed academic staff must complete an induction appropriate to their role, responsibilities, experience, and employment arrangement.

3.2. Induction activities must enable staff to:

- become familiar with MITU's values, strategic priorities, and expectations;
- undertake learning and teaching responsibilities effectively;
- understand their responsibilities under relevant policies, procedures, and standards;
- support learner success and wellbeing; and
- participate effectively within the MITU academic community.

Components

3.3. Induction will normally comprise:

- institutional induction;
- academic induction;
- Te Tiriti, Māori, Pacific, and cultural induction;
- School and campus induction; and
- mentoring and professional support activities.

Induction activities should collectively support the development of **Puukenga** and promote understanding of MITU's commitments to **Te Tiriti o Waitangi**, **Te Mana Akoranga**, and learner success.

Timeframes

3.4. Induction activities must commence as soon as practicable following appointment.

3.5. Core induction requirements should normally be completed within six months of appointment including induction activities that support capability in relation to **Te Tiriti o Waitangi**, **Puukenga**, and culturally responsive practice.

Responsibility

3.6. Academic leaders must ensure induction activities are planned, coordinated, monitored, and completed.

4. Institutional Induction

Purpose

4.1. Institutional induction introduces newly appointed academic staff to MITU and its operating environment.

Content

4.2. Institutional induction must include:

- MITU values, strategic priorities, and organisational structure;
- institutional governance arrangements;
- employment expectations and staff responsibilities;
- health, safety, and wellbeing requirements;
- relevant policies and procedures;
- information management, privacy, and records management requirements;
- staff support services;
- digital systems and technologies;
- other matters determined by MITU; and
- MITU commitments relating to **Te Tiriti o Waitangi**, **Te Mana Akoranga**, learner success, and **Whai hiranga** educational excellence.

Access

4.3. MITU will ensure newly appointed academic staff have access to institutional induction activities and resources.

5. Academic Induction

Purpose

5.1. Academic induction supports newly appointed academic staff to understand institutional expectations relating to learning and teaching.

Content

5.2. Academic induction must include:

- Learning and Teaching Policy requirements;
- Teaching Excellence Framework requirements;
- learning design and delivery expectations;
- learner support processes;
- assessment and moderation requirements;
- academic integrity expectations;
- academic quality requirements;

- learner feedback processes;
- digital learning environment requirements;
- academic systems, technologies, and processes;
- **Te Mana Akoranga** principles and their application within learning and teaching practice;
- expectations relating to culturally responsive teaching and learning; and
- learner success approaches informed by **Whanaungatanga**, **Whai hua**, and **Kia Kotahi te Angitū**.
-

Teaching Excellence Framework

5.3. Academic induction must introduce academic staff to:

- the Teaching Excellence Framework;
- the Teaching Excellence Standards;
- the Teaching Excellence Matrix; and
- expectations relating to professional practice and continuous improvement.

6. Te Tiriti, Māori, Pacific and Cultural Induction

Purpose

6.1. MITU will provide induction activities that support understanding of institutional commitments relating to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori learner success, Pacific learner success, cultural responsiveness, and inclusion.

Content

6.2. Induction activities should provide opportunities to develop understanding of:

- Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its relevance to tertiary education;
- Māori learner success priorities;
- teaching practices informed by Māori ways of knowing, being, and learning;
- Pacific ways of knowing, being, and learning;
- culturally responsive teaching practice;
- inclusive learning environments;

- learner diversity within MITU; and
- **Whanaungatanga** and relationship-based approaches to learning and teaching;
- **Kaupapa Māori** and their relevance to learning and teaching practice;
- **Whai hua**, **Whai hiranga**, and **Kia kotahi te angitū** as expressions of learner success, educational excellence, and shared responsibility.

Formal Welcome Activities

6.3. MITU may include formal welcome activities, including pōwhiri and mihi whakatau, as part of induction programmes.

Participation

6.4. Academic staff are expected to participate in induction activities identified by MITU as essential for establishing baseline capability in these areas.

7. School Induction

Responsibility

7.1. Heads of School must ensure newly appointed academic staff receive an appropriate induction to their School, programme, discipline, or teaching area.

Content

7.2. School induction must include:

- programme and course structures;
- programme regulations and requirements;
- approved curriculum documentation;
- operational requirements;
- quality assurance processes;
- Programme Committee and governance arrangements;
- assessment and moderation arrangements;
- learner support processes;
- key contacts and support staff; and
- discipline-specific, professional, or regulatory requirements; and
- School approaches to Māori learner success, Pacific learner success, and culturally responsive practice.

Resources

7.3. Heads of School must ensure newly appointed academic staff have time and access to the resources required to undertake their role.

8. Mentoring and Buddy Arrangements

Mentor allocation

8.1. Heads of School must assign a mentor, buddy, or equivalent support person to newly appointed academic staff.

8.2. The level and duration of mentoring support should reflect:

- previous teaching experience;
- previous experience within MITU;
- complexity of teaching responsibilities;
- identified development needs; and
- the nature of the appointment.

Purpose

8.3. Mentoring arrangements are intended to:

- support transition into the role;
- assist understanding of institutional expectations;
- support the development of teaching capability;
- assist navigation of institutional systems and processes;
- facilitate engagement with colleagues and academic communities; and
- provide opportunities for professional reflection and dialogue.

Mentor Responsibilities

8.4. Mentors should:

- meet periodically with the newly appointed staff member;
- provide practical advice and guidance;
- support understanding of learning and teaching expectations;
- encourage engagement with professional learning opportunities;
- promote reflective practice; and
- direct staff to relevant support services and resources.

9. New Teacher Support

Staff new to tertiary teaching

9.1. Academic staff who are new to tertiary teaching must receive additional support during the transition into teaching roles.

Support arrangements

9.2. Support arrangements may include:

- observation of experienced teachers;

- observation of teaching practice by experienced colleagues;
- teaching feedback discussions;
- structured mentoring;
- peer support activities;
- professional learning activities;
- guided teaching development activities; and
- other support identified by the Head of School.

Sole teaching responsibility

9.3. Heads of School must ensure staff who are new to tertiary teaching have access to appropriate support prior to assuming sole responsibility for teaching activities.

Ongoing support

9.4. Support arrangements must continue for a period appropriate to the staff member's experience, responsibilities, and professional learning needs.

10. Casual and Contract Academic Staff

General

10.1. Casual and contract academic staff must complete induction activities appropriate to their role and responsibilities.

Minimum requirements

10.2. At a minimum, casual and contract academic staff must be provided with information regarding:

- relevant policies and procedures;
- health and safety requirements;
- learning and teaching expectations;
- learner support pathways;
- assessment responsibilities;
- digital learning systems and technologies; and
- operational requirements.

Additional requirements

10.3. Heads of School may require additional induction activities where warranted by the nature of the role.

11. Completion and Monitoring

Monitoring

11.1. Heads of School are responsible for ensuring induction requirements are

completed and appropriately monitored.

Records

11.2. Records of participation in required induction activities must be maintained in accordance with institutional requirements.

Outstanding requirements

11.3. Where induction requirements remain incomplete, academic leaders must work with the staff member to establish an appropriate completion plan.

Review

11.4. Schools should periodically review induction and mentoring arrangements and identify opportunities for improvement.

12. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

There are no exemptions or dispensations to this procedure.

13. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

The extent to which this procedure achieves its intended outcomes will be monitored by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

The Learning and Teaching Committee will report to the Academic Committee on matters relating to academic staff induction and mentoring and recommend amendments where required.

14. Mana Tuku | Delegations

There are no delegations this procedure.

15. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Learning and Teaching Committee	Monitor implementation and effectiveness of this procedure and advise Academic Committee on induction and mentoring matters.
Heads of School and Academic Leaders	Ensure induction and mentoring requirements are implemented, monitored, and completed.
Mentors and Buddies	Provide guidance, advice, support, and feedback to newly appointed academic staff.
Academic Staff	Participate in required induction and mentoring activities and actively engage with available support.

Role	Responsibilities
People and Culture	Support delivery of institutional induction activities and onboarding processes.

16. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

See the Glossary of MIT&Unitec Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents

17. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

18. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- Learning and Teaching Policy
- Learning Design and Delivery Procedure
- Teaching Excellence Procedure
- Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure
- Literacy and Numeracy Procedure
- Te Mana Akoranga Policy

Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure applies to all MITU staff involved in literacy and numeracy assessment and support activities. It applies to all programmes, courses, micro-credentials, and other educational provision where literacy and numeracy assessment is required by external requirements, institutional requirements, or is used to identify and support learner literacy and numeracy needs.

Document management and control

Version number	V1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Head of Academic Quality

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
V1.0	01/01/2027	Head of Academic Quality	New Policy

Table of Contents

Audience and scope 1

Document management and control 1

Amendment history 1

Table of Contents 1

Recognition of Prior Knowledge and Skills Procedure 3

1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Mātāpono | Principles 3
3. Assessment Requirements 4
4. Assessment Preparation 4
5. Diagnostic Assessment requirements 4
6. Review and Use of Assessment Results 5
7. Progress Assessment 6

8. Monitoring and Reporting 6
9. Staff Capability 6
10. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations 7
11. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes 8
12. Mana Tuku | Delegations 8
13. Kawenga | Responsibilities 8
14. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 9
15. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 9
16. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents 9
17. APPENDIX ONE – Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Requirements 10
18. APPENDIX TWO – Approved Literacy and Numeracy Qualifications 11

Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. This procedure establishes MITU requirements for the assessment of learner literacy and numeracy capabilities, the use of assessment information to support learner success, and the monitoring and reporting of literacy and numeracy assessment activities.

1.2. This procedure supports the implementation of the Literacy and Numeracy assessment and ensures that literacy and numeracy assessment is undertaken consistently and in accordance with external requirements and MITU expectations

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. MITU will ensure that:

a. learners requiring literacy and numeracy assessment are identified and assessed in accordance with institutional and external requirements

b. literacy and numeracy assessments are used to identify learner strengths and support needs

c. assessment information is used to inform teaching and learning practice

d. learners identified as requiring support have access to appropriate interventions and learning support

e. literacy and numeracy assessment activities are monitored and reported on

f. staff involved in literacy and numeracy assessment and support maintain appropriate capability.

3. Assessment Requirements

Assessment obligations

3.1. Programme teams must identify learners requiring literacy and numeracy assessment in accordance with approved institutional requirements.

3.2. Academic staff may require literacy and numeracy assessment for any learner where literacy or numeracy support needs are identified.

3.3. Assessment requirements for different programme and funding categories are set out in Appendix One.

4. Assessment Preparation

4.1. Academic staff delivering programmes subject to literacy and numeracy assessment requirements must obtain and maintain access to Literacy and Numeracy for Adults Assessment Tool (LNAAT) reporting functionality.

4.2. Academic staff must use available reporting tools to monitor learner assessment completion and results.

4.3. The academic support function must establish assessment access arrangements and provide programme teams with assessment information, assessment codes, reporting access, and support.

4.4. Academic staff must ensure that assessment requirements and learner instructions are communicated through approved programme information and learning systems.

5. Diagnostic Assessment requirements

5.1. Required diagnostic assessments must normally be completed during the first half of a learner's programme.

5.2. Academic staff must advise learners that literacy and numeracy assessments are diagnostic tools intended to identify learning needs and support learner success.

5.3. Academic staff must ensure that required learners complete diagnostic assessments.

5.4. Academic staff must ensure that sufficient time is made available within scheduled learning activities for learners to complete required assessments.

5.5. Academic staff must monitor assessment completion and actively follow up learners who have not completed required assessments.

5.6. Where appropriate, reasonable adjustments and support must be provided for learners with disabilities, learning challenges, or other support needs.

5.7. Online assessments must be used wherever practicable. Paper-based assessments should only be used where electronic assessment is unsuitable or impractical.

5.8. MITU expects programmes to achieve a diagnostic assessment participation rate of at least 95 percent of learners required to be assessed.

6. Review and Use of Assessment Results

6.1. Academic staff must review literacy and numeracy assessment results.

6.2. Assessment results must be used to:

- identify learner strengths and development needs
- inform teaching and learning approaches
- support learner goal setting
- identify learners who may require additional support.

6.3. Where a literacy and/or numeracy need is identified, academic staff must implement appropriate support strategies.

Where literacy and numeracy assessment results indicate that a learner may benefit from additional learning support, academic staff must implement, facilitate, or refer the learner to appropriate support strategies. Support should be tailored, where appropriate, to the learner's individual learning needs, including those of neurodivergent learners and learners with disabilities.

Support strategies may include:

- embedded literacy and numeracy activities
- targeted learning support
- additional learning activities
- referral to specialist support services
- supported use of literacy and numeracy learning resources
- other appropriate interventions.

6.4. Assessment results must not be used as a barrier to programme entry, enrolment, or progression except where approved programme entry requirements apply.

7. Progress Assessment

7.1. Progress assessments must be completed where required by institutional requirements.

7.2. Where required, progress assessments must use the same assessment type as the diagnostic assessment.

7.3. Progress assessments must normally be completed during the second half of a programme and prior to programme completion.

7.4. Academic staff must take reasonable steps to ensure that required learners complete progress assessments.

7.5. MITU expects programmes to achieve a progress assessment participation rate of at least 90 percent of eligible learners.

8. Monitoring and Reporting

8.1. Academic staff must monitor learner completion of required assessments and address non-completion promptly.

8.2. Programme Committees must monitor literacy and numeracy assessment participation, completion rates, outcomes, and interventions.

8.3. The Learning and Teaching Committee must receive reports on literacy and numeracy assessment activity, compliance, and any significant issues twice each year.

8.4. Institutional reports on literacy and numeracy assessment participation, outcomes, and compliance must be prepared annually.

8.5. Where significant non-compliance or systemic issues are identified, corrective actions must be implemented and monitored.

9. Staff Capability

9.1. Academic staff teaching on programmes subject to literacy and

numeracy assessment requirements must hold, or be actively working towards, an approved literacy and numeracy qualification or capability pathway recognised by MITU.

9.2. Approved qualifications and capability pathways are set out in Appendix Two.

9.3. Staff involved in literacy and numeracy assessment and learner support are expected to engage in ongoing professional development relating to literacy and numeracy practice.

10. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

10.1. Learners enrolled in qualifications taught predominantly in te reo Māori are exempt from both diagnostic and progress assessment requirements.

10.2. Progress assessments are not required for:

- English Language programmes where successful programme completion provides evidence of language development.
- Intensive Literacy and Numeracy (ILN) programmes where successful programme completion provides evidence of literacy and/or numeracy development.

10.3. Progress assessments are not required for learners who have achieved:

- Step 4 or above in Reading; or
- Step 5 or above in Numeracy,

and those learners are therefore not required to complete a progress assessment in that assessment area.

10.4. The Learning and Teaching Committee may approve alternative literacy and numeracy assessment arrangements where:

- the nature of the programme makes literacy and numeracy progress assessment inappropriate or unnecessary; and
- the programme contains an approved alternative measure of learner literacy and/or numeracy development; and
- equivalent assurance of learner progress can be demonstrated.

and are therefore not required to complete a progress assessment in that assessment area.

11. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

The extent to which the implementation of these procedures achieve their intended outcomes will be subject to evaluation and review by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

12. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Approve alternative literacy and numeracy assessment arrangements.	Learning and Teaching Committee	Head of School
Approve programme exemptions from progress assessment requirements.	Learning and Teaching Committee	Head of School
Determine the equivalence of literacy and numeracy teaching qualifications and capability pathways.	General Manager Academic Services / Director Te Puna Ako	None Required
Approve variations or dispensations from this procedure where exceptional circumstances exist and academic standards are maintained.	Learning and Teaching Committee	None Required
Receive and consider institutional literacy and numeracy assessment reports.	Learning and Teaching Committee	None Required
Receive institutional assurance reports regarding literacy and numeracy assessment participation, compliance, and outcomes.	Academic Quality Committee	None Required

13. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Academic Staff	Identify learners requiring literacy and numeracy assessment; communicate assessment requirements to learners; obtain and maintain access to LNAAT reporting tools; ensure learners complete required diagnostic and progress assessments; provide sufficient class time for assessment activities; monitor assessment completion; review assessment results; implement appropriate support strategies; and maintain literacy and numeracy capability requirements.
Head of School (or delegate)	Ensure literacy and numeracy assessment requirements are implemented within the School; identify programmes requiring assessment; monitor participation and compliance; ensure staff capability requirements are met; and address issues arising from non-compliance.

Role	Responsibilities
Academic Support Function (Academic Centre / Te Puna Ako)	Coordinate institutional literacy and numeracy assessment processes; establish assessment access arrangements; provide assessment codes, reporting access, guidance, and support; prepare institutional reports; and provide quality assurance oversight of literacy and numeracy assessment activities.
Programme Committees	Monitor literacy and numeracy assessment participation, outcomes, and interventions.
Learning and Teaching Committee	Provide institutional oversight of literacy and numeracy assessment activities and outcomes and approve alternative assessment arrangements and programme exemptions as permitted by this procedure.
Academic Quality Committee	Receive assurance reports regarding literacy and numeracy assessment participation

14. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

See the Glossary of MIT&Unitec Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents

15. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

16. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- Learning and Teaching Policy
- Learning Design and Delivery Procedure
- Teaching Excellence Procedure
- Academic Staff Capability and Professional Learning Procedure
- Academic Staff Induction and Mentoring Procedure
- Literacy and Numeracy Procedure

17. APPENDIX ONE – Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Requirements

Programme/Funding Category	Diagnostic Assessment	Progress Assessment
DQ1-2 (Level 1-2 qualifications)	Required	Required (unless exempt)
Youth Guarantee (Level 1-3)	Required	Required (unless exempt)
Trades Academy	Required	Required
DQ3-7 Level 3 programmes	Required	Not required
DQ3-7 Level 4-7 programmes	Where a need is identified by academic staff	Not normally required
Māori and Pasifika Trades Training (MPTT)	Required	Not required
Intensive Literacy and Numeracy (ILN)	Required for funding eligibility. Literacy programmes require literacy assessment. Numeracy programmes require numeracy assessment. Programmes covering both literacy and numeracy require eligibility to be demonstrated in either literacy or numeracy.	Required (unless exempt)
Workplace Literacy and Numeracy (Employer-led and TEO-led)	Required for funding eligibility	Required (unless exempt)
English Language Teaching (ELT/ESOL)	Starting Points Reading and/or Starting Points Listening, or another approved assessment tool	Required (unless exempt)
Pre-purchased English Language Tuition (PELT)	Required	Required
Qualifications	Exempt	Exempt

taught predominantly in te reo Māori		

18. APPENDIX TWO – Approved Literacy and Numeracy Qualifications

Qualification
New Zealand Certificate in Adult Literacy and Numeracy Education (NZCALNE) (Level 5), including previous versions such as the New Zealand Certificate in Adult Literacy Education (NCALE).
A New Zealand adult literacy and numeracy-specific educator qualification at degree level or above, including: ▪ Graduate Diploma of Teaching (Adult Literacy and Numeracy) ▪ Postgraduate Diploma in Language and Literacy Education ▪ Masters in Adult Literacy and Numeracy Education
A New Zealand adult teaching qualification at Level 4 or above together with targeted professional development in: ▪ the Learning Progressions for Adult Literacy ▪ the Literacy and Numeracy for Adults Assessment Tool (LNAAT)
A New Zealand children's or general teaching qualification together with targeted professional development in: ▪ teaching adults ▪ the Learning Progressions for Adult Literacy ▪ the Literacy and Numeracy for Adults Assessment Tool (LNAAT)
For English Language Teaching (ELT) provision only, a recognised New Zealand or internationally recognised TESOL qualification, together with targeted professional development in: ▪ the Learning Progressions ▪ the Literacy and Numeracy for Adults Assessment Tool (LNAAT)

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Helen Perry, Head of Academic Quality

Subject: Academic Development and Approvals Policy and Procedure

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 21/10/2026

Recommendations

That the Academic Committee approves the Academic Approvals Policy and related procedures:

- MITU Academic Development and Approvals Policy
- MITU Academic Development and Approvals Procedure
- MITU Suspension, Withdrawal, Replacement and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure
- MITU Academic Agreements and Sub-contracting Procedure

Background

MITU currently maintains a single Academic Development and Approvals Policy and Academic Development and Approvals Procedure to govern the development, approval and ongoing management of academic provision.

However, a number of related areas continue to be managed through separate legacy procedures inherited from the former institutes. In particular, MIT and Unitec maintained distinct procedures relating to academic agreements and subcontracting arrangements, as well as the suspension, withdrawal, replacement and closure of programmes and other academic provision. The continued existence of multiple legacy documents has resulted in duplication, variation in terminology and process, and a fragmented policy framework.

The proposed changes update the existing Academic Development and Approvals Policy and Academic Development and Approvals Procedure, while incorporating requirements previously contained within separate legacy procedures. The result is a revised and integrated framework comprising:

- MITU Academic Development and Approvals Policy
- MITU Academic Development and Approvals Procedure
- MITU Suspension, Withdrawal, Replacement and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure
- MITU Academic Agreements and Sub-contracting Procedure

Open Session:
This paper may be considered in open session.

Attachments

- MITU Academic Development and Approvals Policy
- MITU Academic Development and Approvals Procedure
- MITU Suspension, Withdrawal, Replacement and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure
- MITU Academic Agreements and Sub-contracting Procedure

MIT&Unitec Academic Development and Approvals Policy

Audience:

This policy is relevant to the following roles: All students and staff.

It covers the development and approval of new or revised academic provision (whether delivered to enrolled students or through contracts with schools, work-based learning or employers) and any changes to academic provision or its delivery. The policy also covers the approval of new teaching locations, the negotiation and approval of academic agreements, and the management and operation of sub-contracting arrangements.

N.B. This document uses the terms Delegated Authority and Designated Contact. In each instance kaimahi should refer to the current version of the *MIT&Unitec Delegations Register* available on the intranet for the role assigned to the matter.

Table of Contents

Audience: ~~1~~1

Table of Contents ~~1~~1

Purpose ~~3~~3

Policy ~~3~~3

1. Development ~~3~~3
2. Approval ~~5~~4
3. Review, redevelopment, replacement and withdrawal ~~6~~4
4. Academic agreements ~~7~~5
5. MIT&Unitec Programme Library ~~7~~5
6. Ongoing compliance ~~7~~5
7. Discontinuing academic provision ~~7~~5

Procedures ~~8~~6

Evaluation/Outcomes ~~8~~6

Glossary ~~8~~6

Exemptions and dispensations ~~8~~6

Delegations ~~9~~7

Relevant Legislation ~~10~~8

Legal Compliance ~~10~~8

Associated documents ~~11~~8

Document management and control ~~12~~9

Amendment history ~~12~~9

~~**Audience:** 1~~

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Table of Contents 1
Purpose 2
Policy 2
1. Development 2
2. Approval 3
3. Review, redevelopment, replacement and withdrawal 4
4. Academic agreements 4
5. MIT&Unitec Programme Library 4
6. Ongoing compliance 5
7. Discontinuing academic provision 5
Procedures 5
Evaluation/Outcomes 5
Glossary 5
Exemptions and dispensations 5
Delegations 6
Relevant Legislation 7
Legal Compliance 7
Associated documents 7
Document management and control 7
Amendment history 8

Purpose

~~This policy ensures that MIT&Unitec's academic provision is of high quality, accessible, and relevant—achieving excellent outcomes for Māori and all learners.~~ This policy ensures that MIT&Unitec's academic provision is of high quality, accessible, relevant, and designed to support equitable and successful outcomes for Māori and all learners.

It is grounded in MIT&Unitec's commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which forms the foundation for inclusive, culturally rich learning experiences for students and guides the design and development of all academic provision.

Policy

1. Development

1.1. MIT&Unitec academic provision will be developed in accordance with:

a. MIT&Unitec's strategic priorities;

b. the relevant legislative requirements;

c. the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) requirements;

d. the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) and other relevant funding body requirements;

e. any other relevant external regulatory or standard-setting body requirements; and

f. *MIT&Unitec Academic Development and Approvals Procedures*.

1.2. All academic development will include a clear focus on teaching and learning, and the inclusion of Mātauranga Māori principles to ensure~~, that demonstrate~~:

a. cultural and accessibility responsiveness;

b. industry relevance; and

c. excellence in teaching delivery

It will ~~meet the needs and aspirations of students, and will have as its outcome:~~ be designed to identify and respond to the needs and aspirations of students and stakeholders and to support:

a. ~~the retention and success of students; and~~retention, achievement and success; and

b. alignment with industry and/or employer requirements.

1.3. ~~All academic development will be supported by the:~~Academic development will include appropriate academic quality, cultural, regulatory, and funding and stakeholder input to ensure that proposed academic provision:

a. aligns with MIT&Unitec strategic priorities;

a. meets quality assurance and regulatory requirements;

b. reflects commitments to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and responsiveness to Māori learners, whānau, hapū and iwi;

c. considers the aspirations of Pacific learners and communities;

d. responds to stakeholder, employer and industry needs; and

Formatted: Widow/Orphan control

Formatted: 4_Letter bullet, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 2.79 cm + Indent at: 3.42 cm, No widow/orphan control

e. is educationally, operationally and financially viable.

~~1.3.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5 cm, Hanging: 1 cm, No bullets or numbering

~~a. Academic Quality team to ensure NZQA and other regulatory and standard setting body requirements are met, and that there is a clear focus on teaching and learning;~~

~~b. Māori Advisory Committee to confirm that the design includes cultural responsiveness, Māori pedagogy, Mātauranga Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi principles;~~

~~c. Pacific Advisory Committee to confirm that the design includes cultural responsiveness and progresses the inclusion of Pacific pedagogy, and Pacific world views; and~~

~~d. The *[Designated Contact]* Office*Academic Registry, or Finance Department and Te Korowai Kahurangi,* will ensure that design and structure aligns with TEC funding requirements and is accurately set up in the SMS.~~

1.4. ~~The intention to develop, or make significant changes to, academic provision will be approved by the DCE Academic via the Tāmaki Academic Product Approval Process (TAPAP).~~The development of new academic provision, and significant changes to existing academic provision, will receive approval in accordance with institutional approval requirements and delegated authority prior to substantive development commencing.

~~1.4.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5 cm, Hanging: 1 cm, No bullets or numbering, Widow/Orphan control, Keep with next

2. Approval

2.1. ~~New, and changes to, existing MIT&Unitec academic provision will be approved prior to delivery in accordance with:~~New academic provision, and changes to existing academic provision, will be approved prior to delivery and comply with all applicable internal approval requirements and external regulatory obligations.

~~2.1.~~

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

a. Academic Development and Approvals Procedures;

b. the delegated authorities stated in the Delegations section of this policy; and

c. the requirements of NZQA, TEC and any other relevant external regulatory, professional, and standard setting bodies.

This includes approval and/or accreditation of new academic provision, consent to assess against standards, new teaching locations, sub-contracted delivery, memoranda of understanding and changes to approved provision.

2.2. Where MIT&Unitec gain accreditation to deliver another organisation's approved programme, the programme document may be amended to meet MIT&Unitec requirements and approved in accordance with MIT&Unitec delegations and approval requirements.~~through the Approvals Committee.~~ Any such amendments will be in keeping with the programme approval.

2.3. ~~Applications for external approval will be approved by the Academic Committee (or its delegated authority – see Delegations section below) prior to submission to the appropriate external body.~~ Applications for external approval will receive the appropriate internal approval prior to submission to an external authority.

~~2.3.~~

~~2.4. NZQA approval and/or accreditation must be obtained prior to delivery commencing for:~~

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

~~New qualifications (including MIT&Unitec qualifications at Level 7 and above)~~
~~Programmes leading to qualifications listed on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework~~
~~Micro-credentials listed on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework~~
~~Accreditation to deliver an NZQA approved programme~~
~~Consent to assess against skill standards, unit standards, and achievement standards listed on the Directory of Assessment and Skill Standards~~
~~New permanent delivery sites, and all new sites for degree-level or higher programmes (levels 7-10)~~
~~Type 2 changes to academic provision or where required by NZQA~~
~~Sub-contracted delivery of:~~ • ~~All or part of a programme or micro-credential where a subcontractor does not hold accreditation for the academic provision; and~~ • ~~A skill standard, unit standard or achievement standard where the subcontractor does not itself hold a consent to assess against that particular standard.~~

~~Any programme or micro-credential intended for fully online delivery~~
~~Any programme or micro-credential intended for offshore delivery~~

2.4. ~~NZQA must be notified prior to delivery of/at:~~MIT&Unitec will meet all NZQA requirements for approval, accreditation, consent to assess and notification before implementing changes to academic provision.

This includes, where applicable:

a. submission of notifications to NZQA for changes requiring notification under NZQA rules (Type 1 changes);

b. obtaining NZQA approval for changes requiring prior approval under NZQA rules (Type 2 changes);

c. approval and accreditation requirements for new qualifications and programmes;

d. approval requirements relating to additional delivery sites, offshore delivery and third-party arrangements; and

~~2.5.~~e. any other activity for which NZQA approval, accreditation, consent to assess or notification is required.

~~Type 1 changes to programmes~~
~~New temporary delivery sites for level 1-6 programmes and micro-credentials~~
~~Sub-contracted delivery of:~~ • ~~All or part of a programme or micro-credential where MIT&Unitec and the subcontractor are both accredited to provide the programme or micro-credential; and~~ • ~~A skill standard, unit standard or achievement standard where the subcontractor is the holder of consent to assess against that particular standard.~~

~~2.6.~~2.5. ~~TEC approval is required:~~MIT&Unitec will obtain all required Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) approvals before implementing academic provision or changes to academic provision that may affect funding approval, funding eligibility, delivery arrangements, or compliance obligations.

~~For any academic provision reported through the SDR~~
~~Before any student is enrolled in a programme or course to be funded through the TEC~~
~~Before any sub-contracted delivery of TEC funded programmes is undertaken (noting that sub-contracting is not permitted under some TEC funding categories)~~

3. Review, redevelopment, replacement and withdrawal

3.1. All programmes will be regularly reviewed ~~(see *Evaluation, Review and Monitoring Policy* and associated procedures),~~ and will be redeveloped, replaced or withdrawn in response to:

a. significant changes in knowledge and industry training/learning requirements;

b. any changes in legislative requirements;

c. advances in relevant teaching methods;

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5 cm, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: 4_Letter bullet, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 2.79 cm + Indent at: 3.42 cm, Widow/Orphan control

Formatted: Widow/Orphan control, Keep with next

d. student and stakeholder need and interests; and/or

e. the strategic direction of MIT&Unitec.

3.2. Where MIT&Unitec is the developer of a New Zealand qualification or microcredential, these will be reviewed (see *Evaluation, Review and Monitoring Policy* and associated procedures) within the period specified in the qualification documentation to ensure they are relevant, fit for purpose and continue to meet the needs of stakeholders.

4. Academic agreements

4.1. All arrangements with an external organisation or third party for the delivery of learning and teaching activities (including sub-contracting and consortium arrangements) will be documented in formal agreement between the parties involved and approved in compliance with NZQA and TEC requirements, and MIT&Unitec delegations.

4.2. Academic agreements are to be negotiated and approved in accordance with *the Contract Approval and Management Policy* and *Procedures for the Negotiation and Approval of Academic Agreements*.

4.3. Sub-contracting arrangements are to be managed on an ongoing basis in accordance with the *Procedures for the Management and Operation of Sub-Contracting Arrangements*.

5. MIT&Unitec Programme Library

5.1. The MIT&Unitec Programme Library is the repository for all final versions of all Programme Documents, their associated Approval Documents and Academic Contractual documents. It has been created to enable MIT&Unitec to meet its obligations under the Public Records Act (2005) to keep and maintain full, accurate and accessible records.

5.2. ~~The *[Delegated Authority]*~~*Head of School* ~~must ensure that academic provision is delivered in accordance with the latest approved version of the offering at all times. The latest version of the Programme in the MIT&Unitec Programme Library is the definitive version, and staff must comply with this version.~~The Head of School is responsible for ensuring that academic provision is delivered in accordance with the latest approved version of the offering and remains compliant with all applicable approval conditions and regulatory requirements.

Formatted: Widow/Orphan control, Keep with next

6. Ongoing compliance

6.1. ~~Once approved, MIT&Unitec academic provision will continue to comply with the requirements set out in this policy and associated procedures, processes and guidelines.~~Once approved, academic provision will be delivered, maintained and reviewed in accordance with this policy, associated procedures and all applicable external regulatory requirements.

~~6.1.~~

6.2. All marketing or publicity in advance of internal and external approvals outlined in this policy being obtained will include a clear notice that the provision is "pending approval".

6.3. Marketing or publicity of new or changed academic provision may only be undertaken once final internal approval has been granted, unless an exception is granted by ~~the [delegated authority]~~Deputy Chief Executive, Academic.

7. Discontinuing academic provision

7.1. Delivery of any academic provision may be temporarily suspended or permanently discontinued.

7.2. Temporary suspension of any academic provision may occur for up to 12 months, after which it will be deemed permanently discontinued.

7.3. Where any type of academic provision is permanently discontinued, further delivery will require a new application for approval and / or accreditation to deliver.

7.4. Where a programme is proposed for significant change, or for closure, a transition plan for all learners ~~must~~ will be developed and approved in accordance with MIT&Unitec Delegations.

7.5. Permanent closure ~~must~~ will be completed in accordance with the Procedures for the Closure of Programmes, Qualifications, Micro-credentials and Short Courses.

Procedures

See the following MIT&Unitec procedures approved by the Academic Committee:

- *Academic Development and Approvals Procedures*

Evaluation/Outcomes

The extent to which the implementation of this policy and associated procedures achieve their intended outcomes will be subject to evaluation and review.

Glossary

See the *Glossary for MIT&Unitec Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents*.

Exemptions and dispensations

Delegations

Under its delegated authority f~~r~~om the MIT and Unitec Council, ~~T~~the Academic Committee sub-delegates authority for the following~~the following authorities under its delegated authority from the Council~~ – see the MIT&Unitec *Delegations Register*:

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
~~Authority t~~To expend institute resource to develop a new qualification or programme, or to add a new major (or similar) to an academic delivery *(Approval in Principle)*	DCE Academic ~~on the basis of a TAPAP recommendation~~	*Finance Director and ~~[Delegated Authority]~~TAPAP*
~~Authority t~~To ~~develop~~approve new qualifications (including awards of the institute at Level 7 and above) *(internal approval of applications to NZQA for new qualifications)*	Academic Approvals Committee~~‡~~	~~DCE Academic on the basis of a TAPAP recommendation~~Head of School, Programme Committee, TAPAP
~~Authority t~~To ~~deliver~~approve programmes leading to qualifications on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework *(internal approval of applications to NZQA for of programme approval)*	Academic Approvals Committee~~‡~~	Head of School, Programme Committee, TAPAP~~DCE Academic on the basis of a TAPAP recommendation~~
~~Authority T~~to deliver approved programmes leading to qualifications on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework *(internal approval of applications to NZQA for programme accreditation)*	General Manager, Schools *or Director Schools and Performance* ~~Academic Committee~~~~‡~~~~Head of School~~	*~~[Delegated Authority]~~* Head of School
~~Authority to~~ To approve applications for consent to assess against assessment standards and skills standards *(internal approval of applications to NZQA for consent to assess against standards)*	*~~[Delegated Authority]~~Academic Approvals Committee*	Head of School, ~~[Delegated Authority]~~Programme Committee
~~Approval t~~To ~~develop~~approve micro-credentials leading to awards on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework *(internal approval of applications for micro-credential approval)*	Academic Approvals Committee~~Academic Committee~~~~‡~~~~DCE Academic~~	Head of School, Programme Committee, TAPAP~~DCE Academic on the basis of a TAPAP recommendation~~
~~Authority t~~To ~~develop~~approve short courses for which NZQA approval is not required *(Final approval)*	*~~[Delegated Authority]~~DCE Academic*	~~[Delegated Authority]~~
~~Authority t~~To ~~make~~ approve Type 1 changes to programmes *(Final approval – NB all Type 1 changes are to be notified to NZQA through the TBC prior to delivery)*	*~~[Delegated Authority]~~Academic Approvals Committee*	Head of School, ~~[Delegated Authority]~~Programme Committee
~~Authority t~~To ~~make~~approve Type 2 changes to programmes *(Internal approval of applications to NZQA for Type 2 changes)*	*Academic Approvals Committee~~[Delegated Authority]~~*	Head of School, Programme Committee~~[Delegated Authority]~~

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
~~Authority t~~To approve new permanent and temporary delivery sites for programmes *(Final approval sub-degree, internal approval of applications to NZQA for new teaching locations for degree and related programmes)*	~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~*DCE Academic*~~*Chief Executive Officer*~~	~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~~~DCE Academic~~
~~Authority t~~To approve new permanent and temporary delivery sites for micro-credential and short courses *(Final Approval)*	*DCE Academic* ~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~	~~NA~~
~~Authority t~~To agree memoranda of understanding (dealing with academic matters), excluding external moderation agreements	~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~*DCE*~~A~~ *Academic*	MIT&Unitec Legal
~~Authority t~~To enter into sub-contracting agreements (including where MIT&Unitec is either the principal or the sub-contractor under the agreement)	DCE Academic	MIT&Unitec Legal
~~Authority t~~To approve teaching and learning resources provided by sub-contractors for use in the delivery of MIT&Unitec programmes under a sub-contracting arrangement.	~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~*Head of School or delegate*	~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~*Academic Lead, Curriculum or Academic Programme Manager*
~~Authority t~~To approve sub-contractor's staff to teach on MIT&Unitec programmes under a sub-contracting arrangement	~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~*General Manager Schools or Director Schools and Performance*	~~MIT&Unitec P&C~~ ~~MIT&Unitec Legal~~
~~Authority t~~To temporarily suspend delegations to ~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~*Heads of School* and Programme Committees where the ~~*[Delegated Authority]*~~*Head of School* and/or Programme Committee temporarily lacks expertise required to ensure that approvals are made in accordance with MIT&Unitec procedures, processes and guidelines, e.g., in the case of a new appointment with limited academic experience.	Chief Executive Officer	DCE Academic

~~[1] These sub-delegations are extended to the Standing Committee of the Academic Committee to be exercised in circumstances where the period of time until the next scheduled Academic Committee meeting would create an undue delay in programme delivery commencing, provided that required supporting endorsements have been obtained and:~~

- ~~the Standing Committee believes that the award, programme and/or accreditation meets the standards and requirements of the Academic Committee; and~~
- ~~the approval exercised by the Standing Committee is to be advised at the next scheduled Academic Committee meeting.~~

Relevant Legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

Legal Compliance

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

- This policy complies with MIT&Unitec statutes, regulations and relevant legislation.

Associated documents

- MIT~~&~~U~~nitec~~ Academic Development and Approvals Procedure~~s~~
- MITU Suspension, Withdrawal, Replacement and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure
- MITU Academic Agreements and Sub-contracting Procedure
- MITU Te Mana Akoranga Policy
- ~~.~~
- MIT&Unitec Delegations Register
- Glossary for MIT&Unitec Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63 cm, Hanging: 0.63 cm, No bullets or numbering

Document management and control

Approver:	Academic Committee~~TTG~~
Latest approval date:	~~2025-11-27~~TBC
Effective date:	~~2026-01-01~~TBC
Next scheduled review date:	~~2026-08-01~~May 2028
Policy sponsor:	DCE Academic
Policy owner:	General Manager, Academic Services / Director Te Korowai Kahurangi

Amendment history

Document Version	Effective Date	Approver	Amendment details
V1.0	2026-01-01	TTG	New document MIT&Unitec transition
V2.0	TBC	Academic Committee	Scheduled Update

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri Light, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri Light, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri Light, 10 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.22 cm

Academic Development and Approvals Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure is relevant to all staff involved in the development and ongoing delivery of academic provision at MIT&Unitec). It governs:

- the development and approval of academic provision (including qualifications, programmes, micro-credentials and short courses);
- obtaining consent to assess against standards;
- making changes to academic provision;
- approval of new permanent or temporary teaching locations; and
- closure of academic provision.

These procedures do not cover the negotiation and approval of academic agreements or the ongoing management of sub-contracting arrangements - see related documents section below. They also do not cover the development or change to academic provision not owned by MIT&Unitec, these are subject to the policies and procedures of the academic provision owner[1].

N.B. This document uses the terms Delegated Authority and Designated Contact. In each instance staff should refer to the current version of the *MIT&Unitec Delegations Register* available on the intranet for the role assigned to the matter.

Table of contents

Audience and scope....1

Table of contents....1

Purpose....2

Procedures....2

1. Academic Development....2
2. Changes to existing provision....6
3. Marketing and Enrolments....7
4. Programme Library....7
5. Pre-Development Approval....7
6. Qualification or Programme development: approval and accreditation process....8
7. Micro-credential development process....15
8. Short Course development process....19
9. Programme Type 1 and Type 2 change process and changes to Micro-credentials....21
10. Process for seeking consent to assess (CTA) against standards listed on the Directory of Assessment and Skill Standards....25
11. Process for the approval of a new permanent or temporary delivery site....26

Definitions....27

[1] In some instances, MIT&Unitec specific changes to the programme may be required

Related Documents 27
Document management and control 27
Amendment history.....27

Purpose

These procedures provide guidance and support to MIT&Unitec staff and stakeholders concerning their responsibilities, and enable those engaged in developing academic provision to operate effectively and efficiently within the MIT&Unitec policy framework.

Procedures

This document sets out MIT&Unitec procedures for academic development and approvals. It must be read in conjunction with the *MIT&Unitec Academic Development and Approvals Policy* documents.

1. Academic Development

1.1. ~~Schools[2] are responsible for the development[3] of academic provision in their disciplines. Primary support for development will be provided by the Academic Quality Team.~~Schools are responsible for the development, review and amendment of academic provision within their discipline areas. Development activities must be supported by the academic development and quality function of MITU.

1.2. ~~The development of academic provision is to be consistent with MIT&Unitec's commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi as expressed through the settings below.~~The development and review of academic provision must be consistent with MITU's commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Te Mana Akoranga Principles.

Staff must complete the Te Mana Akoranga Self-Assessment Tool and seek appropriate Māori cultural advice when developing or reviewing academic provision.

~~1.2.~~ Evidence of alignment with the Te Mana Akoranga Principles must be included in academic development, approval, review and change documentation submitted through MITU approval processes.

~~Staff are encouraged to use *Te Mana Akoranga Māori Curriculum Self-Assessment* (see Appendix One) and consult other appropriate cultural advice when developing or reviewing any academic provision at MIT&Unitec.~~

1.3. ~~Development teams will be supported to design culturally responsive curriculum that:~~Academic provision must demonstrate alignment with the Te Mana Akoranga Principles throughout curriculum development, delivery, assessment, review and continuous improvement. Development teams must design curriculum that:

- gives effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi through curriculum design, delivery, assessment, systems, processes and decision-making **Te Tiriti o Waitangi**;
- is developed, delivered and reviewed in partnership with Māori, including iwi, hapū, whānau and hapori **Whanaungatanga**;

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5 cm, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

~~[2] Schools includes all teams associated with the delivery of academic provision~~
~~[3] Development includes changes to existing academic provision~~

- is supported by staff who demonstrate cultural competence, capability and ongoing professional development in culturally responsive practice **Puukenga**;
- uses equitable, valid and culturally responsive assessment approaches that recognise learner strengths, identities and aspirations **Aromatawai**;
- includes learning outcomes that recognise mātauranga Māori and support the aspirations and success of Māori learners and their communities **Ngā Whāinga Matua**;
- identifies and removes barriers while promoting equitable access, participation, achievement, completion and success for ākonga Māori and all learners **Whai Hua**;
- is designed and delivered in ways that respond to the strengths, identities, aspirations, wellbeing and learning needs of ākonga Māori and all learners **Whai Hiranga**;
- embeds mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori, te reo Māori and Te Taiao perspectives authentically throughout programme design, delivery, assessment, review and evaluation **Taumata**;
- draws upon and advances mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori approaches and Māori-informed research and practice to strengthen knowledge creation, learner success and aspirations **Kaupapa Māori**; and

1.3.- demonstrates shared responsibility, accountability, partnership and continuous improvement to achieve equitable and positive outcomes for Māori learners, whānau and communities **Kia Kotahi te Angitū**.

- ~~is inclusive of, and sensitive to, the aspirations of Māori (wawata);~~
- ~~considers barriers to access, participation and success of Māori (aheitanga);~~
- ~~incorporates Māori knowledge to prepare Māori and all learners to function effectively in a global society (Mātauranga Māori); and~~
- ~~shows how teachers will incorporate Māori knowledge in each course (whakarata)~~

~~1.4. Each application presented to the Academic Approvals Committee for approval must be accompanied by evidence which confirms it:~~

- ~~is culturally response to the needs of Māori;~~
- ~~is culturally responsive to the needs of Pacific;~~
- ~~is inclusive of the needs of disabled persons; and~~

1.4. ~~aligns to the needs of relevant stakeholders.~~Each application submitted for endorsement or approval must include evidence that the academic provision:

- demonstrates alignment with the Te Mana Akoranga Principles;
- is culturally responsive to the needs and aspirations of Māori learners;
- is culturally responsive to the needs and aspirations of Pacific learners;
- is inclusive of disabled learners; and
- responds appropriately to the needs of relevant stakeholders.

1.5. ~~The school will create a Development Project Plan in consultation with the Academic Quality team. The development process will vary depending on the form of academic provision being developed and the needs and capability of the school and the development team.~~Schools are

Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: 06b_Numbered para, No bullets or numbering
Formatted: 06b_Numbered para
Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

responsible for planning and managing the development process, including engagement with relevant stakeholders and ensuring sufficient time is available to complete development, consultation, approval and implementation activities. The development process will vary depending on the type of academic provision being developed and the requirements of the proposal.

1.6. The development of academic provision may only commence once the school has received confirmation of an Approval in Principle (and business case, if required) (see section 2).

1.7. The ~~The Academic Quality Team will advise on programme design, approval, accreditation and regulatory settings and will liaise with relevant other teams as required.~~ academic development and quality function will provide advice on programme design, approval, accreditation and regulatory requirements

~~1.7.~~

1.8. ~~The onus is on schools to engage with the relevant Māori, Pasifika and Disability support teams throughout the development of academic provision and to seek feedback from the Māori and Pacific and Disability Advisory Committees. Engagement with these committees is required when making an application to the Academic Approvals Committee.~~ Schools must engage with relevant specialist functions and advisory groups during the development and review of academic provision, as appropriate to the nature of the proposal. This may include:

- the Māori Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC) and Māori specialist staff;
- the Pacific Academic Advisory Committee (PAAC) and Pacific specialist staff;
- the Disability Academic Advisory Committee (DAAC) and accessibility specialists;
- the International Office and, where appropriate, the International Academic Advisory Committee (IAAC);
- the Academic Registry function for advice relating to programme coding, funding approval, student management systems, and regulatory reporting requirements;
- the Research Office where the proposal has a research component or may require research-related approvals; and

~~1.8.~~• any other specialist area relevant to the proposal.

Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

~~1.9. Schools developing degree provision must also consult with the Research Office.~~

~~1.10.~~1.9. Schools determine how feedback is actioned and incorporated into the final document.

~~1.11.~~1.10. ~~Progress meetings are to be scheduled by the school throughout the development project to ensure that appropriate progress is made, workloads are manageable, documentation is available and consistent, and the overall management of the project is transparent.~~Schools must maintain appropriate oversight of academic development activities and engage with relevant stakeholders throughout the development process.

~~1.12.~~1.11. ~~Document templates will be provided by the Academic Quality Team and will include guidance on specific development aspects. While the templates may be amended to meet the particular needs of the development, all requirements stated in the templates must be addressed. Any amendments should be discussed with the Academic Quality Team.~~Approved templates and supporting guidance for academic development and approval activities are available on the MITU

intranet. Schools must use the current approved templates and ensure that all required sections and requirements are completed.

1.13. The Programme Committee must review applications to ensure they are complete and align with applicable NZQA requirements, programme approval requirements, institutional policy, and quality assurance expectations. Once the document templates have been completed the school submits them, along with supporting documentation, to the Academic Approvals Committee for final internal approval. The Academic Approvals Committee will consider whether the application:

1.12.

- Where satisfied that these requirements have been met, the Programme Committee will endorse the application for submission to the Academic Approvals Committee (AAC). meets MIT&Unitec standards;

will meet relevant NZQA/ISB requirements;

has been appropriately consulted on and the extent of support for the application

whether transition arrangements for students are required and sufficient

The committee will then determine whether the submission will progress to external approval or be returned to the school for further development work.

1.13.

1.14. The Academic Approvals Committee (AAC) will review applications to determine whether institutional, regulatory and quality assurance requirements have been met.

1.15. Where satisfied that these requirements have been met, AAC will approve the application in accordance with delegated authority.

1.16. The school must ensure that final approved documentation is provided to the academic development and quality function prior to submission to any external body.

1.17. The Academic Quality Team is responsible for submission of all applications for academic approval to external bodies and will provide support for any Requests for Information from these bodies, as required. The academic development and quality function will submit applications for academic approval to external bodies and will coordinate responses to any requests for further information.

1.14.

1.15.1.18. The *[Designated Contact]* Office *Academic Registry* academic registry function will is responsible for submission of applications for funding to TEC.

1.16.1.19. Degree and related programme applications may have additional requirements. These are detailed in the *Qualification or Programme development: approval and accreditation process* and noted throughout the Programme Approval Document. Degree and related programme applications may require additional internal and external review activities, including consideration by external experts, professional bodies, or NZQA-appointed panels, as required by NZQA guidelines and approval requirements.

1.17.1.20. At the completion of each academic development project, the Academic Quality Team may undertake a review to determine lessons learned from the process and identify good practice and areas for improvement. Schools and relevant academic support functions may identify

opportunities for improvement arising from academic development activities and incorporate these into future development processes, guidance and templates.

2. Changes to existing provision

2.1. Changes (including changes to the programme, modality, location, etc) are undertaken as per *1. Academic Development* (above) and the relevant process.

3. Marketing and Enrolments

3.1. Marketing activities for new or amended programmes, micro-credentials and assessment standards may commence once any required application has been submitted to NZQA or another relevant regulatory body. All marketing material must clearly state that the provision is pending approval until final approval has been received.

3.2. ~~In accordance with the MIT&Unitec Admission and Enrolment Policy (, programmes, micro-credentials and assessment standards cannot be delivered, and students cannot be enrolled, until all relevant NZQA, TEC and other regulatory body approvals have been received.~~Programmes, micro-credentials and assessment standards must not be delivered, and students must not be enrolled, until all required approvals from NZQA, TEC and any other relevant regulatory body have been obtained.

~~3.1.~~

4. Programme Library

4.1. Programme and associated documentation, ~~(~~including version control requirements,~~)~~ must~~is to~~ be managed in accordance with *Programme Library Guidelines*.

4.2. ~~Where changes are made to application documentation following initial submission of the application, the school is responsible for providing a final version of the documentation to the Academic Quality Team.~~Following approval and implementation, the academic quality function will ensure that final approved documentation is recorded in the Programme Library in accordance with the Programme Library Guidelines.

5. Pre-Development Approval

5.1. Schools seeking to develop, redevelop or replace academic provision must obtain approval to proceed with development before substantive development activities commence.

5.2. Approval in Principle (AIP) is required for all new academic provision and for changes to existing academic provision, except:

- Type 1 changes, as advised by the relevant academic development and quality function; or
- changes that do not introduce new or replacement elements requiring additional resources.

5.3. Where a development activity is required for strategic, regulatory, contractual or other institutional reasons, the Deputy Chief Executive Academic may determine that an Approval in Principle application is not required and approve an alternative pathway supported by a business case.

5.4. Schools must complete and submit an Approval in Principle application or business case, as applicable, through the Tāmaki Academic Product Approval Process (TAPAP).

5.5. The Tāmaki Academic Product Approval Process (TAPAP) comprises representatives from relevant academic and specialist functions and provides institutional consideration of the academic, strategic, financial, operational, cultural and market implications of proposed academic provision.

5.6. TAPAP will review Approval in Principle applications and business cases and may:

- recommend that development proceed;

Formatted: Condensed by 0.1 pt

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

- recommend that a business case be developed prior to further consideration;
- request further information; or d. recommend that the proposal not proceed.

5.7. TAPAP will consider applications within three weeks of submission.

5.8. The Deputy Chief Executive Academic must determine whether:

- development may proceed without a business case;
- a business case is required before development may proceed; or
- the proposal will not proceed.

5.9. Where a business case is required, development must not commence until the business case has been approved.

5.10. The Deputy Chief Executive Academic will advise the school of the outcome of the Approval in Principle application or business case.

~~5.~~6. Qualification or Programme development: approval and accreditation process

~~5.1.~~6.1. ~~Qualification or Programme development, approval and accreditation is to be undertaken in accordance with the following process:~~Once approval to proceed has been granted in accordance with Section 5, the school will undertake the development, consultation, approval and implementation activities required for the academic provision.

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
Select the correct step for the type of academic provision being developed		
New Qualification Development (Level 1-6)	School qualification development team	Develop the academic provision using the New Qualification Document (NQD). Engage with the academic development and quality function regarding programme design, approval, accreditation and any additional regulatory requirements. Complete the Qualification Evaluation Tool (QET) and all required supporting documentation.~~Academic provision developed using the *New Qualification Document (NQD).*~~ ~~Liaise with the Academic Quality team concerning any additional requirements.~~ ~~After which the development team complete the *Qualification Evaluation Tool template.*~~
New Programme Development (includes qualification at Levels 7+)	School programme development team	Develop the academic provision using the Programme Approval Document (PAD) and Student Management System (SMS) templates. Engage with the academic development and quality function regarding programme design, approval, accreditation, and any applicable regulatory requirements. Complete the Programme Evaluation Tool (PET) and all required supporting documentation.~~Academic provision~~

Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

Formatted Table

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
		~~developed using the *Programme Document template (PAD)* and *SMS Template*.~~ ~~After which the development team complete the *Programme Evaluation Tool template*.~~
Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders	School programme development team	Undertake and document consultation with relevant internal and external stakeholders. External consultation must include, as appropriate: • students; • whānau; • hapū; • iwi; • hapori Māori; • the qualification developer; • employers; • industry representatives; • professional bodies; • academic partners; and • other stakeholders relevant to the proposed academic provision. External consultation must include relevant communities and stakeholders appropriate to the proposal. External consultation must confirm the need for, and acceptability of, the proposed academic provision. Internal consultation must include: • MAAC and Māori specialist staff • PAAC and Pacific specialist staff • DAAC and accessibility specialists • teaching staff • Library and Learning Services • Industry Skill Board • Academic Registry • Marketing • Enrolments Internal consultation should include: • current students (where applicable) • recent graduates (where applicable) • International Office Consultation outcomes must be recorded in the consultation log.~~External consultation must articulate~~

Formatted Table

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.9 cm + Indent at: 1.53 cm

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.9 cm + Indent at: 1.53 cm

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.9 cm + Indent at: 1.53 cm

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.9 cm + Indent at: 1.53 cm

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
		~~the need for and acceptability of the proposed programme to the relevant communities (including students, whānau, hapū, iwi and where appropriate, hapori Māori) and other key stakeholders (including the qualification developer and any relevant academic, employer, industry, professional and other bodies).~~ ~~Internal consultation must include:~~ ~~– Academic Quality Team~~ ~~– Māori team~~ ~~– Pacific team~~ ~~– Disability team~~ ~~– staff proposed to teach on the programme~~ ~~– Industry Advisory Board~~ ~~– Registry functions.~~ ~~Internal consultation should include:~~ ~~– current students (if similar programme exists),~~ ~~– recent graduates~~ ~~– Library and Learning Services,~~ ~~– International,~~ ~~– Marketing~~ ~~– Enrolments~~ ~~Consultation must be recorded on a consultation log.~~
Notify NZQA	Academic quality function	Notify NZQA of intended graduate, postgraduate and degree programme approval or accreditation applications within required NZQA timeframes.
Peer Review	Development team ~~and Academic Quality Team~~/ Academic development and quality function	Submit the application to the academic development and quality function for review at least five working days prior to submission to the Programme Committee. Incorporate any agreed feedback and recommendations prior to submission to the Programme Committee and Head of School.~~Product reviewed: comments and recommendations provided to writers incorporated into an updated document prior to submission to the Programme Committee and Head of School for their review and endorsement.~~ ~~Academic Quality Team to notify NZQA of upcoming programme development at least 6 weeks in advance of submission.~~
Endorsement ~~(see note 1 below)~~	Head of School and Programme Committee~~Industry Advisory Group (IAG)~~	The Head of School and Programme Committee Chair will endorse the application where satisfied that it meets all applicable approval, accreditation and quality assurance requirements. Where the Programme Committee endorses the application subject to amendments, the school must complete the required amendments prior to submission

Formatted Table

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25 cm, Space After: 0 pt

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
		to AAC.~~Product is presented to the relevant IAG for endorsement and approval to proceed.~~
Submission to AAC	School~~Head of School/*[Delegated Authority]* and Programme Committee~~	New Qualification Document, SMS template, Programme Evaluation Tool, and any other agreements (signed), provided to the Academic Approvals Committee Programme Document, SMS template, Programme Evaluation Tool, and any other agreements (signed), provided to the Academic Approvals Committee. ~~The Head of School/*[Delegated Authority]* and Programme Committee Chair endorse (sign) the application if they are satisfied that it meets all product approval and accreditation requirements.~~ Submit the application to AAC in accordance with AAC submission requirements, including applicable timeframes and documentation requirements.~~A final edit is to be completed prior to final submission to the Academic Approvals Committee~~
~~Final~~ **New Qualification** ~~Document~~ **or Programme Approval** ~~Document – Submission to Academic Approvals Committee~~	Academic Approvals Committee ~~School~~	Review the application to determine whether institutional, regulatory and quality assurance requirements have been met. Determine the outcome of the application in accordance with delegated authority. Advise the school of the outcome and any conditions, amendments or further information required.~~New Qualification Document, SMS template, Programme Evaluation Tool, and any other agreements (signed), provided to the Academic Approvals Committee~~ ~~Programme Document, SMS template, Programme Evaluation Tool, and any other agreements (signed), provided to the Academic Approvals Committee.~~ ~~Document submission must be meet the requirements (timeframes, completeness) of the Academic Approvals Committee for the application to be accepted.~~
~~Academic Approvals Committee final endorsement *(see note 1 below)*~~	~~Academic Approvals Committee~~	~~Academic Approvals Committee review the product as per the terms of reference and processes of the committee.~~ ~~The committee will determine an outcome for the application and advise the applicant.~~ ~~Once the Academic Approvals Committee is satisfied with the application it will endorse it for submission to the Academic Board~~Academic Committee for approval.
Industry Skills Board (ISB) for endorsement ~~Academic Board~~~~Academic Committee~~ ~~Approval~~	Academic Quality Team~~Academic Board~~~~Academic Committee~~ ~~or delegated approval~~	Where ISB endorsement is required, submit the application to the relevant Industry Skills Board (ISB) and allow a minimum of 20 working days for consideration before submission to NZQA.~~*Academic*

Formatted Table

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25 cm

Formatted Table

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25 cm

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
		~~*Board*~~~~*Academic Committee*~~ ~~*Approval memo*~~ ~~prepared by the Academic Quality Team~~ ~~*(see note 2 below).*~~ ~~If satisfied with the application, the Academic Board~~Academic Committee ~~or delegate approves the application for submission for external approval.~~
Application submitted to NZQA~~**Submission to any professional or regulatory bodies**~~	Academic Quality Team~~Academic Quality Team~~	Application submitted to NZQA. For programmes at levels 1 to 6, or a diploma at level 7 allow up to 6 weeks turn around at NZQA. Higher level programmes (degree and post-graduate programmes) may take significantly longer for NZQA to turn around (in some cases, six months or more).~~Application submitted to the relevant professional or regulatory bodies for endorsement/approval.~~
~~**Application submitted to NZQA**~~	~~Academic Quality Team~~	~~Application submitted to NZQA.~~ ~~For programmes at levels 1 to 6, or a diploma at level 7 allow up to 6 weeks turn around at NZQA. Higher level programmes (degree and post-graduate programmes) will take significantly longer for NZQA to turn around (in some cases, six months or more).~~
***Where required by NZQA (usually for degree and related qualifications/ programmes)*:**		
NZQA Panel Review *Applications for degrees and related qualifications may require evaluation by an NZQA-appointed panel. Additional time should be allowed for panel evaluation activities and any resulting recommendations or requirements.* ~~*(see note 3 below)*~~	Academic development and quality function / School ~~Panel (nominated by MIT&Unitec and selected by NZQA) / Representatives of MIT&Unitec staff~~	Where required, support the establishment of an NZQA evaluation panel, including the nomination of suitably qualified panel members and provision of supporting documentation to NZQA. The academic quality function will co-ordinate any required responses to NZQA requests for further information Where NZQA requirements result in a change being made to the programme or accreditation documentation, MIT&Unitec procedure for approving the relevant type of change (i.e. a Type 1 or Type 2 Change) is to be followed (see section 9 below).~~Where necessary, panel visits are co-ordinated by the Academic Quality Team in consultation with NZQA, Panel members and the School.~~ ~~Panel visits MIT&Unitec and reviews application.~~
	NZQA Evaluation Panel / School Representatives	Participate in NZQA evaluation panel activities, including site visits and meetings, where required.
	Academic development and quality function	Coordinate responses to NZQA requests for further information, panel recommendations and panel requirements.

Formatted Table

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
	School	Complete any amendments required as a result of NZQA panel recommendations or requirements and obtain any necessary internal approvals before submission to NZQA.
Requests for Further Information~~Requests for further information addressed~~	Academic development and quality function / School~~NZQA to Academic Quality Team~~	Coordinate responses to any requests for further information received from NZQA and complete any required amendments before resubmission to NZQA.~~The Academic Quality Team will co-ordinate any required responses to NZQA requests for further information~~ ~~Where NZQA requirements result in a change being made to the programme or accreditation documentation, MIT&Unitec procedure for approving the relevant type of change (i.e. a Type 1 or Type 2 Change) is to be followed (see section 8 below).~~
Approval Outcome	NZQA / Academic development and quality function	Receive the NZQA approval outcome and associated Qualification or Programme Details (RO482), where applicable from NZQA. Notify relevant internal stakeholders of the approval outcome and provide approved programme documentation for implementation and funding approval activities.
TEC for funding approval, loans and allowances; SMS Set-up~~NZQA approval and Qualification/ Programme Details (RO482)~~	Academic registry function ~~NZQA~~	Submit the approved programme documentation to TEC for funding approval, student loan eligibility and student allowance eligibility. Complete SMS set-up Allow a minimum of six weeks for TEC approval processes prior to the intended commencement of delivery.~~NZQA send letter of approval and Qualification/Programme Details (RO482) and the Academic Quality Team informs relevant internal stakeholders once approval has been obtained.~~
~~The *[Designated Contact]* team will notify all relevant parties once approval obtained~~**Approval Outcome Communicated**	Academic development and quality function ~~Academic Registry [Designated Contact] team~~	Notify relevant stakeholders that all approvals have been obtained and implementation activities may commence. ~~Qualification/Programme implementation/delivery can begin once TEC approval has been obtained and SMS set-up is complete.~~Qualification/Programme implementation/delivery can begin once TEC approval has been obtained and SMS set-up is complete.
Record Keeping	Academic development and quality function	Record approved documentation in the Programme Library

Formatted Table

Formatted: Not Expanded by / Condensed by

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Tab stops: 1.3 cm, Left

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
Assign~~ing~~ to a Programme Committee	~~General Manager Schools or Director Schools and~~ Performance~~[Delegated Authority]~~[Delegated Authority]	Assign responsibility for academic oversight of the qualification or programme to the appropriate Programme Committee. ~~The [delegated authority]General Manager Schools or Director Schools and Performance is responsible to assign the qualification/programme to a Programme Committee.~~

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

~~***Note 1 – Academic Approvals Committee endorsement***~~

~~There are three possible outcomes from any application considered by the [delegated authority]Academic Approvals Committee:~~

~~a. the application is endorsed and recommended to the [delegated authority]Academic Committee or delegate for approval.~~

~~b. the application is endorsed subject to stated conditions which can be met within five (5) working days. The stated conditions will be minor, e.g. typographical errors.~~

~~c. the application is not endorsed – a resubmission will be required.~~

~~Where any conditions or requirements are to be met, the Academic Approvals Committee will clearly state what these are and the process to be followed. Where the Academic Approvals Committee endorses an application subject to conditions being met, the Academic Quality Team will work with the School to assist it to meet the conditions. The Academic Quality Team will then confirm to the Academic Approvals Committee that the stated conditions have been met.~~

~~Upon Academic Approvals Committee endorsement, outcomes will be communicated to the applicant and the Academic Quality Team will facilitate the seeking of approval from the [delegated authority]Academic Committee or delegate and the NZQA.~~

~~***Note 2 – Academic Board Committee approval***~~

~~In situations where the period of time until the next scheduled Academic Board Committee meeting would create an undue delay in programme delivery commencing, applications may be approved by the Deputy Chief Executive Academic under the delegated authority of the Academic BoardAcademic Committee, provided that required supporting endorsements have been obtained and:~~

- ~~they are satisfied that the application meets the standards and requirements of the Academic BoardAcademic Committee~~
- ~~the approval is advised to the next scheduled Academic BoardAcademic Committee meeting.~~

~~The Academic BoardAcademic Committee Secretary will advise the applicant and Academic Approvals Committee of the outcome.~~

~~The Academic BoardAcademic Committee may delegate its approval powers to *[Delegated Authority]Deputy Chief Executive, Academic* as it determines.~~

~~***Note 3 – Applications requiring a panel evaluation***~~

~~Applications for degrees and related programmes usually require consideration by a panel of experts nominated by MIT&Unitec and selected by NZQA. NZQA may also consider other applications by panel at its discretion. The need for a panel visit will be negotiated between the Academic Quality Team and NZQA on a case by case basis. The School will be kept informed.~~

~~Where NZQA requires a panel to consider an application, significant additional time will be required. The need, or otherwise, for a panel evaluation will not be confirmed by NZQA until after the application has been submitted to them.~~

~~The Academic Quality Team will facilitate any panel process and oversee the outcomes of the panel visit in terms of recommendations and requirements. Panel evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the current *NZQA Guidelines*. Panel involvement typically requires the following steps:~~

~~a. School, via the Academic Quality Team, nominates appropriately qualified panel members who were not involved in the development of the programme (complete CVs for each nominee are required)~~

~~b. Academic Quality Team:~~
- ~~facilitates an agreed visit date with NZQA~~
- ~~provides documentation to NZQA for distribution to panel~~

- ~~School arranges transport and accommodation (and other logistical arrangements)~~
- ~~Panel visits MIT&Unitec~~
- ~~Panel drafts report~~
- ~~School, via the Academic Quality Team, confirms factual accuracy of report~~
- ~~Panel provides report to NZQA~~
- ~~NZQA considers report and provides an outcome (i.e. approves or declines the application).~~

~~As determined by the *[Delegated Authority]*~~*Chair, Academic Approvals Committee*~~, a mock panel visit may be undertaken to prepare for the visit.~~

~~*Application outcomes*~~
~~All panel reports are considered by the Academic Approvals Committee. Where there are:~~

~~a. Commendations – these will be acknowledged and celebrated~~

~~b. Recommendations – the School will be required respond to any recommendations made by NZQA~~

~~c. Requirements – the School will work with the Academic Centre to meet and respond to the requirements.~~

~~Where requirements are significant, the Academic Quality Team will schedule a planning meeting with the School development team to agree on actions, timelines and process. Regular meetings will take place to ensure progress is made.~~

~~Responses to NZQA panel requirements are required to be considered by the Academic Approvals Committee before submission to NZQA.~~

~~6.~~7. Micro-credential development process

~~6.1.~~7.1. ~~Micro-credential development and approval is to be undertaken in accordance with the following process:~~ Once approval to proceed has been granted in accordance with Section 5, the school will undertake the development, consultation, approval and implementation activities required for the micro-credential.

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
Micro-credential Development	School development team	Develop the micro-credential using the Micro-credential and Short Course Approval Template.

Formatted: Font: 10 pt
Formatted: Font: 10 pt
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.24 cm, Right: 0.34 cm
Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Bold
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.12 cm, Right: 0.34 cm
Formatted Table
Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders	School programme development team	Undertake and document consultation with relevant internal and external stakeholders. External consultation must include, as appropriate: • students; • whānau; • hapū; • iwi; • hapori Māori; • the qualification developer; • employers; • industry representatives; • professional bodies; • academic partners; and • other stakeholders relevant to the proposed academic provision. External consultation must include relevant communities and stakeholders appropriate to the proposal. External consultation must confirm the need for, and acceptability of, the proposed academic provision. Internal consultation must include: • MAAC and Māori specialist staff • PAAC and Pacific specialist staff • DAAC and accessibility specialists • teaching staff • Library and Learning Services • Industry Skill Board • Academic Registry • Marketing • Enrolments Internal consultation should include: • current students (where applicable) • recent graduates (where applicable) • International Office Consultation outcomes must be recorded in the consultation log.~~External consultation must articulate the need for and acceptability of the proposed micro-credential.~~ ~~Internal consultation must include: Academic Quality Team,~~ ~~Internal consultation should include, as appropriate:~~ ~~– Māori team~~ ~~– Pacific team~~ ~~– Disability team~~ ~~– staff proposed to teach on the programme~~

		~~– Industry Advisory Board~~ ~~– Registry functions~~ ~~– current students (if similar delivery exists)~~ ~~– recent graduates~~ ~~– Library and Learning Services~~ ~~– International~~ ~~– Marketing~~ ~~– Enrolments~~ ~~Consultation must be recorded on a consultation log.~~
~~**Micro-credential Development**~~**Peer Review**	Development team / Academic development and quality function~~School development team~~	Submit the application to the academic development and quality function for review at least five working days prior to submission to the Programme Committee. Incorporate any agreed feedback and recommendations prior to submission to the Programme Committee and Head of School.~~Application developed using the *Micro-credential, and short courses approval template*.~~
Endorsement	Programme Committee and Head of School	The Head of School and Programme Committee Chair will endorse the application where satisfied that it meets all applicable approval, accreditation and quality assurance requirements. Where the Programme Committee endorses the application subject to amendments, the school must complete the required amendments prior to submission to AAC.~~If satisfied with the application the Programme Committee and Head of School signs the template on final page~~
Submission to AAC	School	Provide the Micro-credential Approval Document, SMS template, Evaluation Tool and any required signed agreements to AAC. Submit the application to AAC in accordance with AAC submission requirements, including applicable timeframes and documentation requirements.
~~**Deliver to the Academic Quality Team to be scheduled at Academic Approvals Committee meeting.**~~	~~Head of School Micro-credential submission to *[Delegated Authority]* Committee*Academic Approvals Committee*~~	~~Micro-credential Approval Document, SMS template, *Evaluation Tool template*, and any other agreements (signed) provided to the *[Delegated Authority]**Academic Approvals* Committee prior to the scheduled *[Delegated Authority]* Committee meeting.~~
Micro-credential Approval	Academic Approvals Committee	Review the application to determine whether institutional, regulatory and quality assurance requirements have been met. Determine the outcome of the application in accordance with delegated authority. Advise the school of the outcome and any conditions, amendments or further information required.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.19 cm, Right: 0.25 cm

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

~~**Academic Approvals Committee final endorsement** *(see note 1 below)*~~	~~*[Delegated Authority]* Committee~~*Academic Approvals Committee*	~~Academic Approvals Committee review the product as per the terms of reference and processes for the committee.~~ ~~The committee will determine the outcome for the application and advise the applicant.~~ ~~Once the Academic Approvals Committee is satisfied with the application it will endorse it and submit it to the Academic Board~~Academic Committee ~~for approval.~~
~~**Academic Board**~~**Academic Committee** ~~**Approval**~~	~~Academic Board~~Academic Committee ~~or delegated approval~~	~~*Academic Board*~~*Academic Committee* ~~*Approval memo prepared by the Academic Quality Team (see note 2 below).*~~ ~~If satisfied with the application, the Academic Board~~Academic Committee ~~or delegate approves the application for submission for external approval.~~
Industry Skills Board (ISB) for endorsement ~~**Application submitted to relevant Industry Skills Board (ISB) for endorsement**~~	Academic Quality Team~~Academic Quality Team~~	Where ISB endorsement is required, submit the application to the relevant Industry Skills Board (ISB) and allow a minimum of 20 working days for consideration before submission to NZQA.~~If required, the application is submitted to the relevant ISB for endorsement. Allow up to 20 days turn around at the ISB.~~
Application submitted to NZQA	Academic development and quality function~~Academic Quality Team~~	Application submitted to NZQA. Allow up to 6 weeks turn around at NZQA. Submit the application to NZQA. Allow up to six weeks for NZQA consideration.
Requests for Further Information	Academic development and quality function / School	Coordinate responses to any requests for further information received from NZQA and complete any required amendments before resubmission to NZQA.
Approval Outcome Communicated	Academic development and quality function	Notify relevant stakeholders that all approvals have been obtained and implementation activities may commence. Micro-credential implementation/delivery can begin once TEC approval has been obtained (if required).
TEC for funding approval, loans and allowances; SMS Set-up	Academic registry function	Submit the approved micro-credential documentation to TEC for funding approval (if required), student loan eligibility and student allowance eligibility. Complete SMS set-up Allow a minimum of six weeks for TEC approval processes prior to the intended commencement of delivery.
Record Keeping ~~**Record keeping**~~	Academic development and quality function~~Academic Quality Team~~	Record approved documentation in the Programme Library ~~The Academic Quality Team files the Micro-credential Document and SMS Template in the Programme Library and updates the Register of Micro-credentials and short courses.~~
Assign to a Programme Committee~~**Assigning**~~	[Delegated Authority]~~[delegated authority]General Manager Schools or~~	Assign responsibility for academic oversight of the qualification or programme to the appropriate Programme Committee.

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Bold, Condensed by 0.1 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Condensed by 0.1 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Condensed by 0.1 pt

~~to a Programme Committee~~	~~Director Schools and Performance~~	~~The [delegated authority]General Manager Schools or Director Schools and Performance is responsible to assign the micro-credentials/short courses to a Programme Committee~~

~~7.~~8. Short Course development process

8.1. Short course development and approval is to be undertaken in accordance with the following process:

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION
Short Course Development	School development team	Develop the micro-credential using the Micro-credential and Short Course Approval Template.
Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders	School programme development team	Undertake and document consultation with relevant internal and external stakeholders. External consultation must include, as appropriate: • students; • whānau; • hapū; • iwi; • hapori Māori; • the qualification developer; • employers; • industry representatives; • professional bodies; • academic partners; and • other stakeholders relevant to the proposed academic provision. External consultation must include relevant communities and stakeholders appropriate to the proposal. External consultation must confirm the need for, and acceptability of, the proposed academic provision. Internal consultation must include: • MAAC and Māori specialist staff • PAAC and Pacific specialist staff • DAAC and accessibility specialists • teaching staff • Library and Learning Services • Industry Skill Board • Academic Registry • Marketing • Enrolments Internal consultation should include: • current students (where applicable)

		• recent graduates (where applicable) • International Office Consultation outcomes must be recorded in the consultation log.
Peer Review	Development team / Academic development and quality function	Submit the application to the academic development and quality function for review at least five working days prior to submission to the Programme Committee. Incorporate any agreed feedback and recommendations prior to submission to the Programme Committee and Head of School.
Endorsement	Programme Committee and Head of School	The Head of School and Programme Committee Chair will endorse the application where satisfied that it meets all applicable approval, accreditation and quality assurance requirements. Where the Programme Committee endorses the application subject to amendments, the school must complete the required amendments prior to submission to AAC.
Submission to AAC	School	Provide the Short Course Approval Document, SMS template, Evaluation Tool and any required signed agreements to AAC. Submit the application to AAC in accordance with AAC submission requirements, including applicable timeframes and documentation requirements.
Short Course Approval	Academic Approvals Committee	Review the application to determine whether institutional, regulatory and quality assurance requirements have been met. Determine the outcome of the application in accordance with delegated authority. Advise the school of the outcome and any conditions, amendments or further information required.
Approval Outcome Communicated	Academic development and quality function	Notify relevant stakeholders that all approvals have been obtained and implementation activities may commence. Short course implementation/delivery can begin once TEC approval has been obtained (if required). Notify relevant stakeholders that approval has been obtained and implementation activities may commence. Short course delivery may commence once SMS set-up has been completed.
TEC for funding approval, loans and allowances; SMS Set-up	Academic registry function	Submit the approved micro-credential documentation to TEC for funding approval (if required), student loan eligibility and student allowance eligibility. Complete SMS set-up Allow a minimum of six weeks for TEC approval processes prior to the intended commencement of delivery.
Record Keeping	Academic development and quality function	Record approved documentation in the Programme Library

Formatted Table

Assign to a Programme Committee	[Delegated Authority]	Assign responsibility for academic oversight of the qualification or programme to the appropriate Programme Committee.

~~7.1.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5 cm, No bullets or numbering

~~PROCESS~~	~~WHO~~	~~ACTION~~
~~**Approval in Principle**~~	~~Head of School~~	~~*Approval in Principle Application template* completed, and submitted through the Tāmaki Academic Product Approval Process (TAPAP).~~
	~~Deputy Chief Executive Academic~~	~~On recommendation from TAPAP, either:~~ ~~• approves the application; or~~ ~~• declines the application with feedback to the applicant~~
~~**Approval given**~~	~~School and Academic Quality Team~~	~~Follow the guidelines as outlined in the *Micro-credential, and short courses approval template*~~
~~**Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders**~~	~~School programme development team~~	~~Mandatory: Consult with Academic Quality Team Suggested (as required): Consult with External stakeholders, Library and Learning Services, International, Marketing.~~
~~**Short course Development**~~	~~School development team~~	~~Application developed using the above template.~~
~~**Endorsement**~~	~~Programme Committee and Head of School~~	~~If satisfied with the application the Programme Committee and Head of School signs the template on final page~~
~~**Approval submission of approval documentation**~~	~~Head of School Academic Approvals Committee~~	~~The Head of School presents the *application* to the Academic Approvals Committee.~~ ~~The Academic Approvals Committee approves the application or returns it for further development.~~
~~**SMS set-up**~~	~~Head of School~~	~~SMS Template are sent to the *[Designated Contact]* Office to be set-up and to the Academic Quality Team to be filed in the Programme Library~~
~~**Record keeping**~~	~~Academic Quality Team~~	~~The Academic Quality Team files the Micro-credential Document and SMS Template in the Programme Library and updates the Register of micro-credentials and short courses.~~
~~**Assigning to a Programme Committee**~~	~~General Manager Schools or Director Schools and Performance *[Delegated authority]*~~	~~The General Manager Schools or Director Schools and Performance delegated authority is responsible to assign the micro-credentials/short courses to a Programme Committee~~

~~8.~~9. Programme Type 1 and Type 2 change process and changes to Micro-credentials

9.1. ~~Type 1 change: One or more changes to components of an approved programme/micro-credential which do not impact on the programme as a whole, i.e. overall programme aim, content and outcomes. Schools must contact the Academic Quality team about the current NZQA settings and for advice about whether to make a Type 1 or Type 2 application.~~ A Type 1 change is one or more changes to components of an approved programme or micro-credential that do not significantly affect the programme or micro-credential as a whole. Type 1 changes generally do not affect the overall purpose, structure, delivery, content, coherence or outcomes of the approved provision. Type 1 changes are notified to NZQA following internal approval.

Examples of Type 1 changes may include:

- changes to programme or course titles or codes;
- minor amendments to learning outcomes;
- changes to course sequencing;
- changes to holiday periods;
- redistribution of learning hours;
- amendments to assessment methods or assessment weightings; and
- minor amendments required following a qualification review.

~~8.1.~~ Schools must consult the academic development and quality function for advice on whether a proposed change should be submitted as a Type 1 or Type 2 change.

9.2. ~~Type 2 change: One or more changes to components of an approved programme/micro-credential which have an impact on the programme/micro-credential as a whole. These changes alter the approval and accreditation data held by NZQA. A Type 2 change must be approved by NZQA prior to implementation. Schools must contact the Academic Quality team about the current NZQA settings and for advice about whether to make a Type 1 or Type 2 application.~~A Type 2 change is one or more changes to components of an approved programme or micro-credential that significantly affect the programme or micro-credential as a whole. Type 2 changes alter the approval and accreditation information held by NZQA and require NZQA approval before implementation.

Examples of Type 2 changes may include:

- significant changes to qualification outcomes or conditions;
- major changes to programme learning outcomes;
- adding, removing or combining courses;
- significant changes to programme structure or delivery;
- changes to assessment methodology;
- replacement qualifications; or
- changes that materially affect programme coherence, structure or graduate outcomes.

~~8.2.~~ Schools must consult the academic development and quality function for advice on whether a proposed change should be submitted as a Type 1 or Type 2 change.

9.3. ~~Changes to Micro-credentials - Schools must contact the Academic Quality team about the current NZQA settings and for advice about whether to make a change to micro-credentials application.~~ Schools must consult the academic development and quality function for advice on the approval requirements and processes applicable to proposed changes to micro-credentials.

~~8.3.~~

~~8.4.~~9.4. Type 1 and 2 changes and changes to micro-credentials are to be undertaken in accordance with the following process:

PROCESS	WHO	ACTION

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5 cm, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5 cm, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5 cm, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5 cm, No bullets or numbering

Change Development	School development team	Develop the proposed change and update all affected documentation. ▪ Using 'track changes', make the changes to the latest approved version of the Programme Approval Document (PAD) or Micro-credential Document. *Latest approved versions of PADs and micro-credential approval documents are available in the MIT&Unitec Programme Library.* ▪ Complete the appropriate *Type 1, Type 2 Change or Micro-credential Change Memo template* indicating why and how the programme/micro-credential is changing – all changes made to the PAD are to be summarised in the memo. ▪ Where necessary update the SMS Template and sub-contracts/agreements (obtaining approval). Changes will not be accepted without a tracked change document. Documents must be updated in full.
Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders	School programme development team	The extent of consultation required will depend on the proposed changes Mandatory: Consult with ~~Academic Quality Team~~academic development and quality function.~~,~~ Suggested (as required): the Māori Academic Advisory Committee, the Pacific Academic Advisory Committee~~,~~ ~~and~~ a~~A~~cademic r~~R~~egistry function, External stakeholders, Library and Learning Services, International, Marketing, current students, recent graduates.
~~**Prepare change memo and supporting documentation**~~	~~**School**~~	~~▪ Using 'track changes', make the changes to the latest approved version of the Programme Approval Document (PAD) or Micro-credential Document.~~ ~~*Latest approved versions of PADs and micro-credential approval documents are available in the MIT&Unitec Programme Library.*~~ ~~▪ Complete the appropriate *Type 1, Type 2 Change or Micro-credential Change Memo template* indicating why and how the programme/micro-credential is changing – all changes made to the PAD are to be summarised in the memo.~~ ~~▪ Where necessary update the SMS Template and sub-contracts/agreements and obtain approval from YY team.~~ ~~Changes will not be accepted without a tracked change document.~~ ~~Documents must be updated in full.~~
Peer review	**School, Academic Quality Team and YY team**	Peers, Academic Quality Team, and *[Designated Contact]* team review the documentation and recommend any changes.

Programme Committee endorsement	**Programme Committee**	Programme Committee reviews proposed changes and may recommend them to the Head of School for their endorsement. All decisions are to be recorded accurately in the Programme Committee minutes.
Endorsement~~Head of School endorsement~~	Head of School and Programme Committee~~Head of School~~	The Head of School and Programme Committee Chair will endorse the application where satisfied that it meets all applicable approval, accreditation and quality assurance requirements. Where the Programme Committee endorses the application subject to amendments, the school must complete the required amendments prior to submission to AAC.~~Head of School reviews proposed change and may endorse Type 1, Type 2 or Micro-credential changes for approval by the [Delegated Authority]Academic Approvals Committee for forwarding to NZQA for external approval.~~
Submission to ~~[Delegated Authority] Committee~~AAC	**School**	Type 1, Type 2 or Micro-credential Change memo, programme or micro–credential document with track changes, any other agreements (signed), SMS t~~T~~emplate (if required), provided to the ~~[Delegated Authority]~~Academic Approvals Committee. ~~Please note that there may be timeframe requirements for document submission.~~ Submit the application to AAC in accordance with AAC submission requirements, including applicable timeframes and documentation requirements.
~~**Application submitted to relevant ISB for endorsement**~~	~~Academic Quality Team~~	~~Application submitted to the relevant ISB for endorsement (type 2 change). Please note that there may be timeframe requirements for document submission.~~
~~**The ISB endorsed application is submitted to NZQA, TEC etc. as outlined in section 2 above for Qualifications and Programmes**~~		
Change Approval	**Academic Approvals Committee**	Review the application to determine whether institutional, regulatory and quality assurance requirements have been met. Determine the outcome of the application in accordance with delegated authority. Advise the school of the outcome and any conditions, amendments or further information required.
Type 1 Change Notification	Academic development and quality function	Notify NZQA of approved Type 1 changes and provide updated documentation as required.
Type 2 Change Application	Academic development and quality function	Submit approved Type 2 change applications to NZQA and provide updated documentation as required.

Formatted: Not Expanded by / Condensed by

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, Not Expanded by / Condensed by

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.01 cm

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Left

Requests for Further Information	Academic development and quality function / School	Coordinate responses to any requests for further information received from NZQA and complete any required amendments before resubmission to NZQA.
Approval Outcome	NZQA / Academic development and quality function	Receive the NZQA approval outcome/notification receipt and associated Programme/Micro-credential Details (RO482), where applicable from NZQA. Notify relevant internal stakeholders of the approval outcome and provide approved documentation for implementation and funding approval activities.
Record Keeping ~~**Record keeping**~~	Academic development and quality function~~Academic Quality Team~~	Record approved documentation in the Programme Library ~~The Academic Quality Team files the Micro-credential Document and SMS Template in the Programme Library and updates the Register of micro-credentials and short courses.~~

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Left

~~9.~~10. Process for seeking consent to assess (CTA) against standards listed on the Directory of Assessment and Skill Standards

~~9.1.~~10.1. All MIT~~&Unitec~~U programmes and courses that include assessment standards (Achievement, Skill or Unit standards) listed on the NZQA's Directory of Assessment and Skill Standards, must obtain and hold the relevant CTA ~~status for such standards~~.

~~9.2.~~ CTA must be gained prior to, or concurrently with, applications for approval for new programme, or changes to existing programmes.

10.2. CTA applications must comply with:

- all relevant NZQA rules;
- the requirements of the relevant standard-setting body as detailed in the Consent and Moderation Requirements (CMR); and ~~document associated with each assessment standard for which 'consent to assess' is being sought; and~~
- any applicable industry or sector-specific requirements.

Formatted: normaltextrun

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

~~9.3.~~10.3. To maintain CTA status, the CMR must continue to be met. This~~ese~~ includes ensuring:

- staff remain appropriately-qualified;
- internal and external moderation occurs in accordance with the CMR and MIT&Unitec's Assessment and Moderation Policies and Procedures~~y~~; and
- industry or sector-specific requirements are being met.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.9 cm

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

10.4. ~~Schools seeking CTA must contact the Academic Quality Team who will confirm whether consent is already held elsewhere in MIT&Unitec. Where MIT&Unitec does not hold consent to assess the Standard, the school will be supported to apply for consent.~~ Schools seeking Consent to Assess (CTA) must consult the academic development and quality function to determine whether MITU already holds consent to assess against the relevant standard.

10.5. Where MITU does not hold consent to assess against the relevant standard, the school must develop a CTA application with support from the academic development and quality function.

~~9.4.~~10.6. CTA applications must be endorsed by the Head of School and approved by AAC prior to submission to the relevant standard-setting body and NZQA.

~~Applications for CTA standards must be endorsed by the Head of School prior to being approved by Academic Approvals Committee before being submitted to the relevant standard-setting body and NZQA for external approval.~~

~~10.~~11.Process for the approval of a new permanent or temporary delivery site

~~10.1.~~11.1. ~~NZQA approval is required for all new permanent delivery sites and all new sites (temporary or permanent) for degree-level or higher programmes.~~Schools proposing delivery from a new teaching location must consult the academic development and quality function to determine applicable approval, accreditation and notification requirements.

11.2. ~~The delivery of an existing sub-degree programme or course or micro-credential/short course/training at an existing location (except main campus locations) where the programme has not previously been delivered at that location does not require approval.~~NZQA approval is required for:

- all new permanent delivery sites; and
- all new delivery sites (temporary or permanent) for degree-level and related qualifications.

~~10.2.~~11.3. Delivery of approved sub-degree academic provision from an existing MITU teaching location does not require additional site approval unless otherwise required by NZQA.

11.4. Applications for approval of a new permanent delivery site for Levels 1-6 provision must be submitted using the Application for New Teaching Location template.

11.5. New delivery site applications must be endorsed by the Head of School and approved in accordance with delegated authority before submission to NZQA, where required.

11.6. Delivery sites for degree-level and related qualifications must be approved through the relevant programme approval or Type 2 change process and meet any additional NZQA site accreditation requirements.

~~10.3.~~ The academic development and quality function will maintain a register of approved teaching locations.~~Approval for a new permanent delivery site for Level 1-6 programmes is obtained by completing the Application for New Teaching Locations template. Applications for new delivery sites are to be endorsed by the Head of School and forwarded to the Academic Quality Team for approval by the *[Delegated Authority]* and notification to NZQA as required.~~

~~10.4. Approval of delivery sites for degree-level or higher programmes is obtained by submitting a Type 2 change (see section 8.2). This provision also requires separate NZQA site accreditation. Site accreditation will be managed by the Academic Quality team.~~

~~10.5. Schools seeking site approval for offshore programme delivery should first be aware of the NZQA's offshore delivery rules. The Academic Quality Team can assist schools intending to make an application to deliver offshore.~~

~~10.6.~~11.7. ~~The Academic Quality Team will maintain a register of approved teaching locations.~~

~~**11. Marketing and Enrolments**~~

Formatted: normaltextrun

Formatted: 06c subclause level a, Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 1.9 cm + Indent at: 2.54 cm

~~11.1. In accordance with the *MIT&Unitec Admission and Enrolment*, programmes, micro-credentials and assessment standards cannot be delivered, and students cannot be enrolled, until all relevant NZQA, TEC and other regulatory body approvals have been received.~~

~~11.2. Following Academic Approvals Committee endorsement, programmes and NZQA approved Micro-credentials may be marketed with a clear notice that the programme is "pending approval".~~

~~**12. Programme Library**~~

~~12.1. Programme and associated documentation (including version control) is to be managed in accordance with *Programme Library Guidelines*.~~

~~12.2. Where changes are made to application documentation following initial submission of the application, the School is responsible for providing a final version of the documentation to the Academic Quality Team.~~

Definitions

See the *Glossary of MIT&Unitec Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents*

Related Documents

- MIT~~&Unitec~~ Academic Development and Approvals Policy
- MITU Suspension, Withdrawal, Replacement and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure
- MITU Academic Agreements and Sub-contracting Procedure
- MITU Te Mana Akoranga Policy
- MIT~~&Unitec~~ Delegations Register
- MIT~~&Unitec~~ Glossary for Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents.
- MITU AAC Standard Operating Procedure
- MITU Te Mana Akoranga Policy
- Te Mana Akoranga Self-Assessment Tool

Document management and control

Approver:	Academic Committee~~TTG~~
Latest approval date:	2025~~-11-27~~-6-11-xx
Effective date:	2026-11-xx~~01-01~~
Next scheduled review date:	2028~~6-09-01~~
Policy sponsor:	DCE Academic
Policy owner:	General Manager, Academic Services / Director Te Korowai Kahurangi

Amendment history

Document Version	Effective Date	Approver	Amendment details
V1.0	2026-01-01	TTG~~TTG~~	New document MIT&Unitec transition
V2.0	2026-11-xx	Academic Committee	Update for integrated policy/procedure

Appendix One – Te Mana Akoranga: Māori Curriculum Self-Assessment Tool

The following template is for developing, assessing, monitoring and evaluating Māori curriculum and content in programmes, courses, training schemes and micro- credentials. It has been developed for academic management, staff and committees as a resource for ensuring we are able to maintain the highest levels of academic standards for Māori curriculum.

No	PRINCIPLE	TE TIRITI O WAITANGI	CURRICULUM AND COURSE DESIGN
1.	Te Tiriti o Waitangi	Give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and meet Education and Training (E&T) Act (2020).	• Has the development, assessment and review processes of your programme or course met the Education and Training Act (202 statutory requirements with reference to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, academic policy, quality systems and operational processes?
2.	Akoako: Consultation	Māori are key partners in curriculum design in regional, hapū, iwi, whanau and intergenerational development.	• How have Māori key stakeholders and communities of interest been involved in the design and delivery of the curriculum? • Does the programme or course assessment and evaluation process demonstrate that Māori stakeholders and communities of interest have been consulted and included in the course development process?
3.	Whakaako: Training	Te Tiriti o Waitangi based systems for developing skills that inform academic programmes, policies and quality systems.	• How have staff been educated and/or appropriately trained to have a strong and competent understanding and experience in th Māori curriculum content they are delivering? • Has professional development or training been provided to develop and enhance capacity to deliver Māori curriculum? • How are Māori staff in this programme supported or upskilled to deliver or support Māori curriculum?
4.	Aromatawai: Assessment.	Assessment is equitable/tika and values cultural diversity and individual needs. Mātauranga Māori curriculum and learning outcomes are formally assessed and evaluated.	• How is Mātauranga Māori curriculum and learning outcome formally assessed and evaluated? • Are activities inclusive of all ākonga? • Are activities and approaches used in assessment appropriate for ākonga, their language and culture? • Are assessment tasks fair, free from bias and inclusive of cultural diversity? • Are ākonga able to provide assessment responses that are relevant to their culture, tikanga and world views?
5.	Pūtanga: Learning Outcomes	All curriculum aims to improve Māori social, economic, cultural, education and employment outcomes.	• How do the programme learning outcomes identify, recognise and acknowledge Mātauranga Māori as an achievement? • How do the learning outcomes consider the needs of Māori key stakeholders?
6.	Wawata: Aspirations.	All curriculum is inclusive of, sensitive to, and conducive to the aspirations of Māori.	• How does the programme ensure the curriculum is inclusiv of, sensitive to, and conducive to the aspirations of Iwi and Māori? • How does the curriculum define achievements which improve education, staircase learning, employment, and vocational pathways and outcomes for Māori?
7.	Āheitanga: Equality.	Learning environments address and redress Māori inequalities through curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes.	• How do learning environments address Māori inequalities i curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes? • Does the design and delivery of the course consider any unreasonable barriers to access, participation and success by Māori
8.	Oritetanga: Inequalities.	Academic access to address Māori inequalities in	• How has the development and delivery of the programme and/or course addressed effective education and training delivery to meet the specific learning needs of Māori?

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Left, Right: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Right: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Right: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Right: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

No	PRINCIPLE	TE TIRITI O WAITANGI	CURRICULUM AND COURSE DESIGN
		accordance with the ToW principle of participation.	• How has the programme and/or course used curriculum design to address Māori inequalities, flexible learning delivery, resourcing to support online learning, digital and other resources th meet the needs of Māori for example, utilising community Māori leaders and the employment of Māori academic staff?
9.	Matatau: Competency.	Cultural responsiveness to address Māori inequities and uphold, enhance and uplift mana Māori.	• How does this programme and/or course incorporate culturally competent practice and service delivery responsiveness fo Māori? • How has the curriculum design and content been inclusive Tikanga, Te reo and Mātauranga Māori? • How has it supported the development of Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnerships and Education and Training Act (2020) requirements?
10.	Whakarata: Responsibility	Systems, structures and access to services address Māori inequities and transform vocational education.	• How does the programme incorporate Mātauranga Māori a the responsibility of academic governance, management and staff and not just Māori staff? • How does the curriculum delivered within systems and structures create and/or provide vocational and learning education opportunities that uplift the mana of Māori?
11.	Whakapakari: Development	Performance measures contribute to actual improvement of social, economic, cultural, education and workforce outcomes for Māori.	• How does the programme and/or course contribute to the improvement of social, economic, cultural, education and employment outcomes for Māori? • How is the curriculum designed and delivered with performance measures and clear, defined responsibilities, accountabilities including implications if they are not achieved?
12.	Te Taiao: Learning Environments	Learning environments address Māori inequities through curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes.	• How does the programme and/or course consider the learning environment in curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes? • How does the programme and/or course use Te Reo and Tikanga Māori in ways that demonstrate Mātauranga Māori practic where possible?
13.	Tikanga Māori: Māori Customs.	Development, delivery, assessment and review incorporates Tikanga Māori protocols as activities and resources to support learning.	• How do the programme and/or course learning outcomes support extra-curricular Mātauranga Māori learning activities including Māori customs and protocols? • How does the programme and/or course evaluation and assessment processes use these activities to support and enhance achievement of course learning outcomes?
14.	Rangahau: Research	Programmes and courses recognise, acknowledge and use Mātauranga Māori research in development, delivery, assessment and review processes.	• How does the programme and/or course formally recognis Mātauranga Māori research sources and acknowledge endorsement by Māori where possible? • How does the programme and/or course contribute to developing Mātauranga Māori knowledge?
15.	Whakakotahi: Integration	Programmes integrate Mātauranga Māori into the development, delivery, assessment and review processes in ways that meet the needs of students.	• How has the Māori content and curriculum been integrated into the programme design in a way that allows students to understand, develop and build their understanding of Te Reo, Tikanga and Mātauranga Māori?

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Tab stops: Not at 6.24 cm

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Right: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Right: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Right: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted: 02_Heading 1, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Right: 0 cm, Space After: 0 pt, Font Alignment: Auto

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted: Centered, Right: 0 cm, Space Before: 6 pt

Suspension, Cancellation and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure

Audience and scope

These procedures apply to staff involved in the development, delivery, review, suspension, cancellation and closure of academic provision, including:

- Schools and programme teams;
- Programme Committees;
- Academic Committee;
- academic development and quality functions;
- Academic Registry;
- specialist advisory groups and support functions; and
- delegated decision-makers.

These procedures apply to:

- qualifications;
- programmes;
- micro-credentials;
- short courses;
- assessment standards; and
- other approved academic provision.

These procedures apply to the suspension, cancellation and closure of academic provision, including associated teach-out and transition arrangements.

Document management and control

Version number	V1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	General Manager Academic Services

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
V1.0	TBC	Head of Academic Quality	New Procedure

Table of Contents

Suspension, Cancellation and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure 1
Audience and scope 1
Document management and control 1
Amendment history 1
Table of Contents 2
Suspension, Cancellation and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure 3
1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Mātāpono | Principles 3
3. Suspension of Academic Provision 4
4. Cancellation of Academic Provision 4
5. Closure of Academic Provision 5
6. Teach-out and Transition Arrangements 5
7. Suspension, Cancellation and Closure Approval Process 6
8. Regulatory Requirements 7
9. Communication Requirements 8
10. Records Management 8
11. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations 8
12. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes 8
13. Mana Tuku | Delegations 8
14. Kawenga | Responsibilities 9
15. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 9
16. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 10
17. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents 10

Suspension, Cancellation and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. These procedures establish the process for the suspension, cancellation and closure of academic provision.

1.2. These procedures support the implementation of the Academic Development and Approvals Policy and ensure that decisions relating to academic provision are made in a consistent manner that protects learner interests and maintains compliance with regulatory requirements.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. Decisions relating to suspension, withdrawal, replacement and closure must:

a. protect the interests of learners;
b. maintain compliance with regulatory requirements;
c. provide clear and timely communication to affected stakeholders;
d. support equitable outcomes for learners;
e. ensure appropriate teach-out and transition arrangements are available where required;
f. consider strategic, academic and financial implications; and
g. minimise disruption to learners wherever reasonably practicable.

3. Suspension of Academic Provision

3.1. Academic provision may be suspended where:

- enrolments are insufficient to support delivery;
- strategic review is required;
- regulatory concerns have been identified; or
- other circumstances make temporary non-delivery appropriate.

3.2. Suspension may only occur where no currently enrolled learners are affected

3.3. Suspension proposals must include:

- rationale for the suspension;
- proposed duration of the suspension;
- proposed review date; and
- recommended future status of the academic provision.

3.4. Suspended academic provision must be reviewed before the specified review date.

3.5. Following review, the academic provision may:

- return to active delivery;
- remain suspended; or
- proceed to closure.

3.6. Where academic provision has not been delivered for 12 months, the school must consult the academic development and quality function to determine whether regulatory action, programme review, reactivation or closure is required.

4. Cancellation of Academic Provision

4.1. Academic provision may be cancelled where:

- enrolments are insufficient to support delivery;
- strategic, operational, academic or regulatory considerations make continued delivery inappropriate; or
- other circumstances require the discontinuation of delivery.

4.2. Cancellation proposals must include:

- rationale for cancellation;
- learner impact assessment;
- stakeholder consultation;
- teach-out arrangements, where completion is possible; and
- transition arrangements, where completion is not possible.

4.3. Where international learners are affected by a cancellation proposal, the School must consult the International Office and ensure that all applicable learner, immigration and regulatory requirements are addressed.

4.4. Cancellation must not be implemented until an approved teach-out or transition plan is in place.

4.5. Affected learners must be informed of:

- the reasons for cancellation;
- available options;
- relevant timelines; and
- available support services.

5. Closure of Academic Provision

5.1. Academic provision may be closed where:

- it is no longer strategically required;
- it is no longer academically or financially viable;
- it is being replaced by approved academic provision;
- regulatory requirements prevent further delivery; or
- another approved closure rationale applies.

5.2. Closure proposals must include:

- rationale for closure;
- stakeholder consultation;
- learner impacts, if any;
- regulatory requirements; and
- confirmation that all teach-out obligations have been or will be met.

5.3. Academic provision must not be closed until all learner and regulatory obligations have been completed.

6. Teach-out and Transition Arrangements

6.1. Teach-out or transition plans must be developed for all cancellations and closures where learners are affected.

6.2. Teach-out and transition plans must identify:

- affected learners;
- completion pathways;
- alternative study options;
- learner support arrangements;
- key implementation dates; and
- communication requirements.

6.3. Schools are responsible for implementing approved teach-out and transition arrangements.

6.4. Progress against approved teach-out and transition plans must be monitored until all learner obligations have been completed.

7. Suspension, Cancellation and Closure Approval Process

7.1. Suspension, cancellation and closure of academic provision will normally follow the process outlined below.

Process	Who	Action
Proposal Development	School	Develop proposal and supporting documentation.
Annual Review	Academic Registry	Generate an annual list of academic provision that has had no enrolments in the previous 12 months and provide the list to the relevant Head of School for review.
Review of Provision	Head of School	Review the list and determine whether identified provision should remain active, be suspended, be cancelled, or be considered for closure.
Consultation and Planning	School	Undertake consultation and prepare any required rationale, learner impact assessment, transition plan and/or teach-out plan.
Programme Committee Review	Programme Committee	Review the proposal and any associated teach-out or transition plan and determine whether to endorse the proposal.
Head of School Endorsement	Head of School	Confirm endorsement of the proposal and any associated teach-out or transition plan prior to submission for approval.
Teach-out / Transition Plan Approval	Academic Approvals Committee	Review and approve teach-out and transition plans associated with cancellation or closure proposals.
Submission for Approval	School	Submit the endorsed proposal and supporting documentation to Academic Committee in accordance with committee submission requirements.
Approval	Academic Committee	Approve suspension, cancellation or closure of academic provision.
Outcome Notification	Academic Committee Secretary	Advise Academic Registry and the academic development and quality function of the Academic Committee decision within 5 working days of the meeting.
Regulatory	Academic	Complete required notifications to TEC, NZQA,

Process	Who	Action
Notification	Registry and Academic Development and Quality Function	Industry Skills Boards, professional bodies and other external agencies within 10 working days of Academic Committee approval, or within any shorter timeframe required by the external agency.
Service Centre Notification	Academic Development and Quality Function	Notify affected service areas, including Marketing, International Office, Library and Learning Services, Academic Registry, Schools and other relevant functions within 5 working days of receipt of Academic Committee approval.
Learner Communication	School	Notify affected learners of approved cancellation, teach-out, transition or closure arrangements within 10 working days of approval.
Records Update	Academic Registry	Update institutional records and status information to reflect suspension, cancellation or closure within 10 working days of approval.
Programme Library Update	Academic Development and Quality Function	Update Programme Library records and file approved documentation within 10 working days of receipt of all final documentation.
Completion Review	Academic Registry	Confirm completion of approved teach-out and transition arrangements prior to final closure of academic provision.
Final Closure	Academic Development and Quality Function	Confirm completion of all required regulatory notifications and update academic provision status to Closed.

8. Regulatory Requirements

8.1. Schools must consult the academic development and quality function regarding any regulatory requirements associated with suspension, cancellation or closure.

8.2. Where required, the academic development and quality function will coordinate notifications and submissions to:

- NZQA;
- TEC;
- Industry Skills Boards;
- professional bodies; and
- other relevant regulatory authorities.

8.3. Academic provision must not be recorded as closed until all applicable regulatory obligations have been met.

9. Communication Requirements

9.1. Relevant stakeholders must be informed of approved suspension, cancellation and closure decisions.

9.2. Communication must include, where applicable:

- effective dates;
- impacts on learners;
- teach-out arrangements;
- transition options; and
- support available to affected learners.

10. Records Management

10.1. The academic development and quality function will maintain records relating to approved suspension, cancellation and closure decisions.

10.2. Approved documentation must be retained in accordance with institutional recordkeeping requirements.

10.3. The status of academic provision must be updated in institutional records following approval of suspension, cancellation or closure.

11. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

There are no exemptions or dispensations to this procedure.

12. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

The extent to which the implementation of these procedures achieve their intended outcomes will be subject to evaluation and review by the Academic Approvals Committee.

13. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Approve suspension of academic provision.	Academic Committee	Programme Committee and Head of School
Approve cancellation of academic provision.	Academic Committee	Programme Committee and Head of School
Approve closure of academic provision.	Academic Committee	Programme Committee and Head of School
Approve teach-out plans associated with	Academic Approvals	Programme Committee

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
cancellation or closure of academic provision.	Committee (AAC)	and Head of School
Approve transition plans associated with cancellation or closure of academic provision.	Academic Approvals Committee (AAC)	Programme Committee and Head of School
Approve exemptions from these procedures.	Deputy Chief Executive Academic	None

14. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
School	Identify academic provision for review; prepare proposals for suspension, cancellation or closure; undertake consultation; develop learner impact assessments; develop teach-out and transition plans; implement approved decisions; communicate with affected learners.
Programme Committee	Review proposals for suspension, cancellation and closure; consider academic quality, stakeholder feedback and learner impacts; endorse proposals and associated teach-out and transition plans where appropriate.
Head of School	Endorse proposals for suspension, cancellation and closure; ensure consultation has occurred; ensure approved teach-out and transition arrangements are implemented.
Academic Approvals Committee (AAC)	Review and approve teach-out and transition plans associated with cancellation and closure proposals.
Academic Committee	Consider proposals for suspension, cancellation and closure and approve outcomes in accordance with delegated authority.
Academic Development and Quality Function	Provide quality assurance and regulatory advice; coordinate required notifications to NZQA and other external agencies; notify internal stakeholders of approved decisions; maintain Programme Library records; support implementation of approved decisions.
Academic Registry	Undertake annual reviews of inactive provision; provide advice on learner records and enrolment impacts; update institutional records and status information; coordinate TEC notifications where required; confirm completion of approved teach-out and transition activities.
Deputy Chief Executive Academic	Approve exemptions from these procedures where appropriate.

15. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

See the Glossary of MITU Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents

- Current

  Academic provision that is approved for enrolment and/or delivery.

- Suspended

  Academic provision that remains approved but is temporarily not being offered for enrolment or delivery and may be reactivated in the future. No currently enrolled learners are affected by the suspension. Suspension may include postponement of a future delivery.

- Cancelled

  Academic provision for which currently enrolled learners, or learners enrolled prior to commencement, are affected by a decision to discontinue delivery before completion. Cancellation requires approved arrangements for affected learners, including teach-out, transfer, transition, withdrawal or alternative study options.

- Closed

  Academic provision, or delivery of academic provision from a specific delivery location, that has permanently ceased and is no longer available for enrolment, delivery, completion, reporting. All regulatory obligations and learner obligations have been completed. NZQA has removed its accreditation or consent to assess (where applicable).

- Teach-out

  The approved process through which learners are supported to complete the academic provision in which they are enrolled following cancellation or closure.

- Transition Plan

  A documented plan describing how affected learners will be supported to transfer to alternative academic provision where completion of their original enrolment is not possible.

16. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

17. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- Student Regulations
- Academic Development and Approval Policy

- Academic Development and Approval Procedures
- MITU Academic Agreements and Sub-contracting Procedure
- Student Concerns, Complaints and Appeals Procedures
- Records Management Policy and associated documents
- NZQA rules and related guidance documents.

Academic Agreements and Sub-Contracting Procedure

Audience and scope

These procedures apply to:

- Schools;
- Programme Committees;
- Academic Committee;
- Academic Approvals Committee;
- Academic registry function;
- academic development and quality functions;
- International Office;
- Legal and Contracts;
- delegated decision-makers; and
- staff involved in the establishment or management of academic agreements.

These procedures apply to academic agreements relating to learning and teaching activities, including:

- articulation agreements;
- pathway agreements;
- franchise arrangements;
- subcontracting arrangements;
- joint delivery arrangements;
- offshore delivery arrangements;
- credit recognition agreements; and
- other third-party academic delivery arrangements.

These procedures apply to:

- new agreements;
- renewals;
- amendments;
- extensions;
- reviews; and
- termination of agreements.

Document management and control

Version number	V1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	General Manager Academic Services

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
V1.0	TBC	Head of Academic Quality	New Procedure

Table of Contents

Academic Agreements and Sub-Contracting Procedure....1
Audience and scope....1
Document management and control....1
Amendment history....2
Table of Contents....2
Suspension, Cancellation and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure....4
1. Pūtake | Purpose....4
2. Mātāpono | Principles....4
3. General Requirements....5
4. Academic Agreements....5
5. Sub-Contracting Arrangements....6
6. Commencing Delivery....6
7. Management and Oversight of Arrangements....7
8. Assessment and Moderation....7
9. Renewal, Variation and Closure....8
10. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations....9
11. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes....9
12. Mana Tuku | Delegations....9
13. Kawenga | Responsibilities....10
14. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions....11

15. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 12
16. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents 12

Suspension, Cancellation and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. These procedures establish the requirements for the development, approval, implementation, monitoring, review, amendment and termination of academic agreements and subcontracting arrangements.

1.2. These procedures support the Academic Development and Approvals Policy and ensure that academic agreements and subcontracting arrangements.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. Academic agreements and subcontracting arrangements must:

a. support strategic objectives;
b. maintain academic quality and standards;
c. protect learner interests and outcomes;
d. comply with regulatory requirements;
e. include clear roles, responsibilities and accountabilities;
f. include appropriate quality assurance and monitoring arrangements; and
g. be regularly reviewed.

3. General Requirements

3.1. Schools proposing an academic agreement or subcontracting arrangement must engage with the Academic Quality Team at the earliest opportunity to determine applicable regulatory, quality assurance, and approval requirements.

3.2. Prior to negotiating or entering into an academic agreement or subcontracting arrangement, the proposing School must undertake appropriate due diligence to confirm that the proposed partner or subcontractor has the capability, capacity, financial sustainability, and quality assurance systems necessary to meet MITU requirements.

3.3. Schools must consult relevant internal stakeholders, including the academic quality function, the academic registry function, finance, legal, and other service areas as required, before progressing a proposal for approval.

3.4. All academic agreements and subcontracting arrangements must align with MITU strategic priorities, academic quality requirements, legislative obligations, regulatory requirements, and applicable policies and procedures.

3.5. MITU approved templates must be used when establishing, renewing, or varying academic agreements and subcontracting arrangements unless an alternative format is approved by the delegated authority.

3.6. Schools must maintain appropriate records of negotiations, approvals, correspondence, agreements, and supporting documentation in accordance with MITU records management requirements.

4. Academic Agreements

4.1. The Head of School, or delegated nominee, is responsible for initiating and leading negotiations for proposed academic agreements.

4.2. Schools must ensure that the scope, purpose, responsibilities, academic obligations, quality assurance arrangements, reporting requirements, financial arrangements, and termination provisions are clearly documented within the proposed agreement.

4.3. Where a proposed agreement may affect academic quality, regulatory compliance, learner outcomes, assessment, delivery, or qualification approval, Schools must consult the Academic Quality Team before the agreement is finalised.

4.4. All proposed academic agreements must be reviewed by appropriate internal stakeholders prior to approval and execution.

4.5. Academic agreements must be approved by the delegated authority

before being signed on behalf of MITU.

4.6. Only authorised signatories may sign academic agreements on behalf of MITU.

4.7. A fully signed copy of the agreement must be provided to Academic Quality and retained within approved record management systems.

4.8. Schools must monitor academic agreements throughout their term and initiate renewal, variation, or closure activities before the agreement expires where ongoing activities are required.

5. Sub-Contracting Arrangements

5.1. Schools proposing a subcontracting arrangement must engage with the academic quality function before commencing discussions with a prospective subcontractor.

5.2. Prior to approval of a subcontracting arrangement, Schools must demonstrate that the subcontractor has the capability, resources, facilities, staffing, systems, and expertise necessary to deliver the approved educational provision.

5.3. Schools must ensure that all subcontracting arrangements comply with NZQA approval requirements, funding conditions, regulatory obligations, and MITU policies and procedures.

5.4. Where required by regulation or funding conditions, MITU must obtain approval from, or provide notification to, the relevant external agency before delivery commences under a subcontracting arrangement.

5.5. A written subcontracting agreement must be established before any delivery, assessment, learner support activity, marketing activity, or enrolment activity is undertaken by the subcontractor.

5.6. Subcontracting agreements must clearly define roles, responsibilities, delivery arrangements, monitoring requirements, reporting obligations, quality assurance requirements, assessment requirements, and termination provisions.

5.7. No delivery may commence until all required approvals, notifications, contractual arrangements, and operational requirements have been completed.

6. Commencing Delivery

6.1. Prior to the commencement of delivery under an academic agreement or subcontracting arrangement, Schools must ensure that all required regulatory approvals and institutional approvals have been obtained.

6.2. The Head of School must ensure that appropriate academic leadership, operational oversight, and quality assurance arrangements are

established prior to delivery commencing.

6.3. The relevant Programme Committee must be assigned responsibility for monitoring the academic provision where applicable.

6.4. Schools must ensure that approved curriculum documentation, learning resources, assessment materials, moderation arrangements, staff approvals, and learner information are in place before delivery begins.

6.5. Where delivery occurs at an additional teaching location, delivery site, or partner location, Schools must ensure all applicable approval and notification requirements have been met before enrolments commence.

6.6. Learners must be provided with accurate and timely information regarding the nature of the arrangement, the roles of each organisation, and relevant support services.

7. Management and Oversight of Arrangements

7.1. The Head of School remains accountable for the academic quality and performance of approved provision delivered under an academic agreement or subcontracting arrangement.

7.2. Each academic agreement and subcontracting arrangement must have a designated MITU representative responsible for operational liaison and oversight.

7.3. Schools must actively monitor performance throughout the term of the arrangement to ensure compliance with contractual, academic, regulatory, and quality assurance requirements.

7.4. Schools must regularly review learner achievement, retention, completion, progression, graduate outcomes, learner feedback, stakeholder feedback, and quality indicators relevant to the arrangement.

7.5. Significant risks, issues, breaches, complaints, or non-compliance matters must be reported to the Head of School and managed in accordance with MITU policies and procedures.

7.6. The designated MITU representative must maintain regular communication with the partner organisation or subcontractor to monitor performance and address operational matters.

7.7. The Programme Committee must receive regular reports on the performance and quality of academic provision delivered under the arrangement.

8. Assessment and Moderation

8.1. Assessment conducted under an academic agreement or subcontracting arrangement must comply with approved curriculum, assessment, moderation, and academic regulations.

8.2. MITU retains responsibility for ensuring the integrity, validity, reliability, and consistency of assessment and academic decision-making.

8.3. Schools must ensure that appropriate pre-assessment, post-assessment, course moderation, and external moderation activities are undertaken in accordance with institutional requirements.

8.4. Assessment materials, learner work, moderation records, and academic records must be retained in accordance with MITU records management requirements.

8.5. The performance of assessment and moderation processes must be monitored and reviewed throughout the term of the arrangement.

8.6. Where assessment or moderation concerns are identified, Schools must implement corrective actions within an appropriate timeframe and monitor the effectiveness of those actions.

9. Renewal, Variation and Closure

9.1. Schools must review academic agreements and subcontracting arrangements before their expiry date to determine whether renewal, variation, or closure is required.

9.2. Any proposed variation to an academic agreement or subcontracting arrangement must be assessed to determine whether additional approvals, regulatory notifications, or amendments are required.

9.3. Variations must be approved by the delegated authority prior to implementation.

9.4. Where an arrangement is to be terminated, allowed to expire, or otherwise cease operation, Schools must ensure that all contractual, academic, regulatory, learner, and records management obligations are addressed.

9.5. Teach-out, transition, learner support, and communication arrangements must be implemented where required to minimise disruption to learners.

9.6. Schools must notify relevant internal stakeholders of the closure, expiry, suspension, or termination of an arrangement as soon as practicable.

9.7. The academic quality function and academic registry function must be advised of any closure, variation, renewal, or termination requiring institutional records, approvals, or external notifications to be updated.

10. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

There are no exemptions or dispensations to this procedure.

11. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

The extent to which the implementation of these procedures achieve their intended outcomes will be subject to evaluation and review by the Academic Approvals Committee.

12. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Proposal to investigate a new academic agreement	General Manager Schools / Director Schools and Performance	Head of School
Proposal to investigate a new subcontracting arrangement	General Manager Schools / Director Schools and Performance	Head of School
New academic agreement relating to	Delegated Authority in	Programme Committee

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
programme delivery	accordance with Delegations Policy	and Head of School
New subcontracting arrangement relating to programme delivery	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	Programme Committee and Head of School
Academic agreement	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	General Manager Schools / Director Schools and Performance
Subcontracting arrangement	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	General Manager Schools / Director Schools and Performance
Variation to an academic agreement	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	Head of School
Variation to a subcontracting arrangement	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	Head of School
Renewal of an academic agreement	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	Head of School
Renewal of a subcontracting arrangement	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	Head of School
Closure or termination of an academic agreement	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	Head of School
Closure or termination of a subcontracting arrangement	Delegated Authority in accordance with Delegations Policy	Head of School
Operational monitoring and quality improvement actions	Head of School	Programme Committee
Corrective actions arising from monitoring, moderation, audit, or review activities	Head of School	Programme Committee

13. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
General Manager Schools / Director Schools and Performance	Endorses proposals within delegated authority, ensures appropriate oversight of arrangements within their area of responsibility, and monitors associated academic and operational risks.
Head of School	Leads the development, negotiation, implementation, management,

Role	Responsibilities
	monitoring, review, renewal, variation, suspension and closure of academic agreements and subcontracting arrangements. Ensures compliance with regulatory, contractual, academic quality, and institutional requirements.
Programme Committee	Monitors academic quality, learner achievement, assessment outcomes, moderation outcomes, risks, issues, and improvement actions associated with provision delivered under an academic agreement or subcontracting arrangement.
Designated MITU Representative	Acts as the primary liaison between MITU and the partner organisation or subcontractor. Coordinates operational matters, monitors compliance with agreement requirements, and escalates issues and risks where necessary.
Academic Quality Function	Provides advice on regulatory requirements, quality assurance obligations, approval pathways, NZQA requirements, academic quality monitoring, and institutional compliance obligations. Supports regulatory approvals, notifications, and quality assurance activities where required.
Academic Registry Function	Maintains institutional records, supports approval implementation activities, coordinates required regulatory reporting and notifications, and updates institutional systems and records as required.
Legal and Contracts Function	Provides advice on contractual terms, legal obligations, risk exposure, and agreement documentation where required.
Partner Organisation / Subcontractor	Complies with the terms of the agreement, regulatory requirements, quality assurance requirements, reporting obligations, assessment and moderation requirements, and any conditions imposed by MITU.
Staff Involved in Delivery	Deliver teaching, assessment, learner support, administration, and quality assurance activities in accordance with approved curriculum documentation, institutional requirements, and the terms of the agreement.

14. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

See the Glossary of MITU Academic Policies, Procedures and Associated Documents

- Academic Agreement

  A formal agreement between MITU and an external organisation relating to academic provision, learner pathways, programme delivery or other teaching and learning activities.

- Partner

  An external organisation party to an academic agreement.

- Subcontracting Arrangement

  An arrangement in which all or part of the delivery or assessment of academic provision is undertaken by an external organisation on behalf of MITU.

- Contract Owner

  The designated MITU staff member responsible for oversight and management of the agreement.

15. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020

16. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- MITU Student Regulations
- MITU Academic Development and Approval Policy
- MITU Academic Development and Approval Procedure
- MITU Suspension, Withdrawal, Replacement and Closure of Academic Provision Procedure
- Student Concerns, Complaints and Appeals Procedures
- Records Management Policy and associated documents
- NZQA rules and related guidance documents.

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Simon Tries, Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi

Subject: Evaluation, Review and Monitoring Policy

Classification: In-Confidence

Date: 4 November 2026

Recommendation

That the Academic Committee:

- **Approve** the proposed:
    - Evaluation Review and Monitoring Policy
    - Evaluation Procedure
    - Academic Review Procedure
    - Monitoring Procedure
    - Compliance and Improvement Procedure
- **Rescind** the current:
    - AC8_Evaluation Review and Monitoring Policy_v6.0_20260115
    - AC8_1_Evaluation Review and Monitoring Procedures_v5.0_20260115

    And

    - UNITEC AC7.0 Academic Evaluation Review and Improvements Policy
    - UNITEC AC7.2 Review of Academic Provision Procedure
    - UNITEC AC7.3 Monitoring of Degrees Procedure
- **Note:**
    - the implementation timeframe
    - The policy and the Evaluation Procedure is expected to need to also be provided to SLT for concurrent approval

Commentary

The integration of MIT and Unitec has provided the opportunity to develop a single Evaluation, Review and Monitoring Policy and associated procedures for all academic provision delivered by the institution.

The proposed policy and procedures have been developed using the existing MIT and Unitec policy positions as the starting point. The new policy and procedures incorporate lessons learned through the implementation of the existing policies/procedures, strengthen the integration of quality assurance activities across the institution, and align with the known requirements of NZQA's Integrated Quality Assurance Framework (IQAF).

The framework supports the institution's obligations for ongoing self-assessment, quality assurance, monitoring, review and continuous improvement and provides a coherent framework linking course-level evaluation through to institutional monitoring and academic governance. It establishes clear relationships between evaluation, monitoring, academic review, compliance, improvement activities and supports evidence-based decision making at programme, portfolio and institutional levels.

Consultation
The proposed policy and procedures have been reviewed by Te Korowai Kahurangi, the Academic Centre, a Heads of School focus group, and the Academic Leadership Team. Feedback received was valuable in informing the final policy/procedures for approval. Overall, consultation was generally supportive of the proposed framework and focused primarily on clarifying accountabilities, improving integration across quality assurance processes, strengthening reporting pathways, and simplifying terminology. Relevant feedback has been incorporated into the final drafts.

Strategic and Regulatory Context
Development of the framework was initially deferred pending publication of NZQA's IQAF. While implementation of the IQAF continues to evolve, the institution now requires an integrated and contemporary policy framework to support consistent quality assurance practices across MIT and Unitec. The proposed framework establishes the necessary foundations while retaining sufficient flexibility to accommodate future amendments if required by subsequent NZQA guidance.

Approval at this time will ensure that the institution has a single, integrated evaluation, monitoring and review framework in place to support academic quality assurance and governance requirements from 2027 onwards.

Key Changes
The principal changes introduced through the proposed framework are:

Change	Purpose and Impact
Institution-wide course evaluation requirements	Establishes consistent requirements for evaluating courses across all campuses and academic provision.
Institution-wide portfolio evaluation requirements	Introduces a common approach to portfolio evaluation, improving consistency, comparability and oversight across schools and academic units.
Separate Compliance and Improvement Procedure	Clearly distinguishes quality assurance, compliance monitoring, corrective action and continuous improvement responsibilities.
Introduction of Institute Monitoring	Supports emerging NZQA IQAF requirements and strengthens oversight of institutional performance, quality and outcomes.
Integrated quality assurance framework	Provides clearer alignment between evaluation, monitoring, compliance, improvement and academic review processes.

Joint governance and management ownership of TEO Self-Review reporting to NZQA	The scope of the TEO Self-Review Summary Report has institution implications and is therefore proposed to be jointly approved by the Academic Committee and the Executive Leadership Team.

Benefits

Implementation of the proposed framework is expected to:

- Improve consistency of quality assurance activities across MIT and Unitec.
- Provide clearer accountability for evaluation, monitoring, review and improvement activities.
- Improve visibility of quality-related risks and performance trends.
- Strengthen evidence-based decision making and academic governance.
- Better align institutional processes with NZQA expectations under IQAF.
- Create a more coherent and integrated quality assurance system for staff and academic leaders.

Implementation

Subject to approval, the policy and procedures will take effect from **1 January 2027**.

Implementation will be supported through:

- Development of supporting guidance materials and templates.
- Communication with academic leaders and staff.
- Updates to reporting and planning processes.
- Transitional support from Te Korowai Kahurangi and the Academic Centre.

Activities currently underway under the existing framework will continue uninterrupted and transition to the new framework through the next applicable reporting or review cycle. Programme Evaluation on 2026 delivery will be under the proposed policy and procedures.

Resource Implications

The proposed framework will be implemented largely through existing institutional structures, processes and resources, acknowledging that we are in the midst of institutional change.
Some initial effort will be required to communicate changes, update guidance materials and embed new monitoring activities.
While there are no significant short-term resource implications anticipated, longer term the expectation is to develop a fully integrated digital solution to support the intent of this policy and procedures.

Risks and Mitigation

The principal implementation risks are:

Risk	Mitigation
Inconsistent application of new requirements during implementation	Staff guidance, communications and implementation support.
Variability in interpretation of new monitoring requirements	Standardised templates, reporting expectations and central quality assurance oversight.
Future changes to NZQA expectations under IQAF	Ongoing monitoring of NZQA guidance and revision of policy documents through normal review cycles if required.
Additional workload during the transition period	Staged implementation and targeted support for academic leaders and schools.

Conclusion

The proposed Evaluation, Review and Monitoring Policy and supporting procedures provide an integrated institution-wide framework for quality assurance, self-assessment, monitoring, academic review, compliance and continuous improvement.

Approval of the proposed documents will support a consistent approach to academic quality assurance across MIT and Unitec, strengthen alignment with NZQA's evolving Integrated Quality Assurance Framework, and provide a clear basis for ongoing academic governance and quality enhancement activities.

Attachments

Proposed:

1. Evaluation Review and Monitoring Policy
2. Evaluation Procedure
3. Academic Review Procedure
4. Monitoring Procedure
5. Compliance and Improvement Procedure

Evaluation, Review and Monitoring Policy

Audience and scope

This policy applies to all staff and contractors who contribute to, or support, the planning, development, delivery, administration, management, quality assurance, or continuous improvement of academic provision offered by MIT and Unitec.

Document management and control

Version number	1.0	Date of approval	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	Date of next review	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	Policy contact person	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
1.0	1 January 2027	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi	New policy

Table of Contents

Audience and scope 1
Document management and control 1
Table of Contents 2
Evaluation, Review and Monitoring Policy 3
1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Mātāpono | Principles 3
3. Evaluation, Review and Monitoring 3
4. Hātepe | Procedures 6
5. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations 6
6. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes 6
7. Mana Tuku | Delegations 7
8. Kawenga | Responsibilities 8
9. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 8
10. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 9
11. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents 9

Evaluation, Review and Monitoring Policy

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this policy is to set MIT and Unitec's requirements for the evaluation, review and monitoring of academic provision. It is designed to promote and assure academic excellence and an ongoing commitment to quality improvement and to ensure ongoing academic compliance and improvement.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. All academic provision, the services supporting learning, teaching and assessment, and the quality systems designed to assure quality are subject to ongoing evaluation, review and monitoring. This is to maintain and improve the quality and relevance of academic provision.

2.2. Evaluation, review and monitoring at MIT and Unitec will focus on outcomes for students and other stakeholders and will be:

a. systematic

b. evidence based

c. authentic

d. transparent

e. collaborative

f. managed to ensure effective and efficient use of MIT and Unitec resources.

3. Evaluation, Review and Monitoring

3.1. Evaluation, review and monitoring will be carried out in accordance with this policy, related procedures, and with relevant NZQA and other external regulatory requirements.

3.2. Evaluation, review and monitoring is required to be thorough, robust and systematic to provide assurance that academic provision remain fit for purpose and continue to meet the needs of stakeholders. It will consider the views of students, graduates, staff, employers, professional bodies and other relevant stakeholders.

3.3. All staff are required to engage and participate, as required, in relevant evaluation review and monitoring activities.

3.4. Evaluation, review and monitoring will consider equity of outcomes and experiences for priority learner groups, including Māori and Pacific learners,

and support institutional commitments to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

3.5. Evaluation review and monitoring activities will result in a formal report and action plan (if required).

3.6. MIT and Unitec's approach to Evaluation, Review and Monitoring ensures the institute is able to meet its obligations with regard to NZQA's *integrated quality assurance framework* (iQAF). The table below summarises this alignment:

Activity	Primary Purpose	Typical Frequency	Main Outputs	iQAF Alignment
Evaluation	Assess effectiveness and outcomes	Scheduled and evidence-informed	Findings and recommendations	TEO ownership of quality and self-review
Academic Review	Deep examination of provision or systems	Cyclical or triggered	Review reports and decisions	Risk-informed quality improvement and self-review
Monitoring	Ongoing assurance and risk identification	Continuous / Annual	Performance reports, risk identification	Monitoring lever; data and insights enabler
Compliance Activities	Demonstrate requirements are met	Ongoing	Compliance reports and corrective actions	Compliance and enforcement lever
Improvement Activities	Enhance quality and learner success	Ongoing	Improvement plans and implemented changes	System performance and improvement lever

Evaluation

3.7. Evaluation will include course evaluation, programme evaluation, portfolio (School) evaluation and institute evaluation.

3.8. Evaluation will confirm the extent to which intended outcomes are being achieved and identify where improvements may be made.

3.9. Evaluation insights and outcomes will be used to inform decision-making,

drive continuous improvement, and support a coherent and effective approach across the institute.

Academic Review

3.10. Where MIT and Unitec is the qualification or micro-credential developer, the qualification or micro-credential will be reviewed within the review period specified.

3.11. MIT and Unitec will participate in the review of qualifications or micro-credentials that it awards or intends to award.

3.12. All programmes and micro-credentials will be reviewed following any review of the qualification/s they lead to or as required by an external regulatory or standard setting body, or as otherwise determined by MIT and Unitec.

3.13. All MIT and Unitec degree and related qualifications and associated programmes will undergo an initial graduating year review and thereafter will be reviewed at least five yearly.

3.14. The Deputy Chief Executive, Academic may require the review of any academic provision where performance is considered unsatisfactory, where an element of risk is identified or where external regulatory or other requirements necessitate such a review.

Monitoring

3.15. Monitoring may be undertaken at programme and institute level.

3.16. Monitoring may be undertaken in response to regulatory requirements or to provide assurance regarding the provision of learning and teaching related provision and support.

3.17. All programmes of study and micro-credentials are subject to monitoring on to provide assurance that their design and delivery consistently meet the criteria for ongoing approval and accreditation, remains fit for purpose and meets the needs of stakeholders.

3.18. The extent to which graduates consistently meet qualification outcomes will be monitored and assured on an ongoing basis.

3.19. MIT and Unitec will actively participate in NZQA monitoring events.

Compliance and Improvement

3.20. Compliance with internal and external requirements will be maintained across all academic activities, including in relation to quality assurance and improvement.

3.21. Where required, the outcome of an evaluation, review or monitoring event (or similar) will be supported by an action plan designed to achieve subsequent improvement, in accordance with the *Compliance and Improvement Procedure*.

3.22. Accountability for ensuring actions are implemented effectively and in a timely manner rests with the Head of School, who must report progress and completion to the Programme Committee.

3.23. Programme Committees will provide oversight of satisfactory completion of all agreed action plans and monitor progress against identified actions. Programme Committees are required to report any significant issues or risks to the Academic Quality Committee.

3.24. The assurance of academic quality across MIT and Unitec will take a risk-based approach, ensuring oversight is balanced against resource requirements and sound risk assessment.

4. Hātepe | Procedures

4.1. The requirements of this policy are supported by procedures and associated guidance relating to:

a. Evaluation

b. Academic Review

c. Monitoring

d. Compliance and Improvement

5. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

5.1. No exemptions or dispensations may be granted from the requirements of this policy unless required by legislation, an external regulatory body, or approved by the Deputy Chief Executive Academic in exceptional circumstances, or as otherwise indicated in the associated procedures. Any approved exemption must be documented and include appropriate controls to ensure ongoing academic quality assurance.

6. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

6.1. The Academic Quality Office will report annually to the Academic Quality Committee on the institute's core quality assurance mechanisms including:

a. Evaluation Systems

i. Course Evaluation
ii. Programme Evaluation
iii. Micro-credential Evaluation
iv. Portfolio (School) Evaluation

b. Monitoring and Academic Review Systems
i. Qualification Review
ii. Programme Review
iii. Micro-credential Review
iv. Other Academic Review (short course, etc.)
v. Programme Monitoring
vi. Academic Compliance Management
vii. Action Planning

c. Moderation Systems

d. Other systems which support academic processes and outcomes

6.2. In reporting on these systems, the Academic Quality Office will consider:

a. The extent to which the process used to support the outcome was efficient and effective

b. The outcomes from the system

c. Areas of good practice

d. Areas for improvement.

e. Any actions to be taken.

7. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Require a review of any academic provision where performance is unsatisfactory, risk is identified, or external requirements necessitate review	Deputy Chief Executive Academic	Consultation with relevant Head of School and Academic Quality Office
Approve evaluation, review and monitoring methodologies, schedules and frameworks	Academic Quality Committee	Advice from Academic Quality Office
Provide oversight of action plans arising from evaluation, review and monitoring activities	Programme Committee	Head of School

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Monitor implementation of improvement actions and report progress	Head of School	Programme Committee
Prepare institutional reports on evaluation, review and monitoring systems	Academic Quality Office	Academic Quality Committee receipt and consideration

8. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
All Staff	Comply with academic policies, regulations and procedures; seek clarification where required; actively engage in all processes.
Deputy Chief Executive Academic	Ensure institutional compliance with evaluation, review and monitoring requirements; direct reviews where required due to risk, performance concerns or external requirements.
Academic Quality Office	Coordinate institutional evaluation, review and monitoring systems; provide quality assurance support; prepare annual quality assurance reports; monitor effectiveness of quality systems.
Academic Quality Committee	Provide governance oversight of evaluation, review and monitoring systems; monitor institutional quality assurance effectiveness; consider significant risks and issues.
Head of School	Ensure evaluation, review and monitoring activities are undertaken within their area; implement agreed improvement actions; report progress to Programme Committees.
Programme Committee	Consider evaluation, review and monitoring reports and associated findings. Formally adopt action plans arising from evaluation, review and monitoring activities. Maintain oversight of implementation and completion of agreed actions.
Academic Staff	Participate in evaluation, review and monitoring activities; provide evidence and data; contribute to continuous improvement initiatives.
Students, Graduates and External Stakeholders	Provide feedback and evidence to inform evaluation and review activities.

9. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

Term	Definition
Academic Provision	Qualifications, programmes, , micro-credentials, courses, short courses and associated learning, teaching and assessment activities offered by MIT and Unitec.
Action Plan	A documented set of actions developed in response to evaluation, review or monitoring findings to support compliance and continuous improvement.
Evaluation	A systematic and evidence-based process used to determine the extent to which intended outcomes are being achieved and identify opportunities for improvement.
Monitoring	Ongoing oversight activities used to provide assurance that academic provision continues to meet approval, accreditation, stakeholder and regulatory requirements.
Review	A formal examination of qualifications, micro-credentials, programmes or other academic provision to determine ongoing relevance, effectiveness, quality and compliance.
Stakeholder	Any individual or organisation with an interest in academic provision, including students, graduates, staff, employers, professional bodies and regulatory agencies.

10. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020
- New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) Rules made under section 452 of the Education and Training Act 2020.
- Education (Pastoral Care of Tertiary and International Learners) Code of Practice 2021
- Privacy Act 2020
- Copyright Act 1994
- Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (where evaluation and review activities involve staff, students and learning environments)

11. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents

- Evaluation Procedure
- Academic Review Procedure
- Monitoring Procedure
- Compliance and Improvement Procedure
- Moderation Policy and Procedure

Evaluation Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure applies to all staff and contractors who contribute to, or support, the planning, development, delivery, administration, management, quality assurance, or continuous improvement of academic provision offered by MIT and Unitec.

Document management and control

Version number	1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
1.0	1 January 2027	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi	New procedure

Table of Contents

Audience and scope....1
Document management and control....1
Amendment history....1
Table of Contents....2
Evaluation Procedure....3
1. Pūtake | Purpose....3
2. Course Evaluation....3
3. Programme and Micro-credential Evaluation....4
4. Portfolio (School) Evaluation....7
5. Institute Evaluation....10
6. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations 12
7. Mana Tuku | Delegations....12
8. Kawenga | Responsibilities....12
9. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions....13
10. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation....14

Evaluation Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. Evaluation supports reflective practice and continuous improvement and acknowledges the importance of staff perspectives in the evaluation and review of academic delivery and in course and programme improvement.

2. Course Evaluation

Requirements

2.1. Heads of School are accountable for ensuring that courses are evaluated in accordance with this procedure.

2.2. Course Evaluation[1] must be undertaken for each course at least annually in accordance with the *Course Evaluation Guidelines* approved by the Academic Quality Committee.

2.3. Course Evaluation will focus on student engagement and performance, stakeholder feedback, and assessment and moderation, and will typically include:

- Moderation results and any resultant actions
- Student results (assessment and course)
- Feedback from students (including via surveys) and outcomes from the You Said, We Did
- A review of any concerns, complaints or appeals (if any)
- Feedback from industry, including Programme Advisory Committee (if any)
- Alignment of LMS site/s with institute requirements
- Consideration / Review of course resources
- Review of the use of agentic AI (artificial intelligence)
- Reflections from staff teaching / supporting the course
- Integration of research into the curriculum (if relevant)
- Embedding of literacy and numeracy (if relevant)

The Academic Quality Committee may also determine particular focus areas each year.

2.4. The Course Coordinator[2] completes an overarching evaluation of the course utilising the approved Course Evaluation Report template. The Course Coordinator is encouraged to involve teaching staff in the

[1] Course evaluation is undertaken by academic staff, and is distinct from student surveys – sometimes referred to as *student evaluations*
[2] Or other person as delegated by the Head of School

evaluation process.

2.5. Course Evaluation reports are expected to inform programme and micro-credential evaluation and improvement. They may also operate as a 'point in time' report on the course (i.e., for new teaching staff) and be used to inform staff performance discussions.

2.6. Course Evaluation Reports must be completed in time to inform Programme Evaluation, and no later than the start of the first course delivery in the following year (or by end of March – whichever is earlier).

Oversight, exceptions and escalation

2.1. Different approaches to course evaluation may be required for different types[3] of courses / course delivery. Where this is the case, these will be detailed in the *Course Evaluation Guidelines*.

2.2. The Academic Quality Committee may approve exemptions or alternative arrangements for course evaluation based on a recommendation from the relevant Programme Committee. Any such exemptions or alternative arrangements will be reported to the Academic Committee. Criteria for exemptions will be outlined in the *Course Evaluation Guidelines*.

2.3. Exemption requests must be received in advance of the course start date.

3. Programme and Micro-credential Evaluation

Purpose

3.1. Programme Evaluation (PE) and Micro-credential Evaluation (ME) supports continuous improvement in learning and teaching and the attainment of intended outcomes. It involves consideration of the educational performance and outcomes of each programme and micro-credential. It is a collaborative process involving all relevant staff.

3.2. Heads of School are accountable for ensuring PE and ME is undertaken in accordance with this procedure and related policy and guidelines.

Requirements

3.3. All programmes and micro-credentials are subject to evaluation annually.

3.4. Programmes and Micro-Credentials may be evaluated and reported on together as a combined activity if considered appropriate.

[3] "standard" courses vs. Work Integrated Learning vs. Apprenticeship delivery vs. theses, etc.

3.5. The Academic Quality Committee is responsible for approving, by the end of November each year, and on advice from the Academic Quality Office, the schedule for Programme and Micro-Credentials:

a. subject to evaluation;

b. to be evaluated together

c. exempt from evaluation

d. evaluative approach to be taken.

3.6. In exceptional circumstances, an exemption from evaluation requirements may be granted by the Academic Quality Committee. Criteria for exemptions will be detailed in the *Programme Evaluation Guidelines* / *Micro-Credential Evaluation Guidelines*.

3.7. Programmes and Micro-Credentials must be evaluated in accordance with the *Programme Evaluation Guidelines* / *Micro-Credential Evaluation Guidelines* approved by the Academic Quality Committee, which requires:

a. all staff teaching on the programme/micro-credential are expected to contribute to, and participate in, the process of evaluating programmes / micro-credentials they teach on;

b. the process to be completed within the first half of each year; and

c. the evaluation approach to be appropriate to the level of risk associated with the programme / micro-credential.

3.8. Schools are responsible for organising facilitated evaluation workshops, led by trained facilitators (typically trained by the Academic Quality Office) to support programme evaluation and micro-credential evaluation. In exceptional cases facilitation may be mandated by the Academic Quality Committee.

3.9. Evaluation is required to be evidence based, robust and objective and consider, for the period being evaluated:

a. evidence to support:
   i. Student achievement
   ii. Student and graduate outcomes, including the value of the outcomes
   iii. Student learning, assessment, and support
   iv. Stakeholder feedback (student, graduate, external)
   v. Governance and management, including staff support and

programme maintenance

vi. Compliance and risk management

vii. Action Planning

b. existing reports (course, monitoring, moderation, survey, etc.)

c. progress against the prior year's action plan

d. the robustness of the evidence used for the evaluation

3.10. The outcome of the evaluation must be:

a. A judgement on the overall performance of the programme/micro-credential

b. A set of improvement actions in an action plan (if required)

3.11. The final draft PE/ME report is provided to the Programme Advisory Committee (PAC) for review and comment.

3.12. Following PAC review, the PE/ME report, PAC commentary and action plan is presented to the Programme Committee for approval.

3.13. The Programme Committee reviews the PE/ME report and action plan and:

a. seeks any clarification or additional information in order to assure itself of the quality of the report;

b. make a determination on:

i. the robustness of the report

ii. the self-assessment capability evidenced through the report

iii. the appropriateness of the action plan (if required)

3.14. The Head of School must advise the Programme Committee on the feasibility of the action plan.

3.15. The Programme Committee may determine that the report requires amending and resubmission prior to making any determination. In doing so, the programme committee must provide a rationale for its decision. The programme team must review the rationale and resubmit the report/action plan to the Programme Committee.

3.16. Once the Programme Committee has approved the evaluation report, the Programme Committee submits the approved report (with a copy to the Head of School) and its commentary on the report, in a format determined by the Academic Quality Committee, to the Academic Quality Committee, which includes:

Commented [MC1]: The PAC has a remit to review and contribute to the Programme Evaluation Report before it is finalised.

a. key findings

b. commentary on the self-assessment capability demonstrated through the report

c. significant risks

d. ability of the action plan to achieve improvement.

3.17. The Programme Committee is responsible for oversight of progress against the Action Plan and addressing, with the Head of School, any concerns regarding completion of the actions. Heads of School are accountable for ensuring actions are completed and, where necessary, escalated to the appropriate authority.

3.18. Evaluation reports may be provided to NZQA and any other relevant external bodies, as required. This will be managed by the Academic Quality Office.

Programme Evaluation Assurance

3.19. Assurance regarding the robustness of programme/micro-credential related evaluation processes[4] will be supported by the independent review of a sample of evaluation reports.

3.20. The sample and scope will be determined by the Academic Quality Committee as outlined in the *Programme Evaluation Guidelines*. Consideration must be given to:

a. the extent the evaluation report is supported by evidence

b. whether the rating is justified

c. whether the programme committee review is robust (including the self-assessment rating)

d. appropriateness of the action plan and its potential to effect the intended change.

3.21. Reviewers will be appointed by the Head of the Academic Quality Office for each review and evaluation cycle and provided with relevant training by the Academic Quality Office.

3.22. The outcome of the assurance process will be reported to the Academic Quality Committee.

4. Portfolio (School) Evaluation

[4] Programme, micro-credential and course evaluation

Purpose

4.1. The purpose of Portfolio (School) evaluation is to determine the extent to which the School is delivering on its intended outcomes and in alignment with institute strategic objectives.

4.2. Portfolio (School) Evaluation draws on the outcomes of Programme Evaluation and Monitoring activities and informs Institute Evaluation and strategic decision-making.

4.3. It supports proactive management of the School portfolio and accountability for the quality of delivery across the School.

Requirements

4.4. The GM Schools/Director Schools and Performance is accountable for ensuring School Evaluation Reports are completed using the approved template.

4.5. Heads of School are responsible for evaluating the performance of their school's portfolio in a report using evidence drawn from all relevant sources, including relevant evaluation reports and other institutional data.

4.6. The Head of School must prepare a Portfolio (School) Evaluation Report which:

a. summarises the performance of the School portfolio during the evaluation period;

b. identifies key strengths, achievements, risks and areas for improvement;

c. considers the extent to which priority learner groups are achieving equitable outcomes;

d. evaluates progress against previous improvement actions;

e. identifies strategic opportunities and challenges affecting the portfolio;

f. confirms whether the portfolio remains aligned with institutional objectives and stakeholder needs; and

g. identifies any significant actions required, including potential portfolio changes, resource requirements or capability development.

4.7. Portfolio (School) Evaluation must be informed by evidence drawn from relevant institutional, programme and external sources, including:

a. Information provided to students and applicants, including through the LMS and website

b. Student achievement, retention, completion and graduate outcome data (including EPIs);

c. Thematic review of learner feedback, complaints and appeals;

d. Information relating to priority learner success and equity outcomes;

e. Stakeholder, employer and Programme Advisory Committee feedback;

f. Staff capability, capacity, performance, workforce planning and compliance information;

g. Delivery and operational risk information;

h. Quality assurance related reports, including Programme and Micro-credential Evaluation Reports; Monitoring, and Moderation, and associated action plans

i. External quality assurance, accreditation and regulatory findings; and

j. Information relating to portfolio sustainability, including desirability, financial viability, market demand, strategic importance (including future strategic direction)

k. Management of external delivery arrangements including sub-contracted delivery and offshore delivery (if relevant)

l. Other focus areas as determined by the DCE Academic

Note: This evidence should be considered proportionately, having regard to the level of risk and complexity within the School portfolio.

4.8. School Evaluations are reported to the Academic Quality Committee, the General Manager Schools/Director, Schools and Performance, and the DCE Academic, and are utilised to inform Institute Evaluation. (see below) Reports may also be provide to relevant other governance committees.

Timing

4.9. Completed annually no later than the end of August of each year, or as otherwise advised to Heads of School.

4.10. Where academic provision is offered outside the structure of a School the equivalent of the Head of School who holds similar responsibilities/ accountabilities is responsible for providing a School Evaluation report.

5. Institute Evaluation

Purpose

5.1. MIT and Unitec undertake Institute Evaluation to understand:

a. the quality and value of the education and training delivered

b. the effectiveness of the quality systems we use, and the practices we employ, to provide assurance regarding our delivery

c. the extent to which our students and graduates achieve intended and valued outcomes

d. areas of good practice

e. areas for improvement

5.2. Institute Evaluation will be framed within the context of any internal and/or external changes of significance to the institute and will identify institution-wide themes, risks and improvement priorities.

5.3. Institute Evaluation is informed by the outcomes from all relevant evaluation, review, monitoring and compliance activities, as well as relevant other data sources.

Requirements

5.4. The DCE Academic is accountable for ensuring Institute Evaluation is undertaken annually in accordance with this procedure and the *Institute Evaluation Guidance* approved by Academic Committee and the Executive Leadership Team. Institute Evaluation is expected to be undertaken in the second and third quarters of each year.

5.5. The Institute Evaluation will consider MIT and Unitec's:

a. educational performance

b. capability in self-assessment

c. key initiatives related to:
   i. Teaching and learning
   ii. Assessment
   iii. Learner wellbeing and safety

d. any significant changes which have impacted MIT and Unitec

e. the extent to which MIT and Unitec has been compliant with

relevant legislative and regulatory requirements, including:

i. Education and Training Act 2020
ii. NZQA rules made under section 452 of the Act,
iii. The Education (Pastoral Care of Tertiary and International Learners) Code of Practice 2021
iv. Funding Conditions

f. response, position or approach to any specific themes or areas deemed important to (and published by) relevant regulatory bodies (including NZQA, TEC, ISBs)

g. areas of good practice

h. areas for current and future institute improvements and a plan to address these

i. progress and outcomes against the previous year's Institute Improvement Plan

Institute Improvement Plan

5.6. The outcome of the Institute Evaluation will be an *Institute Improvement Plan*.

5.7. The DCE Academic is responsible for the development and maintenance of the Institute Improvement Plan.

5.8. The Academic Committee and Executive Leadership Team is jointly accountable for the achievement of actions on the Institute Improvement Plan.

TEO Self Review summary report

5.9. MIT and Unitec will provide to NZQA annually a "TEO Self Review Summary Report" in the format and at the time required by NZQA.

5.10. The TEO Self-Review Summary Report will include:

a. A summary of the Institute Evaluation

b. A copy of the Institute Improvement Plan

c. A statement of MIT and Unitec's compliance with the Education and Training Act 2020, NZQA rules made under section 452 of the Act, and the Code of Practice.

5.11. The DCE Academic is accountable for the provision of a draft TEO Self-Review summary report to the Academic Committee and the Executive Leadership Team.

5.12. In providing the draft TEO Self Review summary report, the DCE Academic may update the TEO Self-Review summary report to account for key changes that have occurred since the most recent Institute Evaluation or other contributing reports.

5.13. The Academic Committee and Executive Leadership Team is accountable for approving the TEO Self Review Summary Report for submission to NZQA in accordance with NZQA's published schedule.

5.14. MIT and Unitec will meet its obligations to report annually to NZQA in accordance with TEO Self-Review requirements published by NZQA.

6. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

6.1. The DCE Academic may, at their discretion, provide exemptions or dispensations regarding this procedure. Any such exemptions or dispensations must be reported to the Academic Committee.

7. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Approve exemptions or dispensations from the requirements of this procedure.	DCE Academic	Notification to Academic Committee
Approve annual schedules for Programme and Micro-credential Evaluation, including exemptions and evaluation approaches.	Academic Quality Committee	Advice from Academic Quality Office
Approve Course Evaluation Guidelines, Programme Evaluation Guidelines, Micro-credential Evaluation Guidelines and associated templates.	Academic Quality Committee	Advice from Academic Quality Office
Approve Programme and Micro-credential Evaluation Reports and associated Action Plans.	Programme Committee	Programme Advisory Committee review and comment completed
Approve Institute Evaluation outcomes and monitor Institute Improvement Plan progress.	Academic Committee and Executive Leadership Team	Advice from DCE Academic

8. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Academic Committee and Executive Leadership Team	Review Institute Evaluation outcomes; approve the TEO Self-Review Summary Report; oversee achievement of the Institute Improvement Plan.
Academic Quality Committee	Approves evaluation schedules, guidelines and evaluation methodologies; monitors evaluation outcomes; receives assurance reports and improvement information.
Academic Quality Office	Provides guidance, training, quality assurance support and reporting; coordinates assurance activities; supports institutional self-assessment processes.
Academic Staff	Participate in evaluation activities; provide evidence and reflective input; contribute to identified improvement actions.
All Staff	Comply with academic policies, regulations and procedures; seek clarification where required; actively engage in all processes.
Course Coordinators	Lead preparation and completion of Course Evaluation Reports and contribute to programme-level self-assessment and improvement activities.
DCE Academic	Ensures implementation of this procedure; oversees Institute Evaluation; approves exemptions; develops and maintains the Institute Improvement Plan; ensures required reporting to Academic Committee, Senior Leadership Team and NZQA.
GM Schools / Director Schools and Performance	Ensures Portfolio (School) Evaluation is completed.
Heads of School	Ensure Course, Programme and Micro-credential Evaluation activities are completed; support participation of staff; oversee completion of improvement actions; prepare Portfolio (School) Evaluation reports.
Programme Advisory Committees	Review and comment on Programme and Micro-credential Evaluation Reports and provide industry and stakeholder perspectives.
Programme Committees	Approve Programme and Micro-credential Evaluation Reports and Action Plans; monitor implementation of improvement actions.

9. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

Term	Definition
Action Plan	A documented set of improvement actions arising from an evaluation activity, including responsibilities, timelines and expected outcomes.
Course Evaluation	The annual evidence-based review of a course to evaluate educational performance, learner experience, outcomes and opportunities for improvement.

Term	Definition
Evaluation Report	The approved report documenting evaluation findings, conclusions and recommended improvement actions.
Institute Evaluation	The annual institutional self-assessment process that evaluates educational performance, self-assessment capability, compliance, risks and strategic improvement priorities.
Institute Improvement Plan	The institute-wide plan developed from Institute Evaluation outcomes to address improvement priorities and strategic actions.
Micro-credential Evaluation (ME)	The systematic evaluation of a micro-credential to determine achievement of intended outcomes and continuous improvement opportunities.
Portfolio (School) Evaluation	The evaluation of the overall performance, sustainability, quality and strategic alignment of a School's academic portfolio.
Programme Evaluation (PE)	The systematic evaluation of a programme to determine educational performance, learner outcomes, quality, effectiveness and opportunities for enhancement.
Self-assessment	The ongoing, evidence-based process of critically reflecting on performance and outcomes in order to improve quality and learner success.
Self-assessment capability	The demonstrated ability to use evidence-informed, ongoing, and systematic self-assessment processes to understand educational performance, learner achievement and experience, identify strengths and areas for improvement, implement effective actions, and evaluate the impact of those actions on learner and stakeholder outcomes.

10. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

This procedure operates in accordance with relevant legislation, regulations and external requirements, including:

- Education and Training Act 2020.
- NZQA Rules made under section 452 of the Education and Training Act 2020.
- Education (Pastoral Care of Tertiary and International Learners) Code of Practice 2021.
- Any applicable Funding Conditions issued by the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC).
- Requirements relating to tertiary education provider self-review and external evaluation published by NZQA.
- Any applicable accreditation, approval, registration or quality assurance requirements imposed by professional, regulatory or statutory bodies.

Academic Review Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure applies to all staff and contractors who contribute to, or support, the planning, development, delivery, administration, management, quality assurance, or continuous improvement of academic provision offered by MIT and Unitec.

Document management and control

Version number	1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
1.0	1 January 2027	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi	New procedure

Table of Contents

Audience and scope 1
Document management and control 1
Amendment history 1
Table of Contents 2
Academic Review Procedure 3
1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Qualification and Related Reviews 4
3. Programme Reviews 4
4. Micro-credential Reviews 5
5. Short Course and Other Academic Provision 5
6. Special Academic Reviews 6
7. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations. 7
8. Mana Tuku | Delegations 7
9. Kawenga | Responsibilities 8
10. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 8
11. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 9

Academic Review Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this procedure is to set the requirements for the review of qualifications, programmes, micro-credentials, short courses and all other types of academic provision.

1.2. Academic Reviews are undertaken on a regular basis to ensure that qualifications, programmes, micro-credentials, short courses and all other types of academic provision:

a. remain current and relevant,

b. continue to meet regulatory and standard setting body requirements,

c. align with needs of internal and external stakeholders.

1.3. Reviews are expected to be evidence based and confirm the extent to which:

a. intended outcomes are met;

b. changes to the academic provision are required;

c. areas for development and improvement are identified.

Requirements

1.1. The Academic Quality Office is responsible for maintaining a register of all academic provision and their expected and actual review dates and for reporting regularly to the Academic Quality Committee on progress against reviews.

1.2. Heads of School are accountable for ensuring reviews are completed in accordance with this procedure.

1.3. Heads of School are required to actively engage with and are accountable for the engagement of their staff in the process.

1.4. Reviews are to be conducted in accordance with this procedure, relevant NZQA requirements, and the relevant guidelines approved by the Academic Quality Committee.

1.5. The Academic Quality Committee is responsible for maintaining oversight of all reviews, and their outcomes.

2. Qualification and Related Reviews

2.1. Where MIT and Unitec is the Qualification or Micro-credential Developer, the Head of School is accountable for ensuring the qualification or micro-credential is formally reviewed within the period specified.

2.2. Where MIT and Unitec is not the Qualification or Micro-credential Developer, Heads of Schools are expected to support staff to participate in the formal review of qualifications where a related programme is, or is intended to be, delivered by the School.

3. Programme Reviews

3.1. Programmes must be reviewed following any formal review of the qualification to which they lead, including degree programmes where MIT and Unitec is the qualification developer.

3.2. Where a programme leads to multiple qualifications and one of those qualifications is formally reviewed, the programme must be reviewed.

3.3. Programme Review is expected to be completed prior to any significant[1] change to a programme being proposed, including where a qualification review has not been formally reviewed.

3.4. Programme Reviews must include engagement with all relevant internal and external stakeholders (including students, staff, hapu, iwi, employers, regulatory/professional bodies, etc.) and the relevant *Programme Advisory Committee*.

3.5. Written records must be kept of all engagement/consultation undertaken, the views expressed, and the action taken (in relation to the programme) as a result.

3.6. All programme reviews and the outcomes from such reviews will be documented in a review report, endorsed by the Head of School, and reported to the Programme Committee.

3.7. Programme Committees must consider review outcomes, and report to the Academic Quality Committee on key actions taken as a result of each review.

3.8. Where the need to amend, update or cease delivery of a programme is

[1] Significant in this context includes where programme performance, stakeholder feedback, regulatory requirements, or proposed changes indicate that a comprehensive review of the programme is required.
A Type 2 change is not necessarily 'significant' in this context.

identified as a result of a review, the *Academic Development and Approvals Policy* (and associated procedures) must be followed.

3.9. The Academic Quality Office may support Schools to undertake programme reviews.

4. Micro-credential Reviews

4.1. Micro-credentials must be reviewed on a regular basis in accordance with their review period

4.2. Review is expected to be completed prior to any significant[2] change to a micro-credential being proposed.

4.3. Micro-credential Reviews must consider the currency, content and delivery of the micro-credential, to confirm whether there is an ongoing need for the micro-credential and/or whether any changes to the micro-credential are required.

4.4. Micro-credential reviews must include engagement with all relevant internal and external stakeholders (including students, staff, hapu, iwi, employers, regulatory/professional bodies, etc.) and the relevant *Programme Advisory Committee*.

4.5. Written records must be kept of all engagement/consultation undertaken, the views expressed, and the action taken (in relation to the micro-credential) as result.

4.6. All micro-credential reviews and the outcomes from such reviews will be documented in a review report, endorsed by the Head of School, and reported to the Programme Committee.

4.7. Programme Committees must consider the review outcome, and report to the Academic Quality Committee on key actions taken as a result of each review.

4.8. Where the need to amend, update or cease delivery of a micro-credential is identified as a result of a review, the A*cademic Development and Approvals Policy* (and associated procedures) must be followed.

4.9. The Academic Quality Office may support Schools to undertake micro-credential reviews.

5. Short Course and Other Academic Provision

[2] Significant includes where micro-credential performance, stakeholder feedback, regulatory requirements, or proposed changes indicate that a comprehensive review of the micro-credential is required.

5.1. Heads of School are accountable for ensuring short courses and other types of academic provision are regularly reviewed in accordance with the review schedule maintained by the Academic Quality Office, and approved by the Academic Quality Committee.

5.2. Short course and Other Academic Provision reviews must consider the currency, content and delivery, to confirm whether there is an ongoing need for the product and/or whether any changes are required.

5.3. All reviews and the outcomes from such reviews will be documented in a succinct review report, endorsed by the Head of School, and reported to the Programme Committee.

5.4. Programme Committees must consider the review outcome, and report to the Academic Quality Committee on key actions taken as a result of each review.

5.5. Where the need to amend, update or cease delivery of a short course or other academic provision is identified as a result of a review, the A*cademic Development and Approvals Policy* (and associated procedures) must be followed.

5.6. The Academic Quality Office may support Schools to undertake reviews.

6. Special Academic Reviews

Purpose

6.1. The purpose of Special Academic Reviews is to resolve significant potential or actual issues or risks relating to the design or delivery of qualifications, programmes, micro-credentials, short courses or any other type of academic provision, including relating to unsatisfactory performance or regulatory or other requirements.

Requirements

6.2. Where a risk or issue is identified which has institutional significance the DCE Academic may initiate a Special Academic Review.

6.3. The DCE Academic will determine, for any instance requiring Special Academic Review:

a. the terms of reference

b. roles and responsibilities

c. applicable timeframes

d. reporting requirements

e. any actions to be undertaken and accountabilities for the completion of those actions

6.4. Outcomes from any Special Academic Review, including recommendations for improvement or further actions are expected to be reported to the Academic Committee unless it is deemed inappropriate to do so by the DCE Academic. In such cases the reason for non-reporting to Academic Committee must be reported to Academic Committee.

7. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

7.1. The Academic Quality Committee may provide an exemption to review requirements (excepting Special Academic Reviews). Any such exemption, and the reason for it, must be formally recorded and reported to Academic Committee.

8. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Approve an exemption from the review requirements set out in this procedure (excluding Special Academic Reviews).	Academic Quality Committee	Advice from Academic Quality Office
Approve review guidelines, templates and review methodologies.	Academic Quality Committee	Advice from Academic Quality Office
Approve Programme Review Reports and resulting recommendations.	Programme Committee	Consultation with Programme Advisory Committee completed
Approve Micro-credential Review Reports and resulting recommendations.	Programme Committee	Consultation with Programme Advisory Committee completed
Initiate a Special Academic Review.	DCE Academic	Not applicable
Determine the terms of reference, membership, reporting requirements and timeframes for a Special Academic Review.	DCE Academic	Not applicable
Receive reports and recommendations arising from Special Academic Reviews.	Academic Committee	Advice from DCE Academic

9. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
Academic Committee	Maintains governance oversight of academic review outcomes; receives reports on Special Academic Reviews and significant improvement activities.
Academic Quality Committee	Maintains oversight of all academic reviews; monitors review completion and outcomes; considers exemption requests (excluding Special Academic Reviews); approves review guidelines and templates.
Academic Quality Office	Maintains the institutional review schedule and register; supports review activities; provides advice and guidance; reports on review activity and outcomes.
Academic Staff	Participate in reviews, provide evidence and feedback, and contribute to implementation of improvement actions.
All Staff	Comply with academic policies, regulations and procedures; seek clarification where required; actively engage in all processes.
DCE Academic	Initiates Special Academic Reviews where required; oversees implementation of this procedure; receives reports on significant review outcomes and risks.
Head of School	Ensures reviews are completed in accordance with this procedure; ensures appropriate stakeholder engagement; Endorses review reports; Oversees implementation of review recommendations.
Programme Advisory Committee	Provides advice and feedback on review findings and proposed changes from an industry, professional and stakeholder perspective.
Programme Committee	Consider review reports and associated findings. Formally adopt action plans arising from review activities. Maintain oversight of implementation and completion of agreed actions. Reports significant outcomes to Academic Quality Committee.

10. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

Term	Definition
Academic Review	A structured and evidence-based process used to evaluate the quality, relevance, effectiveness and ongoing viability of academic provision.
Currency	The extent to which the content, design, delivery and assessment of academic provision remains up to date and responsive to changes in industry, professional practice, mātauranga Māori, technology, regulation and stakeholder needs.
Micro-credential Review	A formal review of a micro-credential to assess its ongoing relevance, effectiveness, currency and stakeholder need.

Term	Definition
Programme Review	A formal evaluation of a programme to determine the extent to which it remains current, effective, relevant and aligned with stakeholder and regulatory requirements.
Qualification Review	A formal review of a qualification conducted by the qualification developer to determine its continued relevance, currency and fitness for purpose.
Review Report	The formal document recording review findings, conclusions, recommendations and proposed actions.
Special Academic Review	A review initiated to investigate significant actual or potential issues, risks or concerns relating to academic provision.
Stakeholder	Any group or individual with an interest in academic provision, including students, staff, graduates, employers, hapū, iwi, professional bodies and regulators.

11. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

This procedure operates in accordance with relevant legislation and regulatory requirements including:

- Education and Training Act 2020.
- NZQA Rules made under section 452 of the Education and Training Act 2020.
- Education (Pastoral Care of Tertiary and International Learners) Code of Practice 2021.
- Any applicable professional, industry or regulatory body requirements relating to approved qualifications, programmes or micro-credentials.

Monitoring Procedure

Audience and scope

This procedure applies to all staff and contractors who contribute to, or support, the planning, development, delivery, administration, management, quality assurance, or continuous improvement of academic provision offered by MIT and Unitec.

Document management and control

Version number	1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Academic Committee	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
1.0	1 January 2027	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi	New procedure

Table of Contents

Audience and scope 1
Document management and control 1
Amendment history 1
Table of Contents 2
Monitoring Procedure 3
1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Monitoring Procedure 3
3. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations. 6
4. Mana Tuku | Delegations 6
5. Kawenga | Responsibilities 7
6. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 8

Monitoring Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this procedure is to set out the MIT and Unitec approach to monitoring.

2. Monitoring Procedure

2.1. Monitoring may be initiated by MIT and Unitec, by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, or by another regulatory or professional body. It may include any or all of the following:

a. Programme Monitoring[1] to determine:

i. the extent to which the programme is being delivered as approved and in accordance with specified approval and accreditation criteria and/or any other relevant regulatory, professional or MIT and Unitec requirements;

ii. whether intended outcomes are being achieved

iii. the level of compliance associated with the programme

b. Institute Monitoring to determine:

i. the extent to which:

- programmes are effectively managed
- staff are capable and appropriately qualified
- students are appropriately supported
- academic governance and management is effective

ii. or any other matter

Requirements

NZQA Initiated Programme Monitoring

2.2. NZQA will specify the scale and scope of NZQA Initiated Programme Monitoring. The Academic Quality Office is responsible for engaging with NZQA regarding NZQA Initiated Programme Monitoring and, if required, re-negotiating the scale and scope of monitoring events.

2.3. All NZQA Initiated Programme Monitoring requests will be advised to the Academic Committee for information and the Academic Quality Committee for oversight.

[1] Programme in this context includes Micro-Credentials and other types of academic provision.

2.4. The Academic Quality Office will support Schools to prepare for and undertake monitoring and will oversee the process, including the submission of information and evidence to NZQA.

2.5. Heads of School are required to actively engage with and support NZQA Initiated Programme Monitoring and are accountable for the engagement of their staff in the process.

2.6. Where NZQA provides the opportunity for MIT and Unitec to nominate a Monitor, the Head of the Academic Quality Office in consultation with the General Manager, Schools/Director, Schools and Performance, will confirm MIT and Unitec nominees to NZQA.

MIT and Unitec Initiated Programme Monitoring

2.7. All MIT and Unitec programmes may be subject to MIT and Unitec Initiated Programme Monitoring. Programmes will be selected for monitoring based on a risk assessment which includes consideration of:

a. The level of the programme

b. The extent to which the programme is achieving expected outcomes

c. The environmental and regulatory context

d. The programme context

2.8. The focus of monitoring of each programme will be agreed between the Head of School and the Academic Quality Office and approved by the Academic Quality Committee.

2.9. The Academic Quality Office is responsible for maintaining a schedule of MIT and Unitec Initiated Programme Monitoring, which outlines:

a. Programmes to be monitored

b. The scale and scope of monitoring for each programme

c. The status of the monitoring activity

d. The outcome of each monitoring activity

2.10. The Head of the Academic Quality Office in consultation with the General Manager, Schools/Director, Schools and Performance, will confirm monitors for appointment. Requirements for the appointment of Monitors are detailed in the *Monitoring Guidelines*.

2.11. Heads of School are to ensure that monitoring is undertaken in

accordance with the *Monitoring Guidelines* maintained by the Academic Quality Office and approved by the Academic Quality Committee.

Outcomes from Programme Monitoring events

2.12. All monitoring activity will result in a draft report[2] from the monitor detailing the findings, recommendations and requirements for improvement from the event. Monitoring reports must be confirmed as factually accurate by the Head of School (or delegate) and the Academic Quality Office.

2.13. On receipt of the final Monitoring report, the Academic Quality Office will distribute the report to the Head of School, Programme Committee, and the Academic Quality Committee.

2.14. Where significant issues or concerns are identified through the monitoring process, the Academic Quality Office will advise the GM Schools/Director, Schools and Performance and the DCE Academic. The DCE Academic may initiate the Academic Review Procedure.

2.15. Upon receiving the final monitor's report, the Head of School must ensure an action plan is developed to address any issues identified by the monitor in accordance with the requirements outlined in the *Compliance and Improvement Procedure*. Where requested, the Academic Quality Office may provide advice on academic quality requirements and support the monitoring and reporting of progress against agreed actions.

2.16. Once completed, action plans must be formally adopted by the Programme Committee, which is responsible for oversight of the action plan, and the report and action plan provided to the Academic Quality Committee.

2.17. The Academic Quality Office is responsible for maintaining oversight of all recommendations and requirements (explicit or implicit) identified through Programme Monitoring and reporting regularly to the Academic Quality Committee on themes arising from Programme Monitoring.

2.18. Action plans must be developed and oversight maintained of their progress and completion in accordance with the *Compliance and Improvement Procedure*.

NZQA initiated Institute monitoring

---

[2] The format and required content for MIT and Unitec Initiated Monitoring Reports will be outlined in the Monitoring Guidelines.

Reports from NZQA initiated Monitoring will be determined by NZQA.

2.19. The New Zealand Qualifications Authority may initiate Institute Monitoring from time to time and will advise the scope and scale of the monitoring event.

2.20. The Academic Quality Office is responsible for engaging with NZQA regarding NZQA Initiated Institute Monitoring and, if required, negotiating the scale and scope.

2.21. All NZQA Initiated Institute Monitoring requests will be advised to the Academic Committee and the DCE Academic for information and the Academic Quality Committee for oversight.

2.22. The Academic Quality Office will work with relevant internal stakeholders, following consultation with the DCE Academic, to address all Institute Monitoring requirements.

2.23. Relevant internal stakeholders are required to actively engage with and support NZQA Initiated Institute Monitoring.

3. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

3.1. Exemptions from MIT and Unitec Initiated Programme Monitoring may be approved by the Academic Quality Committee upon the recommendation of the Head of School and with the support of the Academic Quality Office.

4. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Approve the annual MIT and Unitec Initiated Programme Monitoring Schedule	Academic Quality Committee	Recommendation from the Academic Quality Office
Approve the focus and scope of MIT and Unitec Initiated Programme Monitoring	Academic Quality Committee	Advice from Academic Quality Office and relevant Head of School
Confirm appointment of programme monitors	Head of Academic Quality Office	Consultation with General Manager, Schools/Director, Schools and Performance
Confirm factual accuracy of monitoring reports	Head of School (or delegate)	Academic Quality Office confirmation
Adopt action plans arising from monitoring	Programme Committee	Endorsement by Head of School
Receive and oversee implementation of monitoring outcomes	Academic Quality Committee	Reports from Programme

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
		Committees and Academic Quality Office
Exempt programmes from MIT and Unitec Initiated Programme Monitoring	Academic Quality Committee	Head of School and with the support of the Academic Quality Office

5. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
All Staff	Comply with academic policies, regulations and procedures; seek clarification where required; actively engage in all processes.
Head of School	Actively engage with and support programme monitoring activities. Ensure programme monitoring is undertaken in accordance with approved Monitoring Guidelines. Ensure staff engage in monitoring activities Confirm the factual accuracy of monitoring reports. Ensure action plans are developed and implemented to address monitoring findings and recommendations.
Head of Academic Quality Office	Lead engagement with NZQA regarding programme and institute monitoring activities. Maintain the schedule of MIT and Unitec initiated programme monitoring. Confirm monitor appointments in consultation with the General Manager, Schools/Director, Schools and Performance. Maintain oversight of recommendations arising from monitoring and report themes and trends to the Academic Quality Committee.
Academic Quality Office	Coordinate and oversee monitoring activities. Support the preparation and submission of evidence and documentation. Support schools in preparing for monitoring activities. Distribute final monitoring reports to relevant stakeholders. Monitor progress against recommendations and associated action plans. Provide advice and support on academic quality requirements where needed.
Programme Committee	Consider monitoring reports and associated findings. Formally adopt action plans arising from monitoring activities. Maintain oversight of implementation and completion of agreed actions.

Role	Responsibilities
Academic Quality Committee	Approve the focus of MIT and Unitec initiated programme monitoring activities. Provide oversight of NZQA and internally initiated monitoring activities. Receive reports and action plans arising from monitoring activities. Monitor institution-wide themes, risks, and improvement opportunities.
DCE Academic	Receive advice regarding significant issues identified through monitoring. Determine whether the *Academic Resolution Procedure* should be initiated where significant concerns exist. Support institutional responses to NZQA-initiated institute monitoring.

6. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

Term	Definition
Action Plan	A documented set of actions developed in response to monitoring findings and recommendations. Must comply with the requirements of the Compliance and Improvement Procedure
Institute Monitoring	Monitoring undertaken at an institutional level to evaluate the effectiveness of programme management, governance, staffing, student support, and related organisational systems.
Monitor	An appropriately qualified individual appointed to undertake monitoring and provide an independent report on findings, recommendations, and improvement requirements.
Monitoring	A formal process undertaken by MIT and Unitec, NZQA, or another approved body to determine whether programmes, systems, and practices are operating effectively and in accordance with approved requirements.
Programme Monitoring	A review of a programme (or other academic provision) to determine whether it is being delivered as approved, achieving intended outcomes, and complying with relevant academic, regulatory, and professional requirements.

Compliance and Improvement Procedure

Audience and scope

This policy applies to all staff and contractors who contribute to, or support, the planning, development, delivery, administration, management, quality assurance, or continuous improvement of academic provision offered by MIT and Unitec.

Document management and control

Version number	1.0	**Date of approval**	TBC
Approval authority	Academic Committee	**Date of next review**	May 2028
Policy sponsor	DCE Academic	**Policy contact person**	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
1.0	1 January 2027	Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi	New procedure

Table of Contents

Compliance and Improvement Procedure 1
Audience and scope 1
Document management and control 1
Amendment history 1
Table of Contents 2
Compliance and Improvement Procedure 3
1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Academic Compliance Management 3
3. Action Planning 5
4. Mana Tuku | Delegations 6
5. Kawenga | Responsibilities 7
6. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions 7
7. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation 8

Compliance and Improvement Procedure

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this procedure is to:

a. support efficient, effective and proportionate responses to suspected or actual instances of non-compliance.

b. ensure a standardised approach to action planning, which is expected to ensure:

i. lessons learned from action planning are shared more broadly across the institute

ii. themes can be identified across programmes and the institute

iii. academic risks and issues can be more effectively managed

1.2. This procedure should be considered alongside institute approaches to the management and assurance of risk.

2. Academic Compliance Management

2.1. All staff are expected to:

a. Adhere to MIT and Unitec academic regulations, policies and procedures.

b. Seek clarification regarding institute requirements where these are unknown or unclear.

c. Advise their line manager of any known or suspected instances of non-compliance with Academic Policies.

d. Support MIT and Unitec to be compliant with internal and external requirements.

2.2. Heads of School and Department Heads are accountable

a. For ensuring their staff are aware of all relevant requirements, and the need to support academic compliance related activities.

b. Reporting significant potential or actual instance of non-compliance to the Academic Quality Office.

Note: The purpose of reporting and investigating actual or potential non-compliance is to identify, assess, and resolve the issue, minimise

risk, and support continuous improvement. These processes are not intended to apportion blame to individuals.

2.3. The Academic Quality Office will administer academic compliance related activities on a regular basis in accordance with the *Academic Compliance Guidelines* approved by the Academic Quality Committee, including for the purpose of regulatory reporting, to determine the extent to which:

a. programmes and other types of academic provision are compliant with:

i. relevant (i.e., academic) MIT and Unitec statutes, regulations, policies, procedures and delegations

ii. legislation, including secondary legislation (i.e., NZQA Rules), and related amendments

iii. regulatory and professional body requirements

iv. requirements or conditions set out by government agencies (i.e., The Tertiary Education Commission)

v. any other requirements deemed necessary by the Academic Quality Committee

b. staff meet any specified requirements for the delivery of the academic provision they are engaged in.

2.4. The General Manager, Schools/Director, Schools and Performance and the DCE Academic may request the Academic Quality Office to undertake compliance related activities within their areas of responsibility.

2.5. The Head of the Academic Quality Office will report to the Academic Quality Committee, the requesting General Manager, Schools/Director, Schools and Performance and the DCE Academic and/or relevant others on the outcome of compliance related activities. In doing so, consideration must be given to the nature of what is being reported to whom, and the appropriateness of reporting what may be confidential or otherwise sensitive information.

2.6. Where an instance of regulatory, or otherwise significant, academic non-compliance is suspected, the Academic Quality Office is required to investigate and, if necessary, direct the resolution of any identified non-compliance. Heads of School (or their equivalent in a related area) are required to support the investigation into, and resolution of, any (suspected) non-compliance.

2.7. The Academic Quality Office will report on investigations into, and the resolution of, regulatory, or otherwise significant, non-compliance to the Academic Quality Committee, and others as relevant.

2.8. Compliance related activities may be used to inform the annual compliance declaration to NZQA.

2.9. The Head of the Academic Quality Office is accountable for the oversight and management of significant actual or suspected instances of non-compliance by:

a. Facilitating and monitoring investigations into identified instances of non-compliance.

b. Advising and supporting the responsible department or business unit to address identified issues.

c. Escalating significant risks, issues, or unresolved instances of non-compliance through appropriate governance channels.

d. Referring matters that fall outside the remit of the Academic Quality Office to the appropriate department.

2.10. Heads of School are accountable for investigating, resolving, and reporting on instances of non-compliance within their School, including the implementation of corrective actions.

3. Action Planning

3.1. Action plans must be developed in accordance with the *Action Plan Guidelines* developed and approved by the Academic Quality Office. The *Action Plan Guidelines* will outline requirements for action plans, including:

a. Formula of the action plan (i.e., the SMART action format)

b. Templates

c. Actions for identified issues beyond the remit of the School (or department)

d. Reporting on progress

e. Completion of actions

f. Action plans must be recorded using the institute approved tool.

3.2. Where issues are identified through a formal quality assurance related report[1] an action plan which addresses the issue/s must be developed.

[1] Quality Assurance related reports include reports resulting from: moderation, programme monitoring, academic review, student feedback, etc.

3.3. Heads of School are accountable for the development of action plans and the resolution of those action plans within their schools.

Note: Heads of School are not accountable for actions outside of their sphere of control, but they are accountable for the escalation of such actions to relevant others (if required).

3.4. When developing action plans, consideration must be given to both the immediate cause/s of the issue and any underpinning factors that contributed to it. All actions must have intended outcome/s.

3.5. Unless otherwise warranted, Schools are expected to take a holistic approach to the management of action plans, including aligning actions arising from different quality (and any other) activities into a single action plan.

3.6. Action plans must be regularly reviewed, with their progress monitored, and relevant processes and outcomes documented.

3.7. For action plans related to programmes:

a. Progress against action plans must be a standing item on the Programme Committee agenda.

b. Outcomes from action plans must be documented in the following year's evaluation report.

3.8. The Academic Quality Office can provide support to address academic quality issues in action plans on request.

4. Mana Tuku | Delegations

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Direct investigation of significant instances of academic non-compliance	Head of Academic Quality Office	None
Require development and monitoring of corrective action plans arising from compliance activities	Head of School / Department Head	None
Approve Academic Compliance Guidelines and associated requirements	Academic Quality Committee	Recommendation from Academic Quality Office
Escalate significant compliance risks or unresolved non-compliance matters to governance bodies	Head of Academic Quality Office	DCE Academic, where appropriate

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Receive reports on significant academic non-compliance and compliance trends	Academic Quality Committee	Reports submitted by Academic Quality Office

5. Kawenga | Responsibilities

Role	Responsibilities
All Staff	Comply with academic policies, regulations and procedures; seek clarification where required; report known or suspected non-compliance; support compliance activities.
Heads of School / Department Heads	Ensure staff awareness of compliance requirements; investigate and resolve instances of non-compliance; develop and oversee action plans; report significant issues to the Academic Quality Office.
Academic Quality Office	Administer academic compliance activities; investigate significant non-compliance; monitor action planning processes; provide advice and support; report outcomes to relevant committees and stakeholders.
Head of Academic Quality Office	Oversee significant compliance investigations; monitor corrective actions; manage escalation of risks and unresolved issues; provide institutional reporting.
Academic Quality Committee	Provide oversight of academic compliance activities; consider reports and recommendations; approve related guidelines.
DCE Academic	Receive escalated compliance matters and provide institutional leadership and oversight where required.

6. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

Term	Definition
Academic Compliance	Adherence to applicable academic regulations, policies, procedures, legislation, regulatory requirements, professional body requirements, and institutional obligations.
Action Plan	A documented set of specific actions developed to address identified issues, risks, recommendations, or instances of non-compliance.
Compliance Activity	Any review, audit, investigation, monitoring activity, or reporting process undertaken to assess compliance with academic requirements.
Non-compliance	Failure to meet an applicable academic regulation, policy, procedure, legislative requirement, regulatory obligation, professional standard, or approved condition.

Term	Definition
Significant issue/non-compliance	Any instance where the non-compliance relates to programme-level activity or presents substantial academic, regulatory, reputational, learner, or organisational risk.

7. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation

- Education and Training Act 2020.
- Privacy Act 2020.
- Official Information Act 1982.
- New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) Rules and associated amendments.
- Any applicable requirements of professional accreditation, registration, or regulatory bodies.
- Tertiary Education Commission funding and reporting requirements.

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Chris Park, General Manager, Academic Services

Contributors: Simon Tries, Director Te Korowai Kahurangi

Subject: Programme Committee Draft Terms of Reference

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 22 October 2026

Recommendations

That the Academic Committee approve the draft Programme Committee Terms of Reference.

Background

The Academic Committee at its meeting of 7 September discussed the Programme Committee Terms of Reference (TOR) and determined to circulate these for feedback across existing Programme Committee members.

The attached documents indicate that there is broad support for the TOR.

Attachments

- MITU Programme Committee ToR Draft 20261022 marked up copy
- MITU Programme Committee ToR Draft 20261022 Clean copy

Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec

Programme Committee

(a subcommittee of Academic Committee)

Terms of Reference

Approval details

Version number	
Issue date	
Approval authority	Academic Committee
Date of approval	
Document owner	Deputy Chief Executive Academic
Contact person	Deputy Chief Executive Academic
Date of next review	September 2026

Version control

Version	Summary of changes	Approved by	Date of Approval
0.1	New draft version (last updated 2026-01-16)	DCEA	
0.2	-Addition of Results Sub-Committee settings and minor other amendments	Academic Committee	

1 Background

Programme Committees are established by the Academic Committee as Standing Subcommittees of the Academic Committee.

Every credit-bearing programme[1] of study leading to the awarding of a qualification, including microcredentials, will be overseen by a designated Programme Committee as decided by the Academic Committee.

Every non-credit-bearing programme of study leading to the awarding of Certificates of Attendance and similar outcomes will be overseen by a designated Programme Committee as decided by the Academic Committee, unless determined otherwise by the Academic Committee.

[1] For the purposes of these Terms of Reference, "programmes" include all credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing academic provision overseen by the Programme Committee, programmes, micro-credentials, certificates of attendance, and other approved forms of academic provision.

Programme Committees are responsible to the Academic Committee (through the Academic Quality Committee) for the academic quality and standards of all academic offerings within their designated remit.

2 Responsibilities

Programme Committees are charged by the Academic Committee to:

Academic Quality and Standards

- Provide the maintenance of academic standards, academic quality, and continuous improvement, in accordance with the Institute's policies and procedures. This includes, but is not limited to:
  - programme design, development and approval (including changes to existing programmes);
  - programme delivery, learning and teaching (in accordance with the Teaching Excellence Standards);
  - assessment and moderation;
  - academic integrity;
  - programme evaluation and review;
  - programme monitoring;
  - consistency of graduate outcomes; and
  - literacy and numeracy assessment.
- Safeguard the fair treatment of students and the academic integrity of the Institute in the granting of credits and qualifications.
- Recommend to the Academic Committee the granting of awards of the Institute where students have met the requirements for the award as set out in approved programme regulations.

Student Success and Priority Groups

- Collect and respond to feedback from students.
- Monitor the progress and academic performance of students enrolled in each programme, giving particular regard to the support for, and achievement of, priority groups.
- Ensure that programmes are designed having regard for the needs of disabled learners.
- Ensure that Te Ao Māori, Mātauranga Māori and Tikanga are appropriately embedded into programme development, design, delivery and evaluation.
- Ensure that Pasifika pedagogies are appropriately embedded into programme development, design, delivery and evaluation.

Stakeholder Engagement and Programme Relevance

- Engage with, receive and consider recommendations from the relevant Programme Advisory Committee and report actions taken in response.
- Ensure that programmes maintain relevance through effective engagement with students, industry, graduates and other relevant stakeholders in accordance with the Institute's policies and procedures.
- Promote innovation in curriculum, assessment, learning and teaching within programme teams.

Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

- Evaluate outcomes of academic provision, and promote and monitor actions to improve teaching, assessment and the outcomes for students.
- Draw to the attention of the Academic Quality Committee any identified risks to the quality of courses, programmes and qualifications which may be recorded in the Academic Risk Register, and make recommendations for their further analysis and mitigation.
- Undertake an annual self-review of its effectiveness using the Institute's approved process.

Compliance and Resources

- Monitor compliance with the recording and safe custody of records containing details of assessments, credits and qualifications for students in accordance with Institute policies.
- Monitor and make recommendations concerning additional resource requirements for programmes as required.

- ~~Ensure the maintenance of high standards, academic quality, and continuous improvement, in accordance with the Institute's policies and procedures. This includes, but is not limited to:~~
  - ~~programme design (including improvements) and approval;~~
  - ~~programme delivery, learning and teaching (in accordance with the Teaching Excellence Standards);~~
  - ~~assessment and moderation (including ensuring issues raised in pre-moderation and post-moderation are addressed appropriately);~~
  - ~~academic integrity;~~
  - ~~programme evaluation and review;~~
  - ~~collecting and responding to feedback from students;~~
  - ~~programme monitoring;~~
  - ~~consistency of graduate outcomes; and~~
  - ~~literacy and numeracy assessment.~~
- ~~Actively encourage innovation in curriculum, assessment, learning and teaching within the Programme teams;~~
- ~~Engage fulsomely and constructively with the relevant Programme Advisory Committee;~~
- ~~Ensure that programmes maintain relevance through effective engagement with students as the customer of the programme, and with industry, graduates and other relevant stakeholders in accordance with the Institute's policies and procedures;~~
- ~~Ensure that Te Ao Māori, Ako (Māori Pedagogy) and Tikanga are appropriately embedded into programme development, design, delivery and evaluation;~~
- ~~Ensure that programmes are designed having regard for the needs of disabled learners;~~
- ~~Ensure that Pasifika pedagogies are appropriately embedded into programme development, design, delivery and evaluation;~~
- ~~Monitor the progress and academic performance of students enrolled in each programme, giving particular regard to the support for, and achievement of, priority groups;~~
- ~~Safeguard the fair treatment of students and the academic integrity of the Institute in the granting of credits and qualifications;~~
- ~~Recommend to the Academic Committee the granting of awards of the Institute where~~

~~students have met the requirements for the award as set out in approved programme regulations;~~

- ~~Ensure the recording and safe custody of records containing details of assessments, credits and qualifications for students in accordance with Institute policies.~~
- ~~Evaluate outcomes of academic provision, and promote and monitor actions to improve teaching, assessment and the outcomes for students;~~
- ~~Identify and recommend additional resource requirements for programmes as required;~~
- ~~Draw to the attention of the Academic~~ Quality ~~Committee any identified risks to the quality of courses, programmes and qualifications, which may be recorded in the Academic Risk Register, and make recommendations for their further analysis and mitigation;Undertake an annual self-review (using a process prepared by the Institute) of its effectiveness.~~

3 Delegations

The Programme Committees are delegated by the Academic Committee to:

- recognise credit (including recognition of prior knowledge and skills);
- formally approve student course results and their release either directly or through the activities of a Results Sub-committee (see section 6); and
- formally approve student programme completion and recommend the conferral of qualifications and other awards.

4 Membership

4.1 Members

Members will be approved by the Academic Committee on the advice of the General Manager, Schools or Director, Schools and Performance, and will comprise the following:

- Head of School*, ex officio;*
- Where applicable, the relevant Academic Lead (Curriculum, Quality and Students*), ex officio*;
- Where applicable, the relevant Academic Programme Manager, *ex officio*;
- For each programme suite within the Programme Committee's remit, two (2) members of the teaching team who have a significant teaching involvement, for a period of two (2) years with the possibility of renewal for a second consecutive two (2) year term only;
- For each programme within the Programme Committee's remit, one (1) member from each other School that makes a significant contribution to teaching, for a period of two (2) years with the possibility of renewal for a second consecutive two (2) year term only;
- For programmes at NZQCF Level 7 and above, the person in the School with primary research leadership responsibility.

  Exceptions to membership are at the discretion of the Academic Committee.

4.2 Chair and Deputy Chair

The Chair will be appointed from among the Programme Committee members by the Chair of the Academic Committee ~~Deputy Chief Executive Academic~~ on the recommendation of the

Programme Committee.

Appointments to the Chair will be for a period of two years and may be renewed by mutual agreement of the Chair of the Programme Committee and the Chair of the Academic Committee ~~and the DCE Academic~~, following consultation with the General Manager Schools/Director Schools and Performance.

The Chair may appoint a Deputy Chair, who will deputise in the Chair's absence.

In consultation with the General Manager, Schools or the Director, Schools and Performance, t~~T~~he Chair of the Academic Quality Committee may, ~~at their discretion,~~ co-opt additional members to Programme Committees where, in their view, such members would provide necessary academic support or experience to the Programme Committee. These members would be appointed on whatever terms or conditions are deemed appropriate.

Notwithstanding the above, the Chair of the Academic Committee may appoint an alternate independent Chair where circumstances make this appropriate (including on the recommendation of the Academic Quality Committee).

4.3 Co-opted members

At the discretion of the Programme Committee, and with the approval of Academic Committee, up to two (2) further members from among the staff of the Institute may be co-opted or seconded to the Programme Committee.

4.4 Observers

Non-voting observers from Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec may attend meetings, with or without speaking rights, at the discretion of the Chair.

4.5 Terminating membership

Members of the Programme Committee, other than those *ex officio*, may revoke their membership at any time by giving four weeks' written notice in writing to the Chair.

Any and all Members of the Programme Committee may have their Membership revoked by resolution of the Academic Committee.

4.6 Members' characteristic, skills and experiences

Membership should reflect a broad set of applicable characteristic, skills and experiences, including:

- demonstrated depth of understanding relating to the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework and related NZQA Rules, in particular for programme approvals and accreditation;
- demonstrated depth of understanding relating to programme design;
- demonstrated knowledge and experience, and a commitment to, Mātauranga Māori;
- preparedness to commit to the reading and depth of analysis, thought and contribution required for the task;
- a broad range of disciplinary and industry perspectives (Academic Committee may decline

a nomination in order to achieve this balance across the committee); and

- ability to work collegially and in accordance with Institutional values.

5 Modus Operandi

5.1 Standing Orders

The Programme Committee is bound by the Standing Orders of Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec.

5.2 Secretarial Support

Each Programme Committee shall be supported by a designated, trained staff member appointed by the School to act as the Secretary to the Committee.

The Committee Secretary is not a member of the Programme Committee, and shall not act as a proxy in the absence of an appointed member.

5.3 Meetings

~~Programme Committees are subject to the MIT and Unitec standing orders and any other direction from the Academic Committee.~~

The Programme Committee will, in its final meeting of the year, set a schedule of meetings for the following year, with no fewer than six meetings per academic year. This will be provided to the Academic Quality Committee.

5.4 Reporting

The Programme Committee will submit final written Minutes to the next scheduled meeting of the Academic Quality Committee.

The Chair will accompany the written Minutes with a summary memo, including any recommendations from the Programme Committee to the Academic Quality Committee and highlighting any other matters from the Minutes which the Chair considers merit the Academic Quality Committee's attention.

For the avoidance of doubt, the reporting requirements outlined above supersede the reporting requirements outlined in the Standing Orders.

6 Results Sub-Committees

6.1 Establishment and Purpose

- A Programme Committee may establish one or more Results Sub-Committees to review, verify and approve, under delegated authority, the accuracy and integrity of student results for all programmes, micro-credentials, and other academic provision, within its remit.
- Results Sub-Committees operate as formal sub-committees of the Programme Committee and report directly to the Programme Committee ~~it~~ after each meeting.

6.2 Membership

Each Results Sub-Committee shall comprise of the following members:

- Head of School, ex officio
- Chair of the Programme Committee, ex officio
- Two senior academic staff, ex officio
- One representative of the teaching staff with major teaching involvement in the relevant programme(s) *Note: This is a role, not a specific individual.*

The Chair of the Programme Committee shall serve as the Chair of the Results Sub-Committee.

6.3 Meetings and Quorum

A results Sub-Committee shall meet as often as necessary to fulfil its duties

A quorum requires the presence of:

- the Head of School (or nominee), and
- the Chair of the Programme Committee.

6.4 Delegated Authority and Responsibilities

Under delegated authority from the Programme Committee (consistent with the Committee's authority to approve results and completion), Results Sub-Committees are responsible for:

- Reviewing and verifying the accuracy of results before approving them.
- Discussing internal moderation reports ~~(post- and check-marking)~~.
- Considering conceded passes (in accordance with the MIT&Unitec Student Regulations, Assessment Policy and Procedures and any procedures for awarding conceded passes) before recommending outcomes to the Programme Committee.
- Considering aegrotat pass applications (in accordance with MIT&Unitec Student Regulations, Assessment Policy and Procedures and any procedures for awarding aegrotat passes) before recommending outcomes to the Programme Committee.
- Reviewing and verifying the accuracy of RPKS results and associated moderation (in accordance with MIT&Unitec Student Regulations, Moderation Policy and Procedures and any procedures for recognising prior knowledge and skills).
- Recommending qualification completions and eligibility to graduate to the Programme Committee.

6.5 Limits of Delegated Authority

Results Sub-Committees do not have authority to approve:

- extensions (including further assessments and resubmissions);
- conceded passes;
- aegrotat passes;
- scaling of marks
- grades as a result of an assessment/recognition of prior learning (APL/RPL).

These matters may only be recommended to the Programme Committee.

6.6 Reporting Requirements

Results Sub-Committees shall report to the Programme Committee following each meeting, providing:

- a record of approved results;
- recommendations relating to passes, aegrotat applications, RPL/CRT decisions, and qualification completions;
- any issues emerging from moderation.

The Programme Committee retains formal responsibility for:

- receipt and custody of all approved results records;
- approval of recommended exceptions or special cases;
- onward reporting to Academic Quality Committee in accordance with Programme Committee Terms of Reference.

Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec

Programme Committee

(a subcommittee of Academic Committee)

Terms of Reference

Approval details

Version number	
Issue date	
Approval authority	Academic Committee
Date of approval	
Document owner	Deputy Chief Executive Academic
Contact person	Deputy Chief Executive Academic
Date of next review	September 2026

Version control

Version	Summary of changes	Approved by	Date of Approval
0.1	New draft version (last updated 2026-01-16)	DCEA	
0.2	Addition of Results Sub-Committee settings and minor other amendments	Academic Committee	

1 Background

Programme Committees are established by the Academic Committee as Standing Subcommittees of the Academic Committee.

Every credit-bearing programme[1] of study leading to the awarding of a qualification, including microcredentials, will be overseen by a designated Programme Committee as decided by the Academic Committee.

Every non-credit-bearing programme of study leading to the awarding of Certificates of Attendance and similar outcomes will be overseen by a designated Programme Committee as decided by the Academic Committee, unless determined otherwise by the Academic Committee.

[1] For the purposes of these Terms of Reference, "programmes" include all credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing academic provision overseen by the Programme Committee, programmes, micro-credentials, certificates of attendance, and other approved forms of academic provision.

Programme Committees are responsible to the Academic Committee (through the Academic Quality Committee) for the academic quality and standards of all academic offerings within their designated remit.

2 Responsibilities

Programme Committees are charged by the Academic Committee to:

Academic Quality and Standards

- Provide the maintenance of academic standards, academic quality, and continuous improvement, in accordance with the Institute's policies and procedures. This includes, but is not limited to:
  - programme design, development and approval (including changes to existing programmes);
  - programme delivery, learning and teaching (in accordance with the Teaching Excellence Standards);
  - assessment and moderation;
  - academic integrity;
  - programme evaluation and review;
  - programme monitoring;
  - consistency of graduate outcomes; and
  - literacy and numeracy assessment.
- Safeguard the fair treatment of students and the academic integrity of the Institute in the granting of credits and qualifications.
- Recommend to the Academic Committee the granting of awards of the Institute where students have met the requirements for the award as set out in approved programme regulations.

Student Success and Priority Groups

- Collect and respond to feedback from students.
- Monitor the progress and academic performance of students enrolled in each programme, giving particular regard to the support for, and achievement of, priority groups.
- Ensure that programmes are designed having regard for the needs of disabled learners.
- Ensure that Te Ao Māori, Mātauranga Māori and Tikanga are appropriately embedded into programme development, design, delivery and evaluation.
- Ensure that Pasifika pedagogies are appropriately embedded into programme development, design, delivery and evaluation.

Stakeholder Engagement and Programme Relevance

- Engage with, receive and consider recommendations from the relevant Programme Advisory Committee and report actions taken in response.
- Ensure that programmes maintain relevance through effective engagement with students, industry, graduates and other relevant stakeholders in accordance with the Institute's

policies and procedures.

- Promote innovation in curriculum, assessment, learning and teaching within programme teams.

Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

- Evaluate outcomes of academic provision, and promote and monitor actions to improve teaching, assessment and the outcomes for students.
- Draw to the attention of the Academic Quality Committee any identified risks to the quality of courses, programmes and qualifications which may be recorded in the Academic Risk Register, and make recommendations for their further analysis and mitigation.
- Undertake an annual self-review of its effectiveness using the Institute's approved process.

Compliance and Resources

- Monitor compliance with the recording and safe custody of records containing details of assessments, credits and qualifications for students in accordance with Institute policies.
- Monitor and make recommendations concerning additional resource requirements for programmes as required.

3 Delegations

The Programme Committees are delegated by the Academic Committee to:

- recognise credit (including recognition of prior knowledge and skills);
- formally approve student course results and their release either directly or through the activities of a Results Sub-committee (see section 6); and
- formally approve student programme completion and recommend the conferral of qualifications and other awards.

4 Membership

4.1 Members

Members will be approved by the Academic Committee on the advice of the General Manager, Schools or Director, Schools and Performance, and will comprise the following:

- Head of School*, ex officio;*
- Where applicable, the relevant Academic Lead (Curriculum, Quality and Students*), ex officio*;
- Where applicable, the relevant Academic Programme Manager, *ex officio*;
- For each programme suite within the Programme Committee's remit, two (2) members of the teaching team who have a significant teaching involvement, for a period of two (2) years with the possibility of renewal for a second consecutive two (2) year term only;
- For each programme within the Programme Committee's remit, one (1) member from each other School that makes a significant contribution to teaching, for a period of two (2) years with the possibility of renewal for a second consecutive two (2) year term only;

- For programmes at NZQCF Level 7 and above, the person in the School with primary research leadership responsibility.

  Exceptions to membership are at the discretion of the Academic Committee.

4.2 Chair and Deputy Chair

The Chair will be appointed from among the Programme Committee members by the Chair of the Academic Committee on the recommendation of the Programme Committee.

Appointments to the Chair will be for a period of two years and may be renewed by mutual agreement of the Chair of the Programme Committee and the Chair of the Academic Committee, following consultation with the General Manager Schools/Director Schools and Performance.

The Chair may appoint a Deputy Chair, who will deputise in the Chair's absence.

In consultation with the General Manager, Schools or the Director, Schools and Performance, the Chair of the Academic Quality Committee may, co-opt additional members to Programme Committees where, in their view, such members would provide necessary academic support or experience to the Programme Committee. These members would be appointed on whatever terms or conditions are deemed appropriate.

Notwithstanding the above, the Chair of the Academic Committee may appoint an alternate independent Chair where circumstances make this appropriate (including on the recommendation of the Academic Quality Committee).

4.3 Co-opted members

At the discretion of the Programme Committee, and with the approval of Academic Committee, up to two (2) further members from among the staff of the Institute may be co-opted or seconded to the Programme Committee.

4.4 Observers

Non-voting observers from Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec may attend meetings, with or without speaking rights, at the discretion of the Chair.

4.5 Terminating membership

Members of the Programme Committee, other than those *ex officio*, may revoke their membership at any time by giving four weeks' written notice in writing to the Chair.

Any and all Members of the Programme Committee may have their Membership revoked by resolution of the Academic Committee.

4.6 Members' characteristic, skills and experiences

Membership should reflect a broad set of applicable characteristic, skills and experiences, including:

- demonstrated depth of understanding relating to the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework and related NZQA Rules, in particular for programme approvals and accreditation;
- demonstrated depth of understanding relating to programme design;

- demonstrated knowledge and experience, and a commitment to, Mātauranga Māori;
- preparedness to commit to the reading and depth of analysis, thought and contribution required for the task;
- a broad range of disciplinary and industry perspectives (Academic Committee may decline a nomination in order to achieve this balance across the committee); and
- ability to work collegially and in accordance with Institutional values.

5 Modus Operandi

5.1 Standing Orders

The Programme Committee is bound by the Standing Orders of Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec.

5.2 Secretarial Support

Each Programme Committee shall be supported by a designated, trained staff member appointed by the School to act as the Secretary to the Committee.

The Committee Secretary is not a member of the Programme Committee, and shall not act as a proxy in the absence of an appointed member.

5.3 Meetings

The Programme Committee will, in its final meeting of the year, set a schedule of meetings for the following year, with no fewer than six meetings per academic year. This will be provided to the Academic Quality Committee.

5.4 Reporting

The Programme Committee will submit final written Minutes to the next scheduled meeting of the Academic Quality Committee.

The Chair will accompany the written Minutes with a summary memo, including any recommendations from the Programme Committee to the Academic Quality Committee and highlighting any other matters from the Minutes which the Chair considers merit the Academic Quality Committee's attention.

For the avoidance of doubt, the reporting requirements outlined above supersede the reporting requirements outlined in the Standing Orders.

6 Results Sub-Committees

6.1 Establishment and Purpose

- A Programme Committee may establish one or more Results Sub-Committees to review, verify and approve, under delegated authority, the accuracy and integrity of student results for all programmes, micro-credentials, and other academic provision, within its remit.
- Results Sub-Committees operate as formal sub-committees of the Programme Committee and report directly to the Programme Committee after each meeting.

6.2 Membership

Each Results Sub-Committee shall comprise of the following members:

- Head of School, ex officio
- Chair of the Programme Committee, ex officio
- Two senior academic staff, ex officio
- One representative of the teaching staff with major teaching involvement in the relevant programme(s) *Note: This is a role, not a specific individual.*

The Chair of the Programme Committee shall serve as the Chair of the Results Sub-Committee.

6.3 Meetings and Quorum

A results Sub-Committee shall meet as often as necessary to fulfil its duties

A quorum requires the presence of:

- the Head of School (or nominee), and
- the Chair of the Programme Committee.

6.4 Delegated Authority and Responsibilities

Under delegated authority from the Programme Committee (consistent with the Committee's authority to approve results and completion), Results Sub-Committees are responsible for:

- Reviewing and verifying the accuracy of results before approving them.
- Discussing internal moderation reports.
- Considering conceded passes (in accordance with the MIT&Unitec Student Regulations, Assessment Policy and Procedures and any procedures for awarding conceded passes) before recommending outcomes to the Programme Committee.
- Considering aegrotat pass applications (in accordance with MIT&Unitec Student Regulations, Assessment Policy and Procedures and any procedures for awarding aegrotat passes) before recommending outcomes to the Programme Committee.
- Reviewing and verifying the accuracy of RPKS results and associated moderation (in accordance with MIT&Unitec Student Regulations, Moderation Policy and Procedures and any procedures for recognising prior knowledge and skills).
- Recommending qualification completions and eligibility to graduate to the Programme Committee.

6.5 Limits of Delegated Authority

Results Sub-Committees do not have authority to approve:

- extensions (including further assessments and resubmissions);
- conceded passes;
- aegrotat passes;
- scaling of marks

- grades as a result of an assessment/recognition of prior learning (APL/RPL).

These matters may only be recommended to the Programme Committee.

6.6 Reporting Requirements

Results Sub-Committees shall report to the Programme Committee following each meeting, providing:

- a record of approved results;
- recommendations relating to passes, aegrotat applications, RPL/CRT decisions, and qualification completions;
- any issues emerging from moderation.

The Programme Committee retains formal responsibility for:

- receipt and custody of all approved results records;
- approval of recommended exceptions or special cases;
- onward reporting to Academic Quality Committee in accordance with Programme Committee Terms of Reference.

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Chris Park, General Manager, Academic Services

Contributors: Simon Tries, Director Te Korowai Kahurangi/Helen Perry, Head of Academic Quality

Subject: Programme Committee Membership

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 22 October 2026

Recommendations

That the Academic Committee approve the proposed process to manage Programme Committee Membership.

Background

Programme Committees are subcommittees of the Academic Committee. As such their membership must be approved by the Academic Committee.

Process

This memo proposes a process for managing Programme Committee changes as follows:

1. Programme Committees will submit their current membership (with roles and titles noted) to the December meeting of the Academic Committee for approval through the Academic Committee secretary. Academic Committee will consider and approve, or require amendments to, current membership at its discretion.

2. After initial membership has been approved, any proposed membership changes will be provided to the Academic Centre or Te Korowai Kahurangi for approval at the next meeting of the Academic Committee.

3. Until proposed members are approved by the Academic Committee, they may attend Programme Committee meetings as observers (or nominated proxies) with such speaking rights as determined by the Chair of the Programme Committee.

4. If the role being replaced is the Chair, the Programme Committee may nominate a Chair, which will be approved by the General Manager, Schools or Director, Schools and Performance on an interim basis until a nomination for a replacement can be considered, and approved, by the Academic Committee.

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Wiremu Manaia, Chair Manukura Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC)

Contributors: Hana Hohapata, Kaiarahi Ako, Manukau Institute of Technology

Subject: Te Mana Akoranga

Classification: Refer MITU 06 Oct 2026 7.5 Te Mana Akoranga

Date: 21 October 2026

Background

Te Mana Akoranga is a Māori curriculum framework developed by MIT and Te Kōmiti Tangata Whenua Academic Sub-Committee in 2022 to support Māori learner success. It provides a framework for embedding mātauranga Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi within programme design, delivery, assessment and evaluation. The Te Mana Akoranga Self-Assessment Tool was approved by MITU as an appendix to Academic Development and Approval Procedure in 2025.

Te Mana Akoranga Overview and Self-Assessment Tool

In July 2026, the Te Mana Akoranga Overview and Self-Assessment Tool were reviewed and updated following consultation with Māori stakeholders across MIT and Unitec including the Manukura Academic Advisory Committee and, Unitec Kaihautū. Feedback from academic teams that implemented Te Mana Akoranga during 2025 and 2026 including the HoS for the Bachelor of Applied Social Work (MIT and Unitec) informed changes. As a result, Te Mana Akoranga was streamlined from fifteen to ten principles to improve usability and alignment with practice.

- **Recommendation: That MITU approve the revised Te Mana Akoranga Overview and Self-Assessment Tool**

Te Mana Akoranga Policy

In October 2026, the Manukura Academic Advisory Committee developed the Te Mana Akoranga Policy to establish a consistent institutional approach to embedding the ten Te Mana Akoranga principles across programme development, delivery, monitoring, and evaluation. The policy aligns with the MITU academic policy framework and is currently being consulted on with key stakeholders across MIT and Unitec. Socialisation and implementation of Te Mana Akoranga will continue throughout 2027 through programme development, monitoring and evaluation processes.

- **Recommendation: That MITU approve the Te Mana Akoranga Policy**

This paper may be considered in open session.

Attachments: Te Mana Akoranga Policy; Te Mana Akoranga Overview & Self-Assessment Tool (Clean & Tracked Versions)

Note: Amendments to the Academic Development and Approvals Policy have been advised to the relevant policy managers.

Te Mana Akoranga Policy

[*insert Policy type and number, if applicable*]

Audience and scope

This policy applies to:

- Academic leaders.
- Curriculum developers.
- Kaiako and teaching staff.
- Programme committees.
- Academic governance bodies.
- Staff responsible for programme design, approval, delivery, assessment, review and quality assurance.
- Staff responsible for the development, review and implementation of academic policies, regulations and procedures.

This policy applies to:

- Programmes.
- Courses.
- Micro-credentials.
- Assessment practices.
- Curriculum design and delivery.
- Academic review and evaluation activities.
- Academic policies, regulations and procedures.
- Academic quality assurance systems and processes.

Document management and control

Version number	1	**Date of approval**	Chair of Manukura Academic Advisory Committee November Minutes 2026
Approval authority		**Date of next review**	TBA
Policy sponsor	Manukura Academic Advisory Committee	**Policy contact person**	Wiremu Manaia

Amendment history

Version	Effective date	Created/reviewed by	Reason for review/comment
1	01 January 2027	Manukura Academic Advisory Committee	New Policy

Table of Contents

Audience and scope 1

Document management and control 1

Amendment history 1

Table of Contents 2

[*insert name*] Policy 3

1. Pūtake | Purpose 3
2. Mātāpono | Principles 3
3. [Add any other headings as required] 4
4. Hātepe | Procedures [OPTIONAL] 4
5. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations [OPTIONAL] 4
6. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes [OPTIONAL] 6
7. Mana Tuku | Delegations [OPTIONAL] 6
8. Kawenga | Responsibilities [OPTIONAL] 7
9. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions [OPTIONAL] 7
10. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation [OPTIONAL] 7
11. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents [OPTIONAL] 7

Te Mana Akoranga Policy

1. Pūtake | Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this policy is to establish Te Mana Akoranga as MITU's framework for giving effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi through curriculum, learning and teaching, assessment, academic quality assurance, academic governance, institutional systems, processes, policies and decision-making.

1.2. This policy establishes the principles, requirements and accountabilities that support equitable outcomes for Māori learners and the meaningful integration of mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori approaches, tikanga Māori, te reo Māori and Te Taiao perspectives across MITU's academic activities.

1.3. This policy supports the development, delivery, quality assurance, review and continuous enhancement of academic provision that is culturally responsive, evidence-informed and aligned with the aspirations of Māori learners, whānau, iwi, hapū, hāpori and communities.

2. Mātāpono | Principles

2.1. Te Mana Akoranga is underpinned by the following principles. These principles apply to programme and course design, curriculum development, delivery, assessment, review, evaluation, quality assurance, academic governance, institutional systems, processes and decision-making.

a. **Te Tiriti o Waitangi**
Give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi through curriculum design, delivery, assessment, systems, processes and decision-making;

b. **Whanaungatanga (Partnership and Consultation)**
Be developed, delivered and reviewed in partnership with Māori, including iwi, hapū, whānau and hāpori;

c. **Puukenga (Staff Capability and Cultural Competency)**
Be supported by staff who demonstrate cultural competence, capability and ongoing professional development in Māori-informed and culturally responsive practice;

d. **Aromatawai (Equitable and Culturally Responsive Assessment)**
Use equitable, valid and culturally responsive assessment approaches that recognise learner strengths, identities and aspirations;

e. **Ngā Whāinga Matua (Outcomes)**
Include learning outcomes that recognise mātauranga Māori and support the aspirations and success of Māori learners and their communities;

f. **Whai Hua (Learner Access, Participation, Achievement and Success)**
Identify and remove barriers while promoting equitable access, participation, achievement, completion and success for ākonga Māori and all learners;

g. **Whai Hiranga (Equitable and Culturally Responsive Curriculum Design and Delivery)**
Be designed and delivered in ways that respond to the strengths, identities, aspirations, wellbeing, and learning needs of ākonga Māori and all learners;

h. **Taumata (Embedding mātauranga Māori)**
Embed mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori, te reo Māori and Te Taiao perspectives authentically throughout programme design, delivery, assessment, review and evaluation;

i. **Kaupapa Māori (Integration of mātauranga Māori, Kaupapa Māori and Research Informed Practice)**

Draw upon and advance mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori approaches and Māori research to strengthen knowledge creation, learner success and aspirations;

j. **Kia Kotahi te Angitū (Shared Responsibility and Continuous Improvement)** Demonstrate shared responsibility, accountability, partnership and continuous improvement to achieve equitable and positive outcomes for Māori learners, whānau and communities.

3. Application of Te Mana Akoranga

3.1. Te Mana Akoranga will inform and guide:

a. programme and course development, approval, modification and review;

b. curriculum design and development;

c. learning and teaching practices;

d. assessment design and assessment practice;

e. learner support and engagement activities;

f. academic quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation activities;

g. academic policy, regulation and procedure development;

h. academic governance and decision-making; and

i. institutional systems and processes that support academic activities.

4. Te Tiriti o Waitangi

4.1. MITU will give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi through curriculum design, delivery, assessment, academic quality assurance, governance, systems, processes and decision-making.

4.2. Academic activities and institutional decision-making will recognise the status of Māori as tangata whenua and support equitable and positive outcomes for Māori learners.

4.3. The requirements of Te Tiriti o Waitangi will be reflected throughout the development, approval, implementation, review and continuous improvement of academic provision.

5. Whanaungatanga | Partnership and Consultation

5.1. MITU will develop, deliver and review academic activities in partnership with Māori.

5.2. Programme development, curriculum review, evaluation and continuous improvement activities will be informed by engagement with iwi, hapū, whānau, hāpori, Māori learners and relevant communities, as appropriate.

5.3. Partnership approaches will support shared decision-making, meaningful consultation and mutually beneficial outcomes.

6. Puukenga | Staff Capability and Cultural Competency

6.1. Learning outcomes will be designed to reflect the knowledge, skills, capabilities and attributes required by approved programme outcomes and graduate profiles.

6.2. Staff involved in academic activities will develop and maintain cultural competence and capability appropriate to their role.

6.3. Staff will engage in ongoing professional learning and development relating to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Te Mana Akoranga, mātauranga Māori, culturally responsive practice and Māori learner success.

6.4. MITU will provide professional learning and development opportunities that support the implementation of Te Mana Akoranga.

7. Aromatawai | Equitable and Culturally Responsive Assessment

7.1. Assessment practices will be equitable, valid, reliable and culturally responsive.

7.2. Assessment approaches will recognise learner strengths, identities, experiences and aspirations.

7.3. Assessment design and implementation will support Māori learner success and minimise barriers to participation and achievement.

7.4. Programme and course assessment practices will be reviewed regularly to ensure ongoing alignment with Te Mana Akoranga principles.

8. Ngā Whāinga Matua | Outcomes

8.1. Programme and course learning outcomes will support learner success and achievement.

8.2. Where appropriate to the purpose and context of the programme or course, learning outcomes will recognise mātauranga Māori and support the aspirations and success of Māori learners and their communities.

8.3. Graduate outcomes and educational outcomes will contribute to positive social, cultural, economic and community outcomes.

9. Whai Hua | Learner Access, Participation, Achievement and Success

9.1. MITU will identify and address barriers that may affect learner access, participation, achievement, completion and success.

9.2. Academic and support activities will promote equitable educational opportunities and outcomes for Māori learners and all learners.

9.3. MITU will use learner success and achievement information to inform quality improvement activities and support equitable outcomes.

10. Whai Hiranga | Equitable and Culturally Responsive Curriculum Design and Delivery

10.1. Programmes and courses will be designed and delivered in ways that respond to the strengths, identities, aspirations, wellbeing and learning needs of Māori learners and all learners.

10.2. Learning and teaching practices will be culturally responsive, inclusive and evidence informed.

10.3. Curriculum design and delivery will support learner engagement, belonging, achievement and success.

10.4. Programme and course development will reflect relevant cultural, disciplinary, professional and industry contexts.

11. Taumata | Embedding Mātauranga Māori

11.1. MITU will embed mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori, te reo Māori and Te Taiao perspectives authentically throughout academic activities.

11.2. Embedding of Māori knowledge and perspectives will be appropriate to the context, purpose and discipline of the academic provision.

11.3. Consideration of Taumata will occur during programme design, delivery, assessment, review and evaluation activities.

12. Kaupapa Māori | Integration of Mātauranga Māori, Kaupapa Māori and Research-Informed Practice

12.1. MITU will draw upon mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori approaches and Māori research to inform academic activities and quality enhancement.

12.2. Knowledge creation, curriculum development, learning and teaching, assessment and evaluation activities will recognise the value and contribution of Māori knowledge systems.

12.3. Academic activities will seek opportunities to strengthen Māori learner success, aspirations and outcomes through kaupapa Māori and research-informed approaches.

13. Kia Kotahi te Angitū | Shared Responsibility and Continuous Improvement

13.1. Implementation of Te Mana Akoranga is a shared responsibility across MITU.

13.2. Staff, leaders, committees and governance bodies will demonstrate accountability for implementing this policy within their areas of responsibility.

13.3. MITU will monitor, evaluate and continuously improve the implementation and effectiveness of Te Mana Akoranga.

13.4. Evidence from quality assurance activities, self-assessment, stakeholder feedback and learner outcomes will be used to support continuous improvement.

14. Whakawāteatanga me ngā Whakaaetanga | Exemptions and dispensations

14.1. There are no exemptions or dispensations to this policy.

15. Aromatawai me ngā Hua | Evaluation / outcomes

15.1. The implementation and effectiveness of this policy will be monitored through academic quality assurance, programme approval, programme review, evaluation and continuous improvement processes.

16. Mana Tuku | Delegations [OPTIONAL]

DRAFTING NOTE: *Delegations must be consistent with Institutional level delegations*

Authority	Delegated authority	Supporting endorsement
Clear information about what the authority enables to be done and in what circumstances (e.g. 'To approve xx in y circumstances'	*Clear information about who holds the delegated authority – position not name*	*Clear information about any required endorsements*

17. Kawenga | Responsibilities [OPTIONAL]

Role	Responsibilities

18. Whakamāramatanga | Definitions [OPTIONAL]

DRAFTING NOTE: *Definitions may be included below or, if not, indicate where they can be found. Include any te reo definitions as appropriate (refer to the enclosed Glossary for a reference list).*

Term	Definition

19. Ngā Ture Whai Pānga | Relevant legislation [OPTIONAL]

- [*list any relevant legislation*]

20. Ngā Tuhinga Pānga | Related documents [OPTIONAL]

- [*list any related documents, eg other policies*]

GLOSSARY OF MĀORI TERMS

DRAFTING NOTE: *Te reo may be used in policies, provided that the English translation is also used alongside te reo. This Glossary sets out a list of suggested words / phrases that you may include in your policy or procedure. Please delete this Glossary from the document before finalising.*

The **Glossary of Māori Terms** provides a standardised bilingual reference for the consistent use of Te Reo Māori and English across MIT and Unitec policies, procedures and governance documents. It supports clear, consistent and culturally responsive documentation by promoting the use of agreed institutional terminology.

This glossary is intended to be a practical reference that promotes consistency, clarity and the appropriate use of bilingual terminology across MITU. It should be reviewed periodically to ensure it remains current and aligned with institutional practice.

ENGLISH	TE REO MĀORI
Accountability	Takohanga
Achievement / Delivery	Whakatutuki
Action Plan	Mahere Mahi
Activities	Ngā Mahi
Advice / Guidance	Tohutohu
Approval / Agreement	Whakaaetanga
Authorisation / Empowerment	Whakamana
Authority / Approval	Mana Tohu
Care, Respect, Hospitality	Manaakitanga
Compassion	Aroha
Correctness / Justice	Tika
Covenant / Agreement	Kawenata
Criteria	Paearu
Customary Practice / Correct Process	Tikanga
Decision	Whakatau
Decision-making Authority	Mana Whakatau
Development	Whakawhanaketanga
Effectiveness	Whai Hua
Engagement / Contact	Whakapā
Equity	Ōritetanga
Equity / Fairness	Mana Taurite
Evaluation / Assessment	Aromatawai
Explanation	Whakamārama
Family Wellbeing	Whānau Ora
Focus	Aronga
Governance	Mana Whakahaere
Guideline	Aratohu
Guiding Principles	Mātāpono Arataki
Impact	Pānga
Implementation	Whakatinana
Implementation Strategy	Rautaki Whakatinana
Integrity / Honesty	Pono
Knowledge	Mātauranga
Long-term Vision	Pae Tawhiti
Management	Whakahaere
Monitoring	Aroturuki

ENGLISH	TE REO MĀORI
Objective	Whāinga
Objectives	Ngā Whāinga
Obligation	Herenga
Operational Arrangements	Whakaritenga Mahi
Outcomes	Ngā Hua
Overview	Tirohanga Whānui
Performance Indicator	Tohu Mahi
Performance Target	Whāinga Paetae
Plan	Mahere
Policy	Kaupapa Here
Policy / Purpose / Initiative	Kaupapa
Practices	Ngā Tikanga
Principle	Mātāpono
Procedure / Process	Hātepe
Process	Tukanga
Programme Management	Whakahaere Kaupapa
Protocol	Kawa
Purpose / Reason	Pūtake
Quality Management	Whakahaere Kounga
Recommendation	Tūtohunga
Reference	Tohutoro
Relationship / Connection	Hononga
Relationship Building	Whakawhanaungatanga
Report	Pūrongo
Requirements / Arrangements	Whakaritenga
Responsibility	Kawenga
Review	Arotake
Risk	Mōrearea
Risk	Tūraru
Risk Management	Whakahaere Mōrearea
Risks	Ngā Tūraru
Rule / Law	Ture
Scope	Whānuitanga
Self-determination / Leadership	Rangatiratanga
Spiritual Wellbeing	Wairua
Stewardship	Kaitiakitanga
Strategic Objective	Whāinga Rautaki
Strategic Plan	Mahere Rautaki
Strategy	Rautaki

ENGLISH	TE REO MĀORI
Success Indicator	Tohu Angitu
Summary	Whakarāpopototanga
Sustainability	Toitūtanga
System	Pūnaha
Timeline	Rārangi Wā
Treaty of Waitangi	Te Tiriti o Waitangi
Unity	Kotahitanga
Values	Ngā Uaratanga
Values	Uaratanga
Wellbeing	Hauora
Working Group	Rōpū Mahi

TE MANA AKORANGA

Tāmaki Waka Hourua and Te Mana Akoranga

The **Tāmaki Waka Hourua** symbolises the partnership between Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec, navigating a shared journey guided by Te Tiriti o Waitangi, our values, and a commitment to learner success.

Te Mana Akoranga advances this vision through a Māori curriculum and Academic Practice framework that embeds mātauranga Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi across programme design, delivery, assessment, review, and continuous improvement. Through culturally responsive academic practice, policies, procedures, and quality systems, it strengthens organisational capability, supports Māori learner success, and prepares all ākonga to engage effectively with Aotearoa New Zealand's diverse communities, workplaces, and professions.

Purpose

Te Mana Akoranga provides a framework for the development, implementation, review, and quality enhancement of academic programmes, courses, micro-credentials, and associated academic policies and procedures.

It supports the meaningful integration of mātauranga Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi across curriculum, academic practice, governance, and quality systems, ensuring accountability for Māori learner success through culturally responsive, high-quality, evidence-informed education.

By strengthening capability and confidence in programme design, delivery, and evaluation, the framework supports equitable outcomes for Māori learners and enriches learning experiences for all ākonga.

Application

Te Mana Akoranga is a practical resource for schools, academic leaders, curriculum developers, kaiako, programme committees, academic governance, and quality assurance processes.

It supports the design, development, delivery, assessment, review, and continuous improvement of academic programmes, courses, micro-credentials, and related academic policies and procedures.

The framework can be applied:

- During the design and development of new programmes, courses, and micro-credentials.
- During programme approval, accreditation, endorsement, and vetting processes.
- When developing, reviewing, or revising academic policies, regulations, and procedures.
- When reviewing, revising, or redeveloping existing curriculum.
- For peer review, assessment, evaluation, and moderation activities.
- As a quality enhancement and continuous improvement resource.
- To assist staff in embedding mātauranga Māori and demonstrating how Te Tiriti o Waitangi is implemented through curriculum, educational practice, policies, procedures, and systems.

Guiding Principles Framework

Te Mana Akoranga is underpinned by ten guiding principles that give practical effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi through curriculum design, delivery, assessment, review, academic practice, and continuous improvement.

The principles provide a consistent framework for academic decision-making, policy development, evaluation, quality enhancement, and integration of mātauranga Māori.

Māori Curriculum Foundations

These principles establish the organisational, academic, and educational foundations for embedding mātauranga Māori and implementing Te Tiriti o Waitangi through curriculum, policy, procedures, and academic practice:

- **Te Tiriti o Waitangi** - Embedding Te Tiriti across Curriculum, Systems, and Processes
- **Whanaungatanga** - Partnership and Consultation
- **Puukenga -** Staff Capability and Cultural Competency

Māori Curriculum Development and Delivery

These principles guide the design, delivery, assessment, and integration of curriculum to support meaningful learning experiences and successful outcomes for Māori learners:

- **Aromatawai -** Equitable and Culturally Responsive Assessment
- **Ngā Whainga Matua** - Outcomes
- **Whai Hua** - Learner Participation, Achievement, Success, and Access
- **Whai Hiranga -** Equitable and Culturally Responsive Curriculum Design and Delivery
- **Taumata -** Embedding Mātauranga Māori
- **Kaupapa Māori** - Integration of Mātauranga Māori and Research-Informed Practice

Quality and Continuous Improvement

These principles guide governance, accountability, evaluation, and continuous improvement to ensure curriculum, academic practice, policies, and organisational systems support positive outcomes for Māori learners while enriching learning experiences and enhancing success for all ākonga:

- **Kia Kotahi te Angitū -** Shared Responsibility and Continuous Improvement

Te Mana Akoranga Self-Assessment Tool

This tool supports the development, delivery, assessment, review, and continuous improvement of academic programmes, courses, micro-credentials, and related academic practices.

It provides a practical process for evaluating how effectively Te Tiriti o Waitangi and mātauranga Māori are embedded within curriculum, teaching, learning, policy implementation, and academic practice.

The tool supports reflection, evidence informed review, accountability, and quality enhancement, enabling programme teams and decision-makers to identify strengths, inform improvement initiatives, and enhance outcomes for Māori learners while contributing to success for all ākonga.

Referencing

The following documents inform and give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi in Governance, Management and Operations in this framework:

- Education and Training Act (2020)
- Ka Hikitia: Māori Education Strategy, Ministry of Education (2013)
- A Strategic Direction for Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec 2025-2026

TE MANA AKORANGA

Tāmaki Waka Hourua and Te Mana Akoranga

~~: The MĀORI CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK AND SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL~~ **Tāmaki Waka Hourua** symbolises the partnership between Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec, navigating a shared journey guided by Te Tiriti o Waitangi, our values, and a commitment to learner success.

Te Mana Akoranga ~~can be used to develop, assess and peer~~ advances this vision through a Māori curriculum and Academic Practice framework that embeds mātauranga Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi across programme design, delivery, assessment, review ~~Māori Curriculum in new or current~~, and continuous improvement. Through culturally responsive academic practice, policies, procedures, and quality systems, it strengthens organisational capability, supports Māori learner success, and prepares all ākonga to engage effectively with Aotearoa New Zealand's diverse communities, workplaces, and professions.

Purpose

Te Mana Akoranga provides a framework for the development, implementation, review, and quality enhancement of academic programmes, courses, ~~training schemes and~~ micro-credentials~~. The self-assessment tool can be used to guide the inclusion of Mātauranga Māori in the development, review, assessment~~, and associated academic policies and procedures.

It supports the meaningful integration of mātauranga Māori and Te Tiriti o Waitangi across curriculum, academic practice, governance, and quality systems, ensuring accountability for Māori learner success through culturally responsive, high-quality, evidence-informed education.

By strengthening capability and confidence in programme design, delivery, and evaluation ~~of all academic curriculum.~~, the framework supports equitable outcomes for Māori learners and enriches learning experiences for all ākonga.

Application

~~Te Mana Akoranga is a "living document" open to change and regional differences such as the vision, reo me ona tikanga, systems and processes if used by others. It is a resource to support kaimahi to build their cultural competency and capability; culturally responsive leadership and practice. It is not an audit tool.~~

~~Foreword~~

~~Ako is the Māori verb for *'learn, study, instruct, teach or advise'*. Akoranga is the action of *doing* these activities. Akoranga describes *'learning, disciplines, educational courses, academic programmes, teaching and learning environments.'* In education, akoranga is sometimes referred to as 'curriculum.' Te Mana~~

Akoranga in this context means *'Empowering the Curriculum.'*[1]

Vision

'Akonga continue to grow and thrive in pursuit of their goals, aspirations and potential in Tāmaki Mākaurau at and beyond MIT Te Pūkenga with confidence and pride'.

Te Mana Akoranga

Te Mana Akoranga Māori Curriculum (TMA) ensures Te Tiriti of Waitangi (ToW)[2] and Mātauranga (Māori knowledge) is explicit and is embedded into academic policies, programmes and courses (refer the Education and Training Act (2020)[3]. TMA was developed from Mātauranga (Māori knowledge), research and reports. It presents a series of guidelines and principles for the development of academic curriculum.

Introduction

Te Mana Akoranga was developed by Te Whare Takiūra ō Manukau (MIT Te Pūkenga) by Te Kōmiti Tangata Whenua and Te Tāri Mātauranga Māori. In preparing the guiding principles, the following documents have been referenced to inform and give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi in Governance, Management and Operations:

- Education and Training Act (2020).
- Te Pae Tawhiti: Te Tiriti o Waitangi Excellence Framework (2020 – 2022).
- Ka Hikitia: Māori Education Strategy, Ministry of Education (2013).
- Refreshing our Curriculum, Ministry of Education (2021)
- MIT - Te Rautaki: Mātauranga Māori Report (2018-2023).
- MIT - Te Putanga Mātauranga Māori: Māori Education Strategic Plan (2021-2024).

[1] *Matua Vince Hapi (2021) Kaumatua. Te Whare Takiura o Manukau: Manukau Instiotue of Technology.*
[2] Minstry of Education (2021). Refreshing our Curriculum. Honouring our mutual obligation ot Te Tiriti o Waitangi. https://www.education.govt.nz/our-work/changes-in-education/curriculum-and-assessment-changes/new-zealand-curriculum/
[3] *Education and Training Act (2020). Section 9 (1) (Section4) '…The purpose of this Act includes establishing and regulating an education system that honours Te Tiriti o Waitangi and supports Māori-Crown relationships.'*

~~Application~~

Te Mana Akoranga is a practical ~~application~~ resource for ~~kaimahi working with~~schools, academic leaders, curriculum~~. The contexts for applying the self-assessment tool are diverse~~ developers, kaiako, programme committees, academic governance, and ~~include:~~quality assurance processes.

~~Prior to designing new~~

It supports the design, development, delivery, assessment, review, and continuous improvement of academic programmes, courses, ~~training schemes and~~ micro-credentials, and related academic policies and procedures.

The framework can be applied:

- During the design and development~~,~~ of new programmes, courses, and micro-credentials.
- During programme approval, accreditation, endorsement, and vetting processes ~~and course approvals,~~
  - ~~When making changes, alterations or amendments an including the unification process~~
- When developing, reviewing, or revising academic policies, regulations, and procedures.
- When reviewing, revising, or redeveloping existing curriculum.
  - For ~~assessment and~~ peer review,
  - ~~As guidelines for various academic committees.~~

~~Purpose~~

- ~~Te Mana Akoranga can be used to support the inclusion of Mātauranga Māori to help staff ensure programme development, review and~~ assessment ~~processes:~~, evaluation, and moderation activities.
  - ~~Are accessible, applicable and relevant to Māori.~~
- ~~Enables~~ As a quality enhancement and continuous improvement resource.
- To assist staff in embedding mātauranga Māori and ~~akonga to develop an appreciation of Mātauranga (Māori knowledge) that can be applied in professional~~ demonstrating how Te Tiriti o Waitangi is implemented through curriculum, educational practice ~~or studies;~~, policies, procedures, and systems.
  - ~~Promotes culturally inclusive communities that value Māori histories, traditions, knowledge and experiences of Māori.~~[4]

~~Te Mana Akoranga:~~

- ~~Makes ToW explicit in academic policy, systems and processes~~

~~Increase equality of access~~

Guiding Principles Framework

Te Mana Akoranga is underpinned by ten guiding principles that give practical effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi through curriculum design, delivery, assessment, review, academic practice, and continuous improvement.

- The principles provide a consistent framework for ~~Māori and,~~

[4] *Te Putanga Mātauranga Māori: Māori Education Strategic Plan (2021-2024). Te Whare Takiura o Manukau: Manukau Institute of Technology.*

- Improve equity of education outcomes for Māori.

Te Mana Akoranga will support Te Pūkenga subsidiaries and/or wider tertiary sector to demonstrate how ToW is being implemented, assessed and evaluated in academic programmedecision-making, policy development and delivery., evaluation, quality enhancement, and integration of mātauranga Māori.

TMA enables staff to interpret and adapt TMA principles in ways that advance the participation and success of Māori akonga. It is a resource for ensuring programmes, courses, training schemes and micro-credentials are effectively delivering Mātauranga Māori curriculum.

Māori Curriculum Foundations

Mātauranga Māori is traditional Māori knowledge and originates from understanding of a Māori worldview. It forms the basis of Māori belief systems and practices including traditions, customs and protocols and uses Māori practices and principles to critique, analyse and understand the world.[5]

Māori curriculum is developed from designing and shaping a curriculum that includes Mātauranga Māori alongside other learning areas and acknowledges its value.[6] It includes a series of common goals and objectives:

1. **WHAKAPAKARI – DEVELOPMENT:** To improve Māori social, economic, cultural, education and employment outcomes.
2. **TE TAIAO - ENVIRONMENT:** To address the learning environment through curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes.
3. **ŌRITETANGA: INEQUALITIES:** To address Māori inequalities for effective education and training delivery to the specific needs of Māori.
4. **MATATAU – COMPETENCY:** To develop culturally competent practice and service delivery responsiveness for Māori.
5. **ĀHEITANGA - ACCESS:** To improve systems and structures for better access to education and training services by Māori.
6. **PAEARU – PERFORMANCE:** To ensure curriculum performance measures contribute to improvement of Māori social, cultural, economic, education and employment outcomes.

Development Principles

The following are the overarching principles for **developing** academic programmes, courses, training schemes and micro-credentials:

1. **TE TIRITI O WAITANGI:** We are committed to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi including maintaining effective delivery of and inclusion of Te Reo, Tikanga and Mātauranga Māori.
2. **WAWATA – ASPIRATIONS:** Courses are designed, developed, assessed and reviewed in ways that ensure the curriculum is inclusive of, sensitive to, and conducive to the aspirations of Māori.

5

The Education and Training Act (2020) Section 9 (D) – 127 (1) (d)(i) 'Working to ensure that its plans, policies, and local curriculum reflect local tikanga Māori, Mātauranga Māori, and te ao Māori.'

[6] *Ka Hikitia (2013) Māori Edcuation Strategy. Ministry of Education, Wellington.*

3. **AHEITANGA - EQUALITY OF ACCESS**: Design and delivery of courses consider barriers to access, participation and success by Māori.[7]

4. **MĀTAURANGA MĀORI - MĀORI KNOWLEDGE**: An understanding of Mātauranga Māori contributes to learning that prepares akonga to function effectively in a global society because learning that is conducive to the aspirations of Māori will benefit all akonga.

5. **WHAKARATA - RESPONSIBILITY**: Incorporating Mātauranga Māori in all programmes and courses is the responsibility of academic governance and not Māori staff.

These principles need to be applied in all establish the organisational, academic policies, programmes, courses, training schemes, and micro-credentials.

[7] Te Ōritetanga Project (2021) Addressing parities and equity by understanding the student journeyt at MIT.

~~Delivery Principles~~

~~The following are the guiding principles~~educational foundations for ~~delivering academic programmes, courses, training schemes and micro-credentials:~~

1. ~~**PUTANGA – LEARNING OUTCOMES:** Where applicable, programme learning outcomes identify, recognise and acknowledge Mātauranga~~ embedding mātauranga Māori ~~as an achievement.~~

~~**WHAKAKOTAHI - INTEGRATION**: Māori curriculum is coherently integrated and allows akonga to understand, develop and build their understanding of Mātauranga Māori.~~ and implementing

2. ~~Aromatawai –~~ ~~**ASSESSMENT**: Māori stakeholders and communities of interest contribute to the design and development of curriculum. Mātauranga Māori is formally assessed and evaluated. Assessment is equitable/tika, and values cultural diversity and individual needs.~~
3. ~~**WHAKAAKO - TRAINING**: All staff have a strong understanding, are appropriately trained and experienced in the Māori curriculum content they are delivering. Professional development training is offered to develop and enhance capacity to deliver Māori curriculum content.~~
4. ~~**RANGAHAU – RESEARCH**: Programmes formally recognise Mātauranga Māori research sources and acknowledge relevant endorsements by Māori organisations where relevant.~~
5. ~~**TE AO MĀORI – MĀORI WORLDVIEW**: Programmes and learning outcomes include Te Reo and Tikanga Māori in ways that demonstrate and support Mātauranga Māori worldview, customs and practices. Evaluation and assessment processes incorporate these activities but not by themselves substitute for Māori curriculum content.~~
6. ~~**AKOAKO - CONSULTATION**: The programme assessment and evaluation process demonstrate that Māori stakeholders and communities of interest have been consulted and included in the course development process.~~

~~These principles need to be explicit in the development of all academic policies, programmes and/or courses, training schemes or micro-credentials and demonstrated in delivery.[8]~~

~~Conclusion~~

~~Te Mana Akoranga presents a series of principles for ensuring Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Mātauranga Māori are explicit and embedded into academic policies and programmes to target priority outcomes outlined in the Te Pae Tawhiti (TPT) framework. TPT is the~~ Te Tiriti o Waitangi ~~excellence framework developed by Te Pukenga: New Zealand Institute of Skills and Technology (NZIST) for guiding change that produces equitable outcomes for Māori.[9] Te Mana Akoranga demonstrates how the ToW is being implemented, assessed and evaluated in academic development and delivery.~~through curriculum, policy, procedures, and academic practice:

- **Te Tiriti o Waitangi** - Embedding Te Tiriti across Curriculum, Systems, and Processes
- **Whanaungatanga** - Partnership and Consultation
- **Puukenga -** Staff Capability and Cultural Competency

Māori Curriculum Development and Delivery

These principles guide the design, delivery, assessment, and integration of curriculum to support meaningful learning experiences and successful outcomes for Māori learners:

- **Aromatawai -** Equitable and Culturally Responsive Assessment

[8] *Te Putanga Mātauranga Māori: Māori Education Strategic Plan (2021-2024). Te Whare Takiura o Manukau: Manukau Institute of Technology.*

[9] *Te Pae Tawhiti Framework (2021) Te Pukenga: New Zealand Institute of Skills and Technology.*

- **Ngā Whainga Matua** - Outcomes
- **Whai Hua** - Learner Participation, Achievement, Success, and Access
- **Whai Hiranga -** Equitable and Culturally Responsive Curriculum Design and Delivery
- **Taumata -** Embedding Mātauranga Māori
- **Kaupapa Māori** - Integration of Mātauranga Māori and Research-Informed Practice

Quality and Continuous Improvement

These principles guide governance, accountability, evaluation, and continuous improvement to ensure curriculum, academic practice, policies, and organisational systems support positive outcomes for Māori learners while enriching learning experiences and enhancing success for all ākonga:

- **Kia Kotahi te Angitū -** Shared Responsibility and Continuous Improvement

Te Mana

~~*"Ko te manu e kai ana i te miro nōnā te ngahere, ko te manu e kai ana i te Mātauranga nōnā te ao."*~~
~~*"The forest belongs to the bird who feasts on the Miro berry, the world belongs to the bird who feasts on education."*~~

Akoranga Self-Assessment Tool

This tool supports the development, delivery, assessment, review, and continuous improvement of academic programmes, courses, micro-credentials, and related academic practices.

It provides a practical process for evaluating how effectively Te Tiriti o Waitangi and mātauranga Māori are embedded within curriculum, teaching, learning, policy implementation, and academic practice.

The tool supports reflection, evidence informed review, accountability, and quality enhancement, enabling programme teams and decision-makers to identify strengths, inform improvement initiatives, and enhance outcomes for Māori learners while contributing to success for all ākonga.

Referencing

The following documents inform and give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi in Governance, Management and Operations in this framework:

- Education and Training Act (2020)
- Ka Hikitia: Māori Education Strategy, Ministry of Education (2013)
- A Strategic Direction for Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec 2025-2026

TE MANA AKORANGA - SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

The following Self-Assessment Tool supports the practical application, review and continuous improvement of Te Mana Akoranga principles across academic programmes, courses and micro-credentials. Please include page numbers where evidence can be located in PAD (where possible).

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
1.	**Te Tiriti o Waitangi**	**Embedding Te Tiriti o Waitangi across Curriculum, Systems and Processes** *Give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and meet Education and Training (E&T) Act (2020).*	• *Do programme development, assessment, and review processes give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and meet Education and Training Act (2020) requirements?* • *How is Te Tiriti consistently embedded across academic policy, quality systems, governance and institutional processes?*	
2.	**Whanaungatanga**	**Partnership and Consultation** *Māori are key partners in the co-design, delivery, and review of curriculum.*	• *How are Māori (iwi, hapū, whānau and communities of interest) actively engaged as partners in the co-design, delivery, and ongoing review of curriculum?* • *How is this partnership embedded across programme, policy, and institutional decision-making processes?*	

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
3.	**Puukenga**	**Staff Capability and Cultural Competency** *Building staff capability and cultural competency for Māori-informed curriculum and culturally responsive practice.*	• *How does the school ensure staff are trained, supported, and accountable to deliver Māori-informed curriculum and culturally responsive practice?* • *How is staff capability in Māori-informed curriculum delivery and culturally responsive practice embedded through professional learning, policy, quality assurance, and continuous improvement?*	
4.	**Aromatawai (Assessment)**	**Equitable and Culturally Responsive Assessment** *Assessment enables ākonga to demonstrate learning in ways that reflect their strengths, identities, cultures, and aspirations.*	• *How are Mātauranga Māori curriculum and learner achievement assessed in culturally valid ways?* • *How do assessment practices respond to the diverse strengths, identities, and needs of ākonga?* • *How do assessment approaches enable ākonga to demonstrate learning in ways that reflect their culture, identity, tikanga and world views?*	

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
5.	**Ngā Whainga Matua**	**Outcomes** *Learning outcomes recognise Mātauranga Māori and support the aspirations, achievement, and success of Māori learners, whānau, iwi, hapū, and communities.*	• *How do the programme learning outcomes identify, recognise and acknowledge Mātauranga Māori as an achievement?* • *How do learning outcomes reflect the needs and aspirations of Māori learners, whānau, iwi, hapū and communities?* • *How does the programme ensure the curriculum is inclusive of, sensitive to, and conducive to the aspirations of iwi and Māori?*	
6.	**Whai Hua**	**Learner Access, Participation, Achievement and Success** *Learning environments address barriers to equitable access, participation, and success for Māori learners through curriculum design, delivery, and planned outcomes.*	• *How does curriculum design, delivery, and planned outcomes address Māori inequities and remove barriers to access, participation, and success?* • *How are Māori learner outcomes analysed and used to identify and address inequities?* • *How is equity in Māori learner access, participation, achievement, and success monitored and improved over time?*	

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
7.	**Whai Hiranga**	**Equitable and Culturally Responsive Curriculum Design and Delivery** *Curriculum design and delivery are culturally responsive to the strengths, identities, aspirations, and learning needs of Māori learners to support equitable participation, success, and achievement.*	• *How does the programme design and delivery reflect the aspirations, strengths, identities and learning needs of Māori learners and their communities?* • *How do learning approaches, resources, and support services reduce barriers and improve participation and success for Māori learners?* • *How does the programme use feedback, reflection, insights and evaluation to continuously improve curriculum design and delivery for Māori learners?*	
8.	**Taumata**	**Embedding Mātauranga Māori** *Programme design, delivery, assessment, and review embed Mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori, te reo Māori, and Te Taiao perspectives to create culturally responsive learning environments.*	• *How are tikanga Māori embedded in learning and programme delivery to support culturally responsive learning environments?* • *How are Te Taiao perspectives reflected across curriculum, learning activities, and learning environments to strengthen connections to whenua, whakapapa, communities, and sustainable practice?* • *How are Mātauranga Māori, te reo Māori, and tikanga Māori consistently integrated through programme design, delivery, assessment, and review?*	

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
9.	**Kaupapa Māori**	**Integration of Mātauranga Māori, Kaupapa Māori and Research-Informed Practice** *Programmes and courses embed Mātauranga Māori, Māori research, and kaupapa Māori approaches to advance Māori knowledge and learner success.*	• *How does the programme or course recognise and draw upon Mātauranga Māori research and Māori sources of expertise?* • *How does the programme or course contribute to the development, application, and advancement of Mātauranga Māori knowledge?* • *How are Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori approaches, and research-informed practices embedded through curriculum design, delivery, assessment, and review to strengthen Māori knowledge and learner success?*	
10.	**Kia Kotahi te Angitū**	**Shared Responsibility and Continuous Improvement** *Shared responsibility, clear accountability, and continuous improvement contribute to positive social, economic, cultural, educational, and employment outcomes for Māori.*	• *How does the programme and/or course contribute to improved social, economic, cultural, educational, and employment outcomes for Māori?* • *How are responsibility, accountability, and shared ownership for improving Māori learner success reflected across curriculum design, governance, management, and delivery?* • *How are Māori learner outcomes and curriculum effectiveness monitored, evaluated, and used to drive continuous improvement?*	

~~TE MANA AKORANGA:~~TE MANA AKORANGA ~~MĀORI CURRICULUM -~~ SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

The following ~~template is for developing, assessing, monitoring~~**Self-Assessment Tool supports the practical application, review and** ~~evaluating Māori curriculum and content in~~ **continuous improvement of Te Mana Akoranga principles across academic programmes, courses**~~, training schemes~~ **and micro-credentials**. ~~It has been developed for academic management, staff and committees as a resource for ensuring we are able to maintain the highest levels of academic standards for Māori curriculum.~~ Please include page numbers where evidence can be located in PAD (where possible).

NO. ~~PRINCIPLE~~ PRINCIPLE	~~TE TIRITI O WAITANGI~~EXPECTED PRACTICE	~~CURRICULUM AND COURSE DESIGN~~SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	~~MONITORING AND EVALUATION~~EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
1. **Te Tiriti o Waitangi**	**Embedding Te Tiriti o Waitangi across Curriculum, Systems and Processes** *Give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and meet Education and Training (E&T) Act (2020).*	• ~~Has the~~*Do programme development, assessment, and review processes* ~~of your programme or course met the~~*give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and meet Education and Training Act (2020)* ~~statutory requirements with reference to~~*?* • *How is Te Tiriti* ~~o Waitangi,~~*consistently embedded across academic policy, quality systems, governance and* ~~operational~~*institutional processes?*	~~Answer this question after you have completed all other criteria.~~
2. ~~**Akoako: Consultation Whanaungatanga**~~	**Partnership and Consultation** *Māori are key partners in the co-design, delivery, and review of curriculum* ~~**design in regional, hapū, iwi, whanau and intergenerational development**~~.	• *How* ~~have~~*are Māori* ~~key stakeholders~~*(iwi, hapū, whānau and communities of interest* ~~been involved~~*) actively engaged as partners in the co-design* ~~and~~*, delivery, and ongoing review of* ~~the~~ *curriculum?* • *How* ~~Does the programme or course assessment and evaluation process demonstrate that Māori stakeholders and communities of interest have been~~	

			consulted and included in the course development process?*is this partnership embedded across programme, policy, and institutional decision-making processes?*	
1.	Whakaako: Training	Te Tiriti o Waitangi based systems for developing skills that inform academic programmes, policies and quality systems.	• How have staff been educated and/or appropriately trained to have a strong and competent understanding and experience in the Māori curriculum content they are delivering? • Has professional development or training been provided to develop and enhance capacity to deliver Māori curriculum? • How are Māori staff in this programme supported or upskilled to deliver or support Māori curriculum?	
2.	Aromatawai: Assessment.	Assessment is equitable/tika and values cultural diversity and individual needs. Mātauranga Māori curriculum and learning outcomes are formally assessed and evaluated.	• How is Mātauranga Māori curriculum and learning outcomes formally assessed and evaluated? • Are activities inclusive of all akonga? • Are activities and approaches used in assessment appropriate for akonga, their language and culture? • Are assessment tasks fair, free from bias and inclusive of cultural diversity? • Are akonga able to provide assessment responses that are relevant to their culture,	

			tikanga and world views?	
3.	Pūtanga: Learning Outcomes	All curriculum aims to improve Māori social, economic, cultural, education and employment outcomes.	• How do the programme learning outcomes identify, recognise and acknowledge Mātauranga Māori as an achievement? • How do the learning outcomes consider the needs of Māori key stakeholders?	
4.	Wāwata: Aspirations.	All curriculum is inclusive of, sensitive to, and conducive to the aspirations of Māori.	• How does the programme ensure the curriculum is inclusive of, sensitive to, and conducive to the aspirations of Iwi and Māori? • How does the curriculum define achievements which improve education, staircase learning, employment, and vocational pathways and outcomes for Māori?	
5.	Aheitanga: Equality.	Learning environments address and redress Māori inequalities through curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes.	• How do learning environments address Māori inequalities in curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes? • Does the design and delivery of the course consider any unreasonable barriers to access, participation and success by Māori?	
6.	Oritetanga: Inequalities.	Academic access to address Māori inequalities in accordance with the ToW principle of participation.	• How has the development and delivery of the programme and/or course addressed effective education and training delivery to meet the specific learning needs of Māori? • How has the programme and/or course used curriculum design to address Māori inequalities, flexible learning delivery,	

			resourcing to support online learning, digital and other resources that meet the needs of Māori for example, utilising community Māori leaders and the employment of Māori academic staff?	
7.	Matatau: Competency.	Cultural responsiveness to address Māori inequities and uphold, enhance and uplift mana Māori.	• How does this programme and/or course incorporate culturally competent practice and service delivery responsiveness for Māori? • How has the curriculum design and content been inclusive of Tikanga, Te reo and Mātauranga Māori? • How has it supported the development of Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnerships and Education and Training Act (2020) requirements?	
8.	Whakarata: Responsibility	Systems, structures and access to services address Māori inequities and transform vocational education.	• How does the programme incorporate Mātauranga Māori as the responsibility of academic governance, management and staff and not just Māori staff? • How does the curriculum delivered within systems and structures create and/or provide vocational and learning education opportunities that uplift the mana of Māori?	
9.	Whakapakari: Development	Performance measures contribute to actual improvement of social, economic, cultural, education and workforce outcomes for Māori.	• How does the programme and/or course contribute to the improvement of social, economic, cultural, education and employment outcomes for Māori? • How is the curriculum designed and delivered with performance measures and clear, defined responsibilities, accountabilities	

			~~including implications if they are not achieved?~~	
~~10.~~	~~Te Taiao: Learning Environments~~	~~Learning environments address Māori inequities through curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes.~~	~~• How does the programme and/or course consider the learning environment in curriculum design, delivery and planned outcomes?~~ ~~• How does the programme and/or course use Te Reo and Tikanga Māori in ways that demonstrate Mātauranga Māori practices where possible?~~	
~~11.~~	~~Tikanga Māori: Māori Customs.~~	~~Development, delivery, assessment and review incorporates Tikanga Māori protocols as activities and resources to support learning.~~	~~• How do the programme and/or course learning outcomes support extra-curricular Mātauranga Māori learning activities including Māori customs and protocols?~~ ~~• How does the programme and/or course evaluation and assessment processes use these activities to support and enhance achievement of course learning outcomes?~~	
~~12.~~	~~Rangahau: Research~~	~~Programmes and courses recognise, acknowledge and use Mātauranga Māori research in development, delivery, assessment and review processes.~~	~~• How does the programme and/or course formally recognise Mātauranga Māori research sources and acknowledge endorsements by Māori where possible?~~ ~~• How does the programme and/or course contribute to developing Mātauranga Māori knowledge?~~	
~~13.~~	~~Whakakotahi: Integration~~	~~Programmes integrate Mātauranga Māori into~~	~~• How has the Māori content and curriculum been integrated into the programme~~	

		~~**the development, delivery, assessment and review processes in ways that meet the needs of students.**~~	~~design in a way that allows students to understand, develop and build their understanding of Te Reo, Tikanga and Mātauranga Māori?~~	

~~TMA~~

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
3.	Puukenga	**Staff Capability and Cultural Competency** *Building staff capability and cultural competency for Māori-informed curriculum and culturally responsive practice.*	• *How does the school ensure staff are trained, supported, and accountable to deliver Māori-informed curriculum and culturally responsive practice?* • *How is staff capability in Māori-informed curriculum delivery and culturally responsive practice embedded through professional learning, policy, quality assurance, and continuous improvement?*	
4.	Aromatawai (Assessment)	**Equitable and Culturally Responsive Assessment** *Assessment enables ākonga to demonstrate learning in ways that reflect their strengths, identities, cultures, and aspirations.*	• *How are Mātauranga Māori curriculum and learner achievement assessed in culturally valid ways?* • *How do assessment practices respond to the diverse strengths, identities, and needs of ākonga?*	

			• *How do assessment approaches enable ākonga to demonstrate learning in ways that reflect their culture, identity, tikanga and world views?*	

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
5.	Ngā Whainga Matua	**Outcomes** *Learning outcomes recognise Mātauranga Māori and support the aspirations, achievement, and success of Māori learners, whānau, iwi, hapū, and communities.*	• *How do the programme learning outcomes identify, recognise and acknowledge Mātauranga Māori as an achievement?* • *How do learning outcomes reflect the needs and aspirations of Māori learners, whānau, iwi, hapū and communities?* • *How does the programme ensure the curriculum is inclusive of, sensitive to, and conducive to the aspirations of iwi and Māori?*	
6.	Whai Hua	**Learner Access, Participation, Achievement and Success** *Learning environments address barriers to equitable access, participation, and success for Māori learners through curriculum design, delivery, and planned outcomes.*	• *How does curriculum design, delivery, and planned outcomes address Māori inequities and remove barriers to access, participation, and success?* • *How are Māori learner outcomes analysed and used to identify and address inequities?* • *How is equity in Māori learner access, participation, achievement, and success monitored and improved over time?*	

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
7.	Whai Hiranga	**Equitable and Culturally Responsive Curriculum Design and Delivery** *Curriculum design and delivery are culturally responsive to the strengths, identities, aspirations, and learning needs of Māori learners to support equitable participation, success, and achievement.*	• *How does the programme design and delivery reflect the aspirations, strengths, identities and learning needs of Māori learners and their communities?* • *How do learning approaches, resources, and support services reduce barriers and improve participation and success for Māori learners?* • *How does the programme use feedback, reflection, insights and evaluation to continuously improve curriculum design and delivery for Māori learners?*	
8.	Taumata	**Embedding Mātauranga Māori** *Programme design, delivery, assessment, and review embed Mātauranga Māori, tikanga Māori, te reo Māori, and Te Taiao perspectives to create culturally responsive learning environments.*	• *How are tikanga Māori embedded in learning and programme delivery to support culturally responsive learning environments?* • *How are Te Taiao perspectives reflected across curriculum, learning activities, and learning environments to strengthen connections to whenua, whakapapa, communities, and sustainable practice?* • *How are Mātauranga Māori, te reo Māori, and tikanga Māori consistently integrated through programme design, delivery, assessment, and review?*	

NO	PRINCIPLE	EXPECTED PRACTICE	SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	EXAMPLES OF PRACTICE *(add PAD page references)*
9.	Kaupapa Māori	**Integration of Mātauranga Māori, Kaupapa Māori and Research-Informed Practice** *Programmes and courses embed Mātauranga Māori, Māori research, and kaupapa Māori approaches to advance Māori knowledge and learner success.*	• *How does the programme or course recognise and draw upon Mātauranga Māori research and Māori sources of expertise?* • *How does the programme or course contribute to the development, application, and advancement of Mātauranga Māori knowledge?* • *How are Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori approaches, and research-informed practices embedded through curriculum design, delivery, assessment, and review to strengthen Māori knowledge and learner success?*	
10.	Kia Kotahi te Angitū	**Shared Responsibility and Continuous Improvement** *Shared responsibility, clear accountability, and continuous improvement contribute to positive social, economic, cultural, educational, and employment outcomes for Māori.*	• *How does the programme and/or course contribute to improved social, economic, cultural, educational, and employment outcomes for Māori?* • *How are responsibility, accountability, and shared ownership for improving Māori learner success reflected across curriculum design, governance, management, and delivery?* • *How are Māori learner outcomes and curriculum effectiveness monitored, evaluated, and used to drive continuous improvement?*	

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Prof. Martin Carroll, Deputy Chief Executive Academic

Subject: **Artificial Intelligence (AI) Usage Policy — Approval**

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 30 October 2026

Purpose:

To seek the Academic Committee's approval of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Usage Policy.

Background:

The AI Usage Policy was developed by the AI Committee and was subject to extensive consultation across all campuses. The policy was subsequently approved by the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and is now presented to the Academic Committee for final approval.

Recommendation:

That the Academic Committee approve the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Usage Policy.

Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE USAGE POLICY

Approval details

Version number	0.6 (Draft)
Issue date	TBD
Approval authority	CE, on advice from the AI Committee, Academic Committee and SLT
Date of approval	TBD
Policy owner	DCEA
Contact person	Assoc. Prof. James Oldfield
Date of next review	TBD

Version control

Version	Summary of changes	Approved by	Date of Approval
0.1 (2026-03-01)	• New version	DCEA (as a draft)	2026-03-01
0.2 (2026-04-14)	• Added "Unvetted" AI App Classification to §3.5.1 and §3.5.2	DCEA (as a draft)	2026-04-14
0.3 (2026-04-17)	• Amended table in §3.5.3 • Removed §3.5.4, §3.5.5 and §3.5.6 • Added Appendix B	DCEA (as a draft)	2026-04-17
0.4 (2026-05-05)	• Amended minor typographical errors • Added §4.3.1 • Amended policies under §4.3.2	DCEA (as a draft)	2026-05-05
0.5	• Added definitions section • Amended §3.1, §3.3, §3.4, §3.5, §4.2, §4.3, §4.5	DCEA (as a draft)	2026-10-20
0.6	• §2. Position statement added • Minor amendments to §4.3.5, §4.5.2, §5.1 §5.2(a), §5.4.1 • §5.3. Added (d) • §5.6. Added • §7. Added UNZ Position Paper	DCEA (as a draft)	2026-10-21

Contents

Approval details **1**

Version control **1**

Contents **2**

Definitions **3**

1 Audience and Scope **5**

2 Position on AI **5**

3 Policy Purpose **5**

4 General Provisions **5**

4.1 AI Governance 5
4.2 Upholding the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi when using AI 6
4.3 Privacy and Data Protection 6
4.4 Ethical use of AI 6
4.5 Usage of Data with AI 7

5 Provisions for Staff **8**

5.1 Risk Management 8
5.2 Restricted uses of AI 8
5.3 Innovation in Learning and Teaching 8
5.4 Request to add to the MIT & Unitec AI Platforms list ..... 9~~8~~
5.5 Academic Integrity Assessment 9
5.6 Breach of this Policy by Staff 9

6 Provisions for Students **9**

6.1 Approved use of AI in Assessment ..... 10~~9~~
6.2 Breach of this Policy by Students 10

7 Related Documents **10**

Appendix A. MIT and Unitec Approved AI Platforms **11**

Appendix B. Data Type Classifications with Examples **12**

Definitions

For clarity, the terms used in this policy are defined below:

Term	Definition
Artificial Intelligence (AI) system	An AI system is a machine-based system that, for explicit or implicit objectives, infers, from the input it receives, how to generate outputs such as predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions that can influence physical or virtual environments. Different AI systems vary in their levels of autonomy and adaptiveness after deployment. (digital.govt.nz)
AI Governance	Governance involves steering responsible development, deployment, and use of AI technologies throughout their lifecycle, by creating and implementing a range of tools such as voluntary guidelines, policies, regulations, and laws, amongst others. (digital.govt.nz)
Data	Data can be defined as any information in a form capable of being communicated, analysed, or processed (whether by an individual or by computer or other automated means). Data is useful when it can be communicated easily and analysed to gain insights. Data's value stems from its use, re-use, and re-purposing, particularly in large volumes. To properly realise this value, data must be accurate, reliable, and free from bias. (digital.govt.nz)
Generative Artificial Intelligence	Generative AI is a type of AI system that can create or generate new content such as text, images, video and music based off models and patterns detected in existing datasets. (OECD) (digital.govt.nz)
Māori Data Sovereignty	**Māori Data Sovereignty** recognises that Māori data should be subject to Māori governance. Māori data sovereignty supports tribal sovereignty and the realisation of Māori and Iwi aspirations. (temanararaunga.maori.nz)
Semi-autonomous AI system	An AI system that can perform tasks, generate outputs, make recommendations, or take actions independently within defined parameters, but which remains subject to meaningful human oversight, review, approval, or intervention before significant outcomes are implemented. (oecd.ai)
Fully-autonomous AI system	An AI system that can independently determine and execute actions, decisions, or workflows in pursuit of its objectives with limited or no real-time human review, approval, or intervention after deployment. (oecd.ai)

https://www.digital.govt.nz/standards-and-guidance/technology-and-architecture/artificial-intelligence/responsible-ai-guidance-for-the-public-service-genai/glossary-of-ai-terms

https://www.temanararaunga.maori.nz

https://oecd.ai/en/dashboards/policy-initiatives/updated-oecd-definition-of-an-ai-system-4108

1 Audience and Scope

This policy applies to the staff and students of Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec (MIT and Unitec) in the course of their work/academic activities, and all other people who use the digital technologies of the Institute.

2 Position on AI[1]

MIT and Unitec recognises that AI has a vast and expanding impact on nearly all areas of human activity - work life and personal life. AI is a part of education, resesarch, work and society. AI can support and accelerate engagement, learning, creativity, research and productivity. AI also creates risks, including (but not limited to) inaccurate biases, privacy breaches, misconduct, adverse environmental impacts and loss of trust and confidence.

MIT and Unitec believes that it has a responsibility to prepare learners for this AI-impacted world. As such, it will endeavour to incorporate an understanding of AI and its impact as much as possible and appropriate into curriculum and the learning experience.

It will also seek to leverage AI, where it is safe and appropriate to do so, in the way that it operates in order to optimise the overall learner and staff experience.

3 Policy Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide a framework to guide the use of AI technologies at MIT and Unitec. The following objectives are within the scope of this policy:

(a) Upholding the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi when using AI;

(b) Privacy and Data Protection: Use of AI protects personal privacy and complies with the Privacy Act 2020;

(c) Risk Management: AI systems are selected and deployed with risks identified and mitigated to protect the institution and stakeholders from harm;

(d) Ethical use of AI: Use of AI is conducted in alignment with the MIT and Unitec Ethical Framework;

(e) Academic Integrity and Authentic Assessment: AI is used in assessments in a way that maintains academic integrity while providing authenticity of assessment tasks; and

(f) Innovation in Learning and Teaching: AI is used in ways to enhance educational outcomes and administrative effectiveness.

4 General Provisions

4.1 AI Governance

The executive leadership team will establish an AI Committee (AIC) to provide AI Governance, advise on AI policy and strategy.

[1] This position acknowledges and draws upon the *Universities New Zealand Sector AI Position Statement*.

4.2 Upholding the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi when using AI

The MIT and Unitec AI Committee has endorsed the following documents regarding their guidance on upholding the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi when using AI:

(a) Te Mana Raraunga Māori Data Sovereignty Network (October 2018). *Principles of Māori Data Sovereignty*

(b) Royal Society Te Apārangi (June 2025). *Guidelines for the best-practice use of generative artificial intelligence in research in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Guidelines for the best-practice use of generative artificial intelligence in research in Aotearoa New Zealand (Online)

4.3 Privacy and Data Protection

4.3.1 Transparency

Staff and students must disclose when and how they have used AI when it has been used to generate content or make of substantive modifications. However, disclosure is not required for routine assistance such as spelling, grammar, formatting, or similar minor enhancements. Individuals have the right to know when they are interacting with, or subject to an AI system.

4.3.2 Accountability

Users of AI are accountable for their actions and decisions, even when assisted by AI. Any decision or output involving AI must have a clearly identified human answerable for it. Users of AI are accountable for the accuracy and reliability of their AI outputs.

4.3.3 Privacy Rights and Informed Consent

Whenever AI systems collect, use, or analyse personal information, those accountable in the institution will ensure compliance with the Privacy Act 2020 and obtain informed consent from the individuals concerned where appropriate. Users will also protect the confidentiality of sensitive or commercial information when using AI.

4.3.4 Data Purpose Limitation and Minimisation

Any personal or confidential information gathered for an AI related activity must be necessary and proportionate to the legitimate purpose. Data collected for a specific purpose will not be intentionally repurposed for unrelated uses without consent.

4.3.5 Audit and monitoring

MIT and Unitec reserve the right to audit the usage of data and AI systems for compliance against this and other policies or legal obligations. Anyone found to have breached these policies or obligations may face disciplinary procedures.

4.4 Ethical use of AI

MIT and Unitec will develop an ethical framework to guide its engagement with AI. In the interim, guidance can be found within the Royal Society Te Apārangi (June 2025). *Guidelines for the best-practice use of generative artificial intelligence in research in Aotearoa New*

Zealand. Guidelines for the best-practice use of generative artificial intelligence in research in Aotearoa New Zealand (Online)

4.5 Usage of Data with AI

4.5.1 AI Application Classifications

AI applications are classified into ~~four~~ five categories as they are considered by the AI Committee.

AI Application Classification	**Description**
Controlled	AI applications that are recognised by AIC as featuring the highest level of security and reliability. These applications are likely only available to a limited group of kaimahi and are intended for specific purposes
Supported	AI applications that are centrally managed and licensed by MIT and Unitec. These applications are effective at what they do, treat our data securely and protect the privacy of their users
Permitted	AI applications that have been reviewed by AIC and are permitted for specific use, perhaps subject to certain settings being in effect.
Unvetted	AI applications that have not been reviewed by AIC and are not actively Controlled, Supported, Permitted or Prohibited.
Prohibited	AI applications that have been reviewed by AIC and found to pose too great a risk to be used as part of MIT and Unitec activities

4.5.2 Data Classifications

Data is classified according to the MIT and Unitec Information Classification Standard, a contextualised summary of which is shown below. Examples of data for each Data Classification are shown in Appendix B~~Appendix B~~ and are regularly updated.

Data Classification	**Description**
Unclassified	Data that is publicly available through the web or other sources. The assumption is that this data is not sensitive in any way (and has likely been used for AI training already).
In-Confidence	Data that contains confidential and/or commercially sensitive information.
Sensitive	Data related to business operations such as licensed teaching resources, contracts and other business arrangements.
Restricted	Data that is legally privileged, certain personal records, medical records

4.5.3 Permission to use MIT and Unitec data in AI systems

AI Application Classification	Data Classification			
	Unclassified	In-Confidence	Sensitive	Restricted
Controlled	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Supported	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Permitted	Yes	Yes	No	No
Unvetted	Yes	No	No	No
Prohibited	No	No	No	No

5 Provisions for Staff

5.1 Risk Management

In addition to adherring to the provisions o fthis policy, staff are expected to consider and manage all risks associated with their use of AI.

5.2 Restricted uses of AI

AI may not be used for the following purposes without specific written permission from the relevant Executive:

(a) Evaluation and marking of student summative assessment without human analysis, interpretation and final decisions;

(b) Transcription of meeting recordings using any tool other than those classified as supported within the MIT and Unitec digital environment;

(c) Use of a semi or fully autonomous AI tool within any MIT and Unitec system (including, but not limited to, LMS and Library systems);

Kaimahi may not use MIT and Unitec sensitive or restricted data with AI on personal devices (excluding the use of Microsoft tools accessed under your MIT & Unitec account).

5.3 Innovation in Learning and Teaching

Innovative learning and teaching practices utilising AI are encouraged with the proviso that they must:

(a) only utilise permitted or supported tools from the MIT and Unitec AI Platforms list if participation is required of ākonga.

(b) avoid restricted uses listed in section 5.2~~5.3~~ Restricted uses of AI~~Restricted uses of AI~~;

(c) avoid using prohibited tools from the MIT and Unitec AI Platforms list; and

(d) do not require learners to use AI tools at their own expense, unless properly approved in advance in accordance with the MIT and Unitec additional course costs procedure.

5.4 Request to add to the MIT & Unitec AI Platforms list

Prior to AI tools or platforms being designated with a classification they must be endorsed by the AI Committee and evaluated from legal, financial and security perspectives. MIT and Unitec kaimahi may request to have an AI tool or platform added to the MIT and Unitec AI Platforms list by completing the following steps (pending):

(a) Check the MIT and Unitec AI Platforms list to ensure your AI tool or platform is not currently listed and to consider any alternatives that are already approved; and

(b) To request a classification of a new tool, complete the "New AI Tool or Platform" justification form and submit as directed.

(c) To request approval for the addition of an AI feature to an existing tool, complete the "AI feature approval request for existing platforms/tools" justification form and submit as directed.

5.5 Academic Integrity Assessment

AI-related matters are referred to in the following governance documents (these are subject to change; refer to the most recent version).

5.5.1 MIT and Unitec policies, procedures and guidance:

(a) MITU Assessment Policy and Procedures

5.5.2 MIT policies, procedures and guidance:

(a) MIT Managing AI in Assessment

(b) MIT Protocols for the use of Turnitin

5.5.3 Unitec policies, procedures and guidance:

(a) AC2.8 Academic Integrity Procedure

(b) AC2.1 Assessment and Grading Procedures

(c) Academic Integrity Web Page

5.6 Breach of this Policy by Staff

A breach of this policy by staff may lead to disciplinary action.

6 Provisions for Students

MIT and Unitec has a responsibility to ensure that ākonga have mastered certain skills independently and thus authentically meet the required outcomes of their course or programme of study. MIT and Unitec also recognise that there is no aspect of work or life that is or will not be impacted by AI, and therefore it has a responsibility to prepare learners for an AI-impacted world. For this reason, policies and procedures are made from time to time to ensure that learning can be authenticated in a context in which AI also impacts the learning, assessment and authentication processes themselves.

6.1 Approved use of AI in Assessment

(a) For each course, any use of AI in assessment by ākonga must be approved by their course lecturer in advance.

(b) Approved forms of AI use for each course are listed on the relevant Moodle or Canvas page.

(c) Any use of generative AI in assessments must be appropriately acknowledged following the guidance in the MITU Assessment Policy and Procedures.

(d) Where AI is approved for study, research, or assessment purposes, kaimahi and ākonga must follow the directions of their lecturer, Student Regulations, Student Code of Conduct or relevant programme documentation before using AI, and then only in accordance with this policy and any other applicable policies or processes.

6.2 Breach of this Policy by Students

A breach of this policy by ākonga may be considered a breach of the MITU Student Regulations or the Academic Integrity Procedure, and may result in disciplinary action under the MITU Student Misconduct Procedures.

7 Related Documents

The following documents have been endorsed by the AI Committee for application as appropriate at MIT and Unitec. Where there is conflict between this policy and these reference documents, the policy will have priority effect.

- Universities New Zealand (August 2026). *Universities New Zealand Sector AI Position Statement. Universities New Zealand Sector AI Position Statement | Universities New Zealand - Te Pōkai Tara, last accessed 2026-10-21.*
- MacCallum, K., Parsons, D., Mhaghegh, M (2024). *The Scaffolded AI Literacy (SAIL) Framework for Education*. The Scaffolded AI Literacy (SAIL) Framework for Education, last accessed 2026-03-02.
- Royal Society Te Apārangi (June 2025). *Guidelines for the best-practice use of generative artificial intelligence in research in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Guidelines for the best-practice use of generative artificial intelligence in research in Aotearoa New Zealand (Online), last accessed 2026-03-02.
- Te Mana Raraunga Māori Data Sovereignty Network (October 2018). *Principles of Māori Data Sovereignty* (TMR+Māori+Data+Sovereignty+Principles+Oct+2018.pdf, last accessed 2026-03-02.

Appendix A. MIT and Unitec Approved AI Platforms

AI App Classification	AI App
Controlled	•
Supported	• Microsoft CoPilot (within MIT and Unitec's digital environment) • Cogniti (within MIT and Unitec's digital environment)
Permitted	•
Unvetted	•
Prohibited	• Otter.ai

Note: This is an example only, a live online version will be made available at launch of the policy and regularly updated as new classifications are confirmed.

Appendix B. Data Type Classifications with Examples

Data Type Classification	Data Examples
Unclassified	• Promotional materials • Publicly available learning materials • Finalised policies and procedures
In-Confidence	• Teaching resources developed within MIT & Unitec • Programme documentation • Project reports • Internal meeting minutes • Draft policies and procedures
Sensitive	• Unpublished research data • Student activity, results and assessment data • Data related to business operations such as contracts and other business arrangements. • Personal contact details • Financial information • Enrolment records • Employment details
Restricted	• Strategic working papers • Change proposals

Note: This is an example only and will be replaced with an online live version developed by a representative group of experts from across the organisation.

Memo to: Academic Committee
From: Prof Martin Carroll, DCE Academic
Subject: **Subcommittee Membership Nominations**
Classification: **Unclassified**
Date: 28 October 2026

Purpose

To seek Academic Committee's approval for the appointment of members to Academic Committee Subcommittees in accordance with the Terms of Reference.

Background

As part of the establishment of the Academic Committee subcommittee structure, nominations for membership are being progressed in accordance with the subcommittee's Terms of Reference.

Nomination Received
Pacific Academic Advisory Committee:

Name	Position	Membership
Tu Nuualiitia	Student Experience Partner, Trades and Services	Member
Sione Kavaliku	Senior Lecturer, Automotive	Member
Zainal Shah	Lecturer, School of Digital Technologies	Member

RECOMMENDATION:
That the Academic Committee approve the appointment of Tu Nuualiitia, Sione Kavaliku, Zainal Shah as academic staff, nominated by the Deputy Chief Executive Academic on advice from Heads of School, for a period of two (2) years with the possibility of renewal for a second consecutive two (2) year term only

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Wiremu Manaia, Director Māori Education & Viv Merito, Director Maori Success

Subject: Proposed MAAC Representation on Academic Subcommittees

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 27 October 2026

Purpose

To seek the Academic Committee's approval to appoint the Māori Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC) representatives to Academic Committee subcommittees, in accordance with the relevant Terms of Reference.

Background

As part of establishing the Academic Committee's subcommittee structure, nominations for membership are being progressed under the relevant Terms of Reference.

Nominations

Academic subcommittees	Proposed MAAC representative	Membership basis
Academic Approvals Committee (AAC)	Jennifer Haraki	ToR provision A
Academic Quality Committee (AQC)	Vivienne Merito	ToR provision A
Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)	Kayne Haira	ToR provision A
Research Ethics Committee (REC)	Diane Tamati	ToR provision A
Programme Advisory Oversight Committee (PAOC)	Hana Hohapata	ToR provision B

Membership provisions under the relevant Terms of Reference

A: Terms of Reference for AAC, AQC, LTC and REC

One member nominated by the Chair of the Māori Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC), for a term of two years, renewable once for a further consecutive two-year term.

B: Terms of Reference for PAOC

One senior Māori staff member, nominated by the Deputy Chief Executive Academic on the advice of the Director Māori Education and the Director Māori Success, for a term of two years, renewable once for a further consecutive two-year term.

Recommendation

That the Academic Committee approve the proposed MAAC representatives to the subcommittees, as set out in the nomination schedule, in accordance with the applicable Terms of Reference.

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Academic Committee Secretary

Subject: **Academic Committee and Subcommittee Memberships**

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 22 October 2026

Purpose:

To present the current membership schedules for the Academic Committee and its subcommittees in accordance with the Committee's work plan.

Recommendation:

That the Academic Committee receive the membership schedules for the Academic Committee and its subcommittees.

Appendices

1. Academic Committee Membership (p.2)
2. Academic Committee Executive Committee Membership (p.3)
3. Academic Approvals Committee Membership (p.4)
4. Academic Quality Committee Membership (p.5)
5. Disabilities Academic Advisory Committee Membership (p.6)
6. International Academic Advisory Committee Membership (p.7)
7. Learning & Teaching Committee Membership (p.8)
8. Māori Academic Advisory Committee Membership (p.9)
9. Pacific Academic Advisory Committee Membership (p.10)
10. Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee Membership (p.11)
11. Programme Advisory Oversight Committee Membership (p.12)
12. Research Committee Membership (p.13)
13. Research Ethics Committee Membership (p.14)

Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec

Academic Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Deputy Chief Executive Academic	Prof Martin Carroll	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chief Executive – Executive Director	Prof Christina Hong	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success	Dr Simon Nash	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Māori Education	Dr Wiremu Manaia	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Pacific Success	Doana Fatuleai	Sep 2026	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Māori Success	Viv Merito	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Research and Enterprise	Dr Rosanne Ellis	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Schools and Performance	Chris King	—	—	*Ex-officio*
General Manager, Schools	Pip Schollum-Manase	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Head of School	Kylie Smith	Apr 2026	Apr 2028	Two years
	Peter McPherson	Apr 2026	Apr 2028	Two years
Professoriate/Principal Lecturers	Vacant			Two years
	Vacant			Two years
Student Representative	Thao (Tiffany) Nguyen	Feb 2026	Dec 2026	One year
	Terina Haimona	Feb 2026	Dec 2026	One year
Chair, Ethics Committee	Eric Boamah	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Research Committee	Dr Rosanne Ellis	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Postgraduate Research and Scholarship Committee	Dr Rosanne Ellis	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Programme Advisory Group Oversight Committee	Julie Prentice	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Academic Approvals Committee	Chris Park	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Academic Quality Committee	Simon Tries	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Learning & Teaching Committee	Dr Simon Nash	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Māori Academic Advisory Committee	Dr Wiremu Manaia	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Pacific Academic Advisory Committee	Doana Fatuleai	Sep 2026	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, International Academic Advisory Committee	Jeff Howe	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Chair, Disability Academic Advisory Committee	Annette Pitovao	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Co-opted members	Vacant			

Standing Observers	Prof. Sharon Brownie
	Ward Kamo.

Academic Committee Executive Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis
Deputy Chief Executive Academic	Prof Martin Carroll **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience and Success	Dr Simon Nash	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi	Simon Tries	—	—	*Ex-officio*
General Manager, Academic Services	Chris Park	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Schools and Performance	Chris King	—	—	*Ex-officio*
General Manager, Schools	Pip Schollum-Manase	—	—	*Ex-officio*

Academic Approvals Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
General Manager, Academic Services	Chris Park **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi	Simon Tries	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Head, Academic Quality	Helen Perry	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Manager, Te Puna Ako	Jocelyn Williams	—	—	*Ex-officio*
MAAC Representative	Vacant			Two years
PAAC Representative	Jo Schwenke	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Head of School	Sandi Eickhoff	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Head of School	Paul Jeurissen	Oct-26	Oct-28	Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	David McCurdy	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	Christoph Schnoor	Oct-26	Oct-28	Two years
PC Chair	Kate Harder	Aug-26	Aug-28	Two years
PC Chair	Jayne Jackson	Aug-26	Aug-28	Two years

Academic Quality Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Director, Te Korowai Kahurangi	Simon Tries **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
General Manager, Academic Services	Chris Park	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Head, Academic Quality	Helen Perry	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Manager, Digital Learning	James Oldfield	—	—	*Ex-officio*
MAAC Representative	Vacant			Two years
Head of School	Craig Lucas	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Head of School	Sue Emerson	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	Fatma James	Oct-26	Oct-28	Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	Yusef Patel	Oct-26	Oct-28	Two years
PC Chair	Cornelis Kok	Oct-26	Oct-28	Two years
PC Chair	Gerard Lovell	Oct-26	Oct-28	Two years

Disabilities Academic Advisory Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Director, Student Success	Annette Pitovao **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Academic Staff	Dave Hicks	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Laura Harvey	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Melanie Wong	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Support Staff	Radhika Kumar	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Support Staff	Lele Talagi	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Support Staff	Mirabel Mowat-Smith	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Support Staff	Sabrina Sharma	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Student Representative	Nikiah Rodriguez	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Student Representative	Roland Blignaut	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Co-Opted member	Ruth Laing	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years
Co-Opted member	Trisha Edwards	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years

International Academic Advisory Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Director, International	Jeff Howe **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Academic Staff	Vacant			Two years
Academic Staff	Vacant			Two years
Support Staff	Don Sirimanne	Mar-26	Mar-28	Two years
Support Staff	Jeffrey Wu	Mar-26	Mar-28	Two years
Support Staff	Luka Crosbie	Mar-26	Mar-28	Two years
Support Staff	Simon Tries	Mar-26	Mar-28	Two years
Student Representative	Methindu Liyanage	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Student Representative	Siosifa Sifa	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year

Learning and Teaching Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Deputy Chief Executive, Learner Experience & Success	Simon Nash **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Manager, Te Puna Ako	Jocelyn Williams	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Manager, Digital Learning	James Oldfield	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Head, Academic Quality	Helen Perry	—	—	*Ex-officio*
MAAC representative	Vacant			Two years
PAAC representative	Vacant			Two years
Student Representative	Akenese Tuala	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Student Representative	Beyonce Kahui	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Academic Staff	Becca Wood	Aug-26	Aug-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Bob Morton	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Cameron Moore	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Craig Goodhue	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Guillermo Ramirez Prado	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Intan Bahri	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Jay Kumar	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Lee-Anne Turton	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Lorne Roberts	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Nick Kearns	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Quaanita Barthis	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Rebecca Ho	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Samah Ridha	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Sophia Li	May-26	May-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Yasaman Emad	May-26	May-28	Two years

Māori Academic Advisory Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Pou Whakarewa Mātauranga Māori - Director, Māori Education	Wiremu Manaia **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Taharangi – Director, Māori Success	Vivienne Merito	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Kaumatua, MIT	Vince Hapi	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Kaumatua, Unitec	Hohepa Renata	—	—	*Ex-officio*
PAAC Representative	Vacant			Two years
Academic Staff	Vacant			Two years
Academic Staff	Vacant			Two years
Support Staff	Vacant			Two years
Support Staff	Vacant			Two years
Student Representative	Beyonce Kahui	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Student Representative	Kianu Toia-Tawhai	Jun-26	Dec-26	One year

Pacific Academic Advisory Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Director, Pacific Success	Doana Fatuleai **(Chair)**	Sep 2026	—	*Ex-officio*
MAAC Representative	Ngaire Molyneux	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Academic Staff	Vacant			Two years
Academic Staff	Vacant			Two years
Support Staff	Liz Keneti	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Support Staff	Luke Fleming	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Support Staff	Rokosiga Morrison	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Support Staff	Janet Tawaketini	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Student Representative	Natara lata Pimoe	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Student Representative	Maimairasa Leituala	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Co-opted Member	Luka Crosbie	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Co-opted Member	Mere Tupaea	Aug-26	Aug-28	Two years

Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Director, Research and Enterprise	Dr Rosanne Ellis **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
MAAC representative	Ngaire Molyneux	Aug-26	Aug-28	Two years
PAAC representative	Ioane Aleke Fa'avae	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
General staff	Dr Ahmad Wedyan	Aug-26	Aug-28	Two years
General staff	Dr Hamid Sharifzadeh	Oct-26	Oct-26	Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	Dr Mel Wong	Jun-26	Jun-28	Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	Dr Annabel Pretty	Aug-26	Aug-28	Two years
Student Representative	Alandara Mahanama	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Student Representative	Vacant			

Programme Advisory Oversight Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Director, Pathways and External Engagement	Julie Prentice **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
Director, Schools and Performance	Chris King	—	—	*Ex-officio*
General Manager, Schools	Pip Schollum-Manase	—	—	*Ex-officio*
PAC Chair	Vacant			Two years
PAC Chair	Vacant			Two years
PAC Chair	Vacant			Two years
PAC Chair	Vacant			Two years
PAC Chair	Vacant			Two years
Māori staff member	Vacant			Two years
Pacific staff member	Aiono Manu Fa'aea	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years

Research Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Basis/Term
Director, Research and Enterprise	Dr Rosanne Ellis **(Chair)**	—	—	*Ex-officio*
MAAC representative	Deborah Heke	May-26	May-28	Two years
PAAC representative	James Prescott	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years
Head of School	Vanessa Byrnes	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Research Group Leader	Dr Alaa Al Janaby	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	Asso Prof. Linda Kestle	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Early Career Researcher	Dr Maia Topp	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Research Support Staff	Hadley Brown	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Student Representative	Natara lata Pimoe	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Student Representative	Vacant			
Co-opted Member	Anna Wheeler	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years

Research Ethics Committee Membership

Position	Name	Term Commencement	Term Expiry	Appointment Term
REC Chair	Dr Eric Boamah **(Chair)**	Jan-26	Jan-28	Two years
MAAC representative	Vacant			Two years
PAAC representative	Daisy Bentley-Gray	Jul-26	Jul-28	Two years
Head of School	Dr Linda Aumua	Apr-26	Apr-28	Two years
Head of School	Vacant			Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	Vacant			Two years
Professoriate/ Principal Lectures	Vacant			Two years
Student Representative	Nikiah Rodriguez	Apr-26	Dec-26	One year
Student Representative	Vacant			One year
Co-opted Member	Associate Prof. Lian Wu	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years
Co-opted Member	Dr. Caralyn Kemp	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years
Co-opted Member	Dr. Kaberi Rajendra	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years
Co-opted Member	Dr. Soheil Pour	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years
Co-opted Member	Diane Tamati	Sept-26	Sept-28	Two years

Academic Committee Self-Assessment 2026

This self-assessment invites each Academic Committee member to reflect on the Committee's effectiveness in fulfilling its governance responsibilities under its Terms of Reference.
The self-assessment is intended to support reflection on Academic Committee's contribution to academic governance, the quality of its deliberations and decisions, its oversight of academic activities, and opportunities to strengthen its effectiveness.
The responses will inform a collective review of the Committee's performance and help identify priorities for improvement. The assessment is of the Committee as a governance body rather than an assessment of individual members.

* Required

1. The Academic Committee effectively fulfils its responsibilities under its Terms of Reference. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

2. The Committee's discussions are focused on matters of academic significance requiring Committee level oversight, advice or decision making. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

3. The Committee effectively oversees its subcommittees and uses their work and reporting to support oversight and continuous improvement of academic quality. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

4. The Academic Committee's performance of its responsibility to "set and promote quality standards for research, and to give ethical approval for research by staff and students involving human subjects (including student course work research) and/or a Māori or Te Tiriti o Waitangi dimension", was effective. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

5. The Committee effectively oversees the development, approval, monitoring and review of policies and procedures for academic activities. *

- [ ] Strong agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

6. The Committee effectively fulfils its responsibility to monitor, defend and promote academic freedom. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

7. The Committee appropriately considers relevant stakeholder feedback to inform its deliberations, advice and oversight of academic activities. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

8. The Committee's decisions and recommendations are communicated clearly and in a timely manner to relevant staff and stakeholders as appropriate. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

9. The Committee has an appropriate mix of expertise, experience and representation to fulfil its responsibilities effectively. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

10. The Committee works collectively and constructively, with a shared understanding of its purpose, responsibilities and delegated authority. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

11. Subcommittee reports provide timely, relevant and sufficient information to support informed Committee oversight and decision making, including identifying significant issues and matters requiring further attention. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

12. Papers are timely, clear, accurate and sufficiently analytical to support informed consideration and decision-making. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

13. The Committee discussions are constructive, appropriately challenging and focused on the key issues, implications and decisions before the Committee. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

14. The meeting environment enables members to contribute openly and constructively, raise concerns and offer differing perspectives. *

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

15. What does the Academic Committee do particularly well, and/or which aspects of its work contribute most to its effectiveness? *

16. Where could the Academic Committee improve its effectiveness, and/or what one change would make the greatest difference over the next year? *

17. Are there any significant academic governance, academic quality or emerging risk matters that you believe require greater attention from the Academic Committee? *

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Microsoft. The data you submit will be sent to the form owner.

Microsoft Forms

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Academic Committee Secretary

Subject: **2027 Academic Committee Meeting Schedule**

Classification: Unclassified

Date: 22 October 2026

Purpose:

To present the proposed 2027 meeting schedule for the Academic Committee in accordance with the Committee's work plan.

Recommendation:

That the Academic Committee receive and note the proposed 2027 meeting schedule.

2027 Academic Committee Meeting Schedule

Meeting Date	Papers Due (Thursday)	Venue
Wednesday 3 February 2027	Thursday 21 January 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 3 March 2027	Thursday 18 February 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 7 April 2027	Monday 22 March 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 5 May 2027	Thursday 22 April 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 2 June 2027	Thursday 20 May 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 7 July 2027	Thursday 24 June 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 4 August 2027	Thursday 22 July 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 1 September 2027	Thursday 19 August 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 6 October 2027	Thursday 23 September 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 3 November 2027	Thursday 21 October 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams
Wednesday 1 December 2027	Thursday 18 November 2027	Ōtara Campus ND317 and Teams

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: **Chair of DAAC:** Annette Pitovao, Director Student Success

Subject: Disability Academic Advisory Committee Minutes Hui 2 in August 2026

Classification: In-Confidence

Date: October 2026

Recommendations

That the Academic Committee receive the approved minutes from Hui 3 for DAAC in August 2026.

Attachment

Minutes

Disability Academic Advisory Committee MIT and Unitec
AGENDA and MINUTES

Date: 25/08/2026
Time: 9-10
Venue: Teams
https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/46404464565697?p=JPOk0cJ1Hb5N5MhEvC

1 Whakatuwheratanga | Opening

Kia tūturu tātou *(Let's be real)*
Kia manaaki tātou *(Let's be caring)*
Kia whai hiranga tātou *(Let's pursue excellence)*
Kia tūhonohono tātou *(Let's connect)*

Whano! Whano!
Haramai te toki!
Haumi ē!
Hui ē!
Taiki ē!

1.1 Attendance & Apologies

Members:	Role	Present	Apologies	Absent	Proxy
Annette Pitovao	Director, Student Success	✓			
Dave Hicks	Academic Programme Manager, Supported Learning	✓			
Jochelee Punzalan	Code of Practice Lead	✓			
Lele Talagi	Interim Team Leader, Access4Success	✓			
Laura Harvey	Head of School, Environmental and Animal Science	✓			
Mirabel Mowat-Smith	Organisational Development and Equity Business Partner	✓			

Melanie Wong	Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work		✓		None
Nikiah Rodriguez	Waitākere Student Representative, Unitec		✓		None
Radhika Kumar	Head of School, Health & Applied Counselling	✓			
Roland Blignaut	MIT Disability Student Representative	✓			
Ruth Laing	Academic Development Lecturer, Learning and Achievement	✓			
Sabrina Sharma	Team Leader Disability Support	✓			
Sophia de Fossard (as observer with speaker rights)	Access4Success Project Lead	✓			
Trisha Edwards	Student Outreach Advisor, Student Village	✓			

In attendance:

Annette Pitovao	Director, Student Success				
Dave Hicks	Academic Programme Manager, Supported Learning				
Jochelee Punzalan	Code of Practice Lead				
Laura Harvey	Head of School, Environmental and Animal Science				
Lele Talagi	Interim Team Leader, Access4Success				

Mirabel Mowat-Smith	Organisational Development and Equity Business Partner				
Radhika Kumar	Head of School, Health & Applied Counselling				
Roland Blignaut	MIT Disability Student Representative				
Ruth Laing	Academic Development Lecturer, Learning and Achievement				
Sabrina Sharma	Team Leader Disability Support				
Sophia de Fossard	Access4Success Project Lead				
Trisha Edwards	Student Outreach Advisor, Student Village				

RESOLVED: That the apologies be received from:

- Mel Wong
- Nikiah Rodriguez

1.2 Declaration of Interest (if applicable)

Nil

1.3 Confirmation of Previous Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2026 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Moved: Roland Blignaut
Seconded: Trisha Edwards
CARRIED

1.4 Action Register

ID	Action Item	Details	Responsible	Status/Timelines
1	Build 2026 Action Register	Develop and maintain a centralised table of all action items (this register)	Jo Punzalan	Done
2	Call for agenda items for DAAC Hui #2	Invite members to submit agenda items for June hui	Annette Pitovao	Done
3	Call for Deputy Chair nominations	Seek nominations for Deputy Chair role	Jo Punzalan	Done
4	Call for additional members	Seek nominations for up to 3 co-opted members	Jo Punzalan	Done
5	Send Disability Action Plan (old/expired) and Disability Strategy	Email to members	Annette Pitovao	Done
6	Observer with speaker rights status for Sophia de Fossard on committee	Everyone agreed. Formalise Sophia as “observer” member of DAAC	Jo & Annette	Done
7	Sophia to present DAP update	Provide memo and present DAP update to DAAC members	Sophia de Fossard	25 August 2026
8	Introduce Mel to Sophia	Connect for Dyslexia-Friendly Quality Mark discussion	Sabrina Sharma	Done
9	Seek cross-committee input on the Disability Action update	Engage other Advisory Committee Chairs for Pasifika & Māori perspectives	Annette Pitovao	After DAP update is ready
10	Explore in-person hui option	Look for funding/logistics for possible in-person meeting. Annette is looking at venues in Onehunga area. Committee members to please send their dietary requirements (if any) to Jo	Annette Pitovao & Jo Punzalan	Aim for mid-year break - Will do mid-spring break
11	Establish membership continuity process	Define process when members leave/resign in accordance with ToR	Committee / Annette	End of each hui
12	Set up correspondence process	Ensure all official correspondence (e.g., NZQA) is shared and tabled, the member who received the correspondence will present it to the team for discussion	All members (lead: Chair)	Every hui
13	Call for agenda items for DAAC Hui #3	Invite members to submit agenda items for August hui	Jo Punzalan	Done

14	Communication with nominated kaimahi for co-option	Reach out to nominated/co-opted members, submit their names to the Academic Committee Secretariat, and invite them to the next hui	Annette Pitovao & Jo Punzalan	Done Trisha Edwards accepted nomination (21 July) Ruth Laing accepted nomination (22 July)
15	Confirmation of Committee Membership	Reach out to Nikiah Rodriguez through Christine Fusio is she is aware of her membership and role in DAAC	Jo Punzalan	Done. Nikiah replied and confirmed attendance to the next 2 meetings
16	To accommodate other business not included in the agenda	To delegate time for members to raise other items that were not included in the agenda, and for these to be tabled as Section 2.3 in the Minutes.	Annette Pitovao & Jo Punzalan	From DAAC Hui #2 onwards
17	Email copy of MITU 2025 EPI to all members	Annette to email copy to all members	Annette Pitovao	Done
18	Understand the MITU 2025 EPI summary	Read, absorb, and understand the analysis from the POV of disabled learners	All members	Before August hui
19	Draft a memo to AC re: feedback on 2025 EPI Summary	Memo to send feedback to AC	Annette Pitovao & Jo Punzalan	Before next AC's hui

2 General Business

2.1 Chairperson's Report

Presenter: Annette Pitovao

The Chair spoke to her report on the agenda. The items that she expanded on were:

- The Chair welcomed all the Committee Members and staff to the meeting.
- Trisha Edwards and Ruth Laing were also introduced as co-opted members
- Updates on the Action Register
- Reminder that we will need to send our feedback on the 2025 EPI Summary to the Academic Committee

RESOLVED: That the Disability Academic Advisory Committee received the Chairperson's Report.

Moved: Dave Hicks
Seconded: Radhika Kumar
CARRIED

2.2 Correspondence

Nil

3 Standing Items

3.1 Reports

- **2025 EPI Summary**
    - Lele raised concerns about how disability data is currently represented in EPI reporting, noting that a single disability figure may not accurately reflect the range of experiences and support needs across the Western campuses.
        - 406 students had signalled a disability at enrolment, noting there were 16 duplicates in the data.
        - 260 students had engaged with Access for Success.
        - 272 students had disclosed a disability at enrolment but had not verified/engaged through Access for Success.
        - 126 students had disclosed a disability but progressed through their studies without engaging with disability-specific support.
        - The EPI data therefore risks giving the impression that students who disclose a disability are being supported through disability services, when a significant number do not engage with those services.
    - Some students may access support through other channels, such as pastoral care or academic staff, while others may choose not to seek disability-specific support.
    - Lele emphasised the need for a broader institutional lens on disability, beyond students who are formally connected with Access for Success, to better understand the experiences and support needs of disabled students.
    - Annette noted that the identified gap between students who disclose a disability and those who engage with disability-specific support presents an opportunity for the DAAC to raise the issue formally.
    - The committee will prepare a memo to Academic Committee to highlight the limitations of the current EPI disability data and ensure that Academic Committee has a more accurate understanding of what the figures represent.

RESOLVED: That the Disability Academic Advisory Committee MIT and Unitec notes the concerns raised regarding the interpretation and limitations of the EPI disability data, particularly the distinction between students who disclose a disability and those who engage with disability-specific support, and agrees to submit a memo to Academic Committee to provide this context and support more accurate interpretation of the data.

Moved: Laura Harvey
Seconded: Lele Talagi
CARRIED

- **DAP Updates from Sophia de Fossard**
    - The new DAP will focus not only on what actions are required, but also who is accountable and how success and usefulness will be measured.
    - Workshops have been held with:
        - MIT Disability teams
        - Senior leaders
        - Unitec Disability team

        - Academic and allied staff
    - Further workshops are planned with academic/allied staff across different schools, with a focus on how disability support and policy can be translated into practical environments such as workshops, building sites and other vocational settings.
    - A workshop with students, including students with disabilities, is also being organised.
    - Sophia is also looking to engage community disability organisations/leaders to understand expectations around how disabled people should be supported when accessing tertiary institutions. DAC members may be asked to suggest relevant contacts.
    - All workshops use a consistent framework to enable analysis across groups, with information treated confidentially.
    - Early analysis is showing several common themes and barriers, but new issues are emerging from each workshop, indicating the importance of capturing the diverse experiences across Unitec and MIT.
    - Workshops are expected to be completed around September, with Sophia's overall work continuing through to December.
    - Participants will have an opportunity to provide feedback on the findings before the DAP is finalised.
    - The new DAP will include new objectives, some of which may retain relevant objectives from the previous plan, but with a stronger strategic focus on how the objectives will be implemented and measured.
    - Sophia's longer-term vision is for Unitec and MIT to develop a strong reputation as institutions where disabled learners are well supported.
    - Sabrina asked what the emerging themes were and Sophia highlighted the below:
        - **Data collection and measurement:** MIT and Unitec currently collect disability-related data differently. There are also important **privacy and confidentiality considerations**, particularly around how information about a person's disability is shared and used. Developing consistent ways to measure outcomes while protecting student privacy will be important.
        - **Accountability and operationalisation:** There is a need to clarify **who is responsible** for implementing disability-related actions and how progress and outcomes will be measured.
        - **Disability champions:** Much of the current work relies on individuals who have a strong personal commitment to disability inclusion or lived experience. Consideration is needed around how this work can be supported and embedded more sustainably across the organisation.
        - **Support for staff with disabilities:** Although the DAP focuses specifically on students, several workshops raised the issue of how well staff with disabilities are supported. Sophia noted that staff wellbeing and inclusion can influence the experience of disabled students and will be reported as a theme outside the DAP's current scope.
        - **Resourcing: Funding and staffing capacity** were identified as ongoing challenges, although these are not unique to Unitec and MIT.
        - **Existing staff networks:** The **Kaimahi Disability Support Network** was identified as a potential resource that Sophia will investigate further.

- **Overall theme:** The workshops are highlighting the need to move beyond having disability objectives on paper and consider **how they are resourced, operationalised, assigned to accountable people, and measured for impact**.

RESOLVED: That the Disability Academic Advisory Committee MIT and Unitec notes the update on the development of the new Disability Action Plan and supports continued consultation with disabled students, staff, senior leaders, and community stakeholders, with the findings to inform the Plan's objectives, accountability measures, and implementation.

Moved: Laura Harvey
Seconded: Lele Talagi
CARRIED

4 Resolution to exclude the public (if required)

No public member was in attendance.

5 CLOSED Session (if required)

The whole meeting was held in Closed Session.

Whakamutunga | Closing

Ka wehe atu tātou
I raro i te rangimārie
Te harikoa
Me te manawanui
Haumi ē! Hui ē! Taiki ē!
We are departing
Peacefully
Joyfully
And resolute
We are united, progressing forward!

The meeting concluded at 9:35am.

Confirmed as a true and correct record:

Chair: Annette Pitovao

Date:

Action Register as at 31 August 2026

ID	Action Item	Details	Responsible	Status/Timelines
1	Build 2026 Action Register	Develop and maintain a centralised table of all action items (this register)	Jo Punzalan	Done
2	Call for agenda items for DAAC Hui #2	Invite members to submit agenda items for June hui	Annette Pitovao	Done
3	Call for Deputy Chair nominations	Seek nominations for Deputy Chair role	Jo Punzalan	Done
4	Call for additional members	Seek nominations for up to 3 co-opted members	Jo Punzalan	Done
5	Send Disability Action Plan (old/expired) and Disability Strategy	Email to members	Annette Pitovao	Done
6	Observer with speaker rights status for Sophia de Fossard on committee	Everyone agreed. Formalise Sophia as “observer” member of DAAC	Jo & Annette	Done
7	Sophia to present DAP update	Provide memo and present DAP update to DAAC members	Sophia de Fossard	25 August 2026
8	Introduce Mel to Sophia	Connect for Dyslexia-Friendly Quality Mark discussion	Sabrina Sharma	Done
9	Seek cross-committee input on the Disability Action update	Engage other Advisory Committee Chairs for Pasifika & Māori perspectives	Annette Pitovao	After DAP update is ready
10	Explore in-person hui option	Look for funding/logistics for possible in-person meeting. Annette is looking at venues in Onehunga area. Committee members to please send their dietary requirements (if any) to Jo	Annette Pitovao & Jo Punzalan	Aim for mid-year break
11	Establish membership continuity process	Define process when members leave/resign in accordance with ToR	Committee / Annette	End of each hui
12	Set up correspondence process	Ensure all official correspondence (e.g., NZQA) is shared and tabled, the member who received the correspondence will present it to the team for discussion	All members (lead: Chair)	Every hui
13	Call for agenda items for DAAC Hui #3	Invite members to submit agenda items for August hui	Jo Punzalan	Before August hui

14	Communication with nominated kaimahi for co-option	Reach out to nominated/co-opted members, submit their names to the Academic Committee Secretariat, and invite them to the next hui	Annette Pitovao & Jo Punzalan	Annette has emailed Ruth Laing and Trisha Edwards. Trisha Edwards accepted nomination (21 July) Ruth Laing accepted nomination (22 July)
15	Confirmation of Committee Membership	Reach out to Nikiah Rodriguez through Christine Fusio is she is aware of her membership and role in DAAC	Jo Punzalan	Done. Nikiah replied and confirmed attendance to the next 2 meetings
16	To accommodate other business not included in the agenda	To delegate time for members to raise other items that were not included in the agenda, and for these to be tabled as Section 2.3 in the Minutes.	Annette Pitovao & Jo Punzalan	From DAAC Hui #2 onwards
17	Email copy of MITU 2025 EPI to all members	Annette to email copy to all members	Annette Pitovao	Before August hui
18	Understand the MITU 2025 EPI analysis	Read, absorb, and understand the analysis from the POV of disabled learners	All members	Before August hui
19	Draft a memo to AC re: feedback on 2025 EPI Summary	Memo to send feedback to AC	Annette Pitovao & Jo Punzalan	Memo drafted , for review and then sending to AC

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Jeff Howe, Chair

Subject: International Academic Advisory Committee Minutes

Classification: [Unclassified]

Date: **21 October 2026**

Recommendations

That the Academic Committee note that:

a) Having undertaken further analysis of international student EPIs for 2025, IAAC is satisfied that there are no significant concerns across the three EPI measures at either an institutional or campus level; and

b) IAAC will undertake a more detailed review of programme-level EPIs during 2027 to support continuous improvement in EPI performance.

Background

1. The Committee reviewed international student complaints at Mt Albert and Waitakere campuses with no significant concerns or trends to report. A future report on the Manukau campuses will be considered at the next meeting.

2. A concern regarding access to Moodle resources for a larger than anticipated Semester 2B cohort was reviewed and potential opportunities for operational process improvements were identified.

3. International EPI data was reviewed with no significant concerns identified at the institutional or campus level. However, the Committee agreed that further analysis of programme-level variations should be undertaken to better understand factors contributing to strong performance and areas where improvement opportunities exist.

Attachments
Draft meeting minutes

International Academic Advisory Committee | MIT and Unitec

MINUTES

Date: 21 October 2026
Time: 10:00 AM
Venue: Unitec Mt Albert 110-2020 / MS Teams

Whakatuwheratanga | Opening

Kia tūturu tātou *(Let's be real)*
Kia manaaki tātou *(Let's be caring)*
Kia whai hiranga tātou *(Let's pursue excellence)*
Kia tūhonohono tātou *(Let's connect)*

Whano! Whano!
Haramai te toki!
Haumi ē!
Hui ē!
Taiki ē!

Welcome & Apologies

Members:	Role	Present	Apologies	Absent	Proxy
Jeff Howe	Chair	✓			
Simon Tries	Member	✓			
Jeffrey Wu	Member	✓			
Methindu Madawala Liyanage	Member		✓		
Siosifa Sifa	Member		✓		
Luka Crosbie	Member	✓			
Don Sirimanne	Member	✓			

The meeting opened with karakia and all committee members were welcomed.

Apologies:
- Methindu Madawala Liyanage
- Siosifa Sifa
- Academic staff memberships are recorded as vacant.

Attendance notes
Simon Tries joined the meeting at 10:35 am.
Luka Crosbie left the meeting at 11:15 am.

The Chair received all apologies and declared the meeting quorate.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 19 August 2026 were accepted at a true and accurate record.

Moved: Luka Crosbie
Seconded: Jeffrey Wu

CARRIED

Declaration of Interest

Members to declare any conflicts of interest. Nil.

1. International Student Complaints Report

Presenter: Jeffrey Wu

The Committee was presented with an update on formal complaints for the Mt Albert and Waitakere campuses for Q3 2026.

In Q3, 28 formal student complaints were received, of which 16 (57%) related to international students and 12 (43%) related to domestic students. While the volume of complaints was notable, the outcomes to date do not indicate any broader systemic issues.

Of the Q3 international student complaints concluded by the end of September, all were either not upheld or withdrawn, with two remaining under investigation.

Action: A report on Manukau campus student complaints covering Q2 and Q3 will be presented to the next IAAC meeting

2. International student enrolments and issues with access to Moodle

Presenter: Jeffrey Wu

The discussion highlighted a number of enrolment and student access issues associated with the MAB 2B intake, which was significantly larger than expected, with 92 students arriving compared with the forecast of 40. While this was a positive recruitment outcome, it created operational challenges, including insufficient planning for orientation and increased pressure on enrolment processes.
A key concern was that many students had not been fully enrolled when they arrived, and approximately one-third did not have access to Moodle. In many cases, enrolment had been delayed because students had not selected their electives, although some students were unaware that this was preventing their enrolment and access to systems.
The meeting discussed the option of enrolling students into compulsory courses first and allowing elective selections to be completed later, which would provide earlier access to Moodle and reduce commencement issues. An alternative approach would be to require students to select electives before arriving in New Zealand. It was agreed that better visibility of student numbers, enrolment status, and outstanding student actions is needed to support planning and improve communication between Schools and the Enrolments team.

Actions: Several operational actions were discussed and agreed, including:

a) further discussions on changes to the enrolment process to enrol students into compulsory courses earlier;

b) improving visibility of enrolment information and student numbers; and
c) strengthening communications and training for students and agents regarding elective selection requirements.

The overall objective is to ensure students are enrolled and able to access Moodle as early as possible, reducing disruption and improving the student experience at the start of their studies.

3. International EPI data 2025

Presenter: Jeff Howe

The Committee reviewed international student EPI performance data for 2025 presented by Jeff Howe. During the discussion, members noted differences in course completion results for Nursing and Health programmes across campuses. Simon T presented additional data from the EPI dashboard and emphasised the importance of comparing like-for-like programmes and delivery contexts when interpreting performance results.

The Committee reviewed a number of programme areas where performance improvements could have the greatest impact due to larger EFTS volumes. These included Building Construction, which achieved a course completion rate of 90.9% across 327 EFTS, Construction and Civil Engineering Technology (CSCET) with a completion rate of 88.6% across 221.9 EFTS, and Professional Engineering at MIT SCC with a completion rate of 89.3% across 186.6 EFTS. Applied Business at Mt Albert performed particularly strongly, achieving a course completion rate of 98.2% across 529 EFTS.

Overall, the Committee noted there were no significant concerns across the three EPI measures at either an institutional or campus level, with Student Course Completion, Qualification Completion, and First-Year Retention results for international students all performing significantly above those of domestic students. However, members agreed there was less visibility of performance at the programme level and a limited understanding of the factors contributing to variations in outcomes. The Committee considered it important to gain a better understanding of why some programmes are performing particularly well and where improvement opportunities exist.

To address this, the Committee agreed to place a greater focus on programme-level performance in future discussions, working alongside TKK and receiving additional programme-level analysis and reporting from Jeff Honey during 2027. Members noted that enhanced programme and course-level analysis would provide a better understanding of where variations are occurring and the factors driving these results. Key findings and lessons learned will be reported back to Academic Committee to support continuous improvement and the sharing of effective practice across programmes.

Action: IAAC Report to Academic Committee to note that:

a) **Having undertaken further analysis of international student EPIs for 2025, IAAC is satisfied that there are no significant concerns across the three EPI measures at either an institutional or campus level.**
b) **IAAC will undertake a more detailed review of programme-level EPIs during 2027 to support continuous improvement in EPI performance.**

Whakamutunga | Closing

Ka wehe atu tātou
I raro i te rangimārie
Te harikoa
Me te manawanui
Haumi ē! Hui ē! Taiki ē!
We are departing
Peacefully
Joyfully
And resolute
We are united, progressing forward!

The meeting concluded at 11:30 AM

Confirmed as a true and correct record:

Chair: Jeff Howe

Date: 21 October 2026

Memo to: Academic Committee

From: Wiremu Manaia, Chair Pou Whakarewa Mātauranga Māori

Subject: MAAC October Minutes

Classification: Unclassified

Date: **22 October 2026**

Recommendations

That the Academic Committee receive the Manukura Academic Advisory Committee (MAAC) meeting held on 6 October 2026.

Open

Open Session:
This paper may be considered in open session.

Manukura Academic Advisory Committee | MIT and Unitec Minutes

Date: 6 October 2026
Time: 8:30 am
Venue: MS Teams

1 Whakatuwheratanga | Opening

Kia tūturu tātou *(Let's be real)*
Kia manaaki tātou *(Let's be caring)*
Kia whai hiranga tātou *(Let's pursue excellence)*
Kia tūhonohono tātou *(Let's connect)*

Whano! Whano!
Haramai te toki!
Haumi ē!
Hui ē!
Taiki ē!

The Chair welcomed all the Committee Members to the meeting.

1.1 Welcome & Apologies

Members:	Role	Present	Apologies	Absent	Proxy
Wiremu Manaia (Ex Officio)	**Pou Whakarewa**	✓			
Vivienne Merito (Ex Officio)	**Taharangi**	✓			
Vince Hapi (Ex Officio)	**MIT Kaumatua**		✓		
Hohepa Renata (Ex Officio)	**Unitec Kaumatua**			✓	
Kianu Toia-Tawhai (Ex Officio)	**Student Rep**			✓	
Beyoncé Kahui (Ex Officio)	**Student Rep**	✓			

In attendance:

Hana Hohapata	**Kaiarahi Ako,**					
Ange Sagapolutele	**Te Ara Oranga Programme Manager,**					
Veraneeca Taiepa	**Kaihautū Matauranga Māori Lead, Unitec**					
Ngaire Molyneux	**Relationships Manager**					

Hinewaimarama Reihana-White	**Senior Lecturer/Kaitiaki Taiao, Unitec**					
Deborah Heke	**Director, Ngā Wai o Te Tui**					
Mere Tupaea	**Pasifika Success Navigator**					
Diane Tamati	**Academic Lead**					
Jennifer Haraki	**Senior Lecturer**					
Sonny Tahi	**Lecturer**					
Mahuta Amoamo	**Secretary**					

RESOLUTION
That the apologies be received from Vince Hapi, Ngaire Molyneux and Diane Tamati
Moved: Kayne Haira
Seconded: Wiremu Manaia
CARRIED

1.2 Declaration of Interest (if applicable)

Nil

1.3 Confirmation of Previous Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2026 be approved, subject to the agreed amendments.

Moved: Wiremu Manaia
Seconded: Veraneeca Taiepa
CARRIED

1.4 Action Register

	Action	Responsible
3.1.2	Discuss with Martin whether the TMA Annual Review Report should be presented to MIT-Unitec Academic Committee (AC).	Wiremu Manaia
3.1.3	Confirm future MAAC representative for stakeholder engagement activities and 2027 forums.	Wiremu Manaia
3.1.5c	Circulate HRW update notes.	Vivenne Merito

2 General Business

2.1 Chairperson's Report

Presenter: Wiremu Manaia
Update on activities over the last month relating to the MIT-Unitec transition.

Key discussion points included:

- Ongoing work relating to Te Hono o Kahurangi, including the review of TEC expectations regarding kaupapa Māori and research.
- Early-stage discussions regarding programme integration across MIT and Unitec.
- The Nursing programme was noted as the first fully merged programme.
- Meetings have commenced with the transition monitor regarding the integration of the two institutions.

RESOLUTION: That the MAAC Committee receives the Chairperson's Report.

Moved: DJ Jones
Seconded: Vivenne Merito
CARRIED

2.1.a Co-Chairperson's Report

Presenter : Vivienne Merito

Key points included:

- Engagement with NZQA has commenced through Mereata Tauroa.
- Feedback has been provided requesting Māori representation and input into the consultation process.
- An invitation from NZQA is expected shortly.

Māori Success Data Reporting

- Data relating to Māori applicants, enrolments and EFTS was presented.
- Veraneeca Taipea suggested members receive the data prior to each meeting to allow sufficient time for review and discussion.
- Hana Hohapata queried how learners identifying as both Māori and Pasifika are represented within the reporting.
- Vivenne Merito advised that dual-identifying learners are currently reported within Pasifika reporting, however alternative reporting methods could be explored if required.

RESOLUTION: That Māori applicant, enrolment and EFTS data become a standing agenda item for future MAAC meetings.

Moved**:** Wiremu Manaia
Seconded**:** Veraneeca Taiepa
CARRIED

2.1.b Māori Women's Welfare League

Presenter: Hinewaimarama

Mihi to MIT and Unitec for the response to MWL. Pōwhiri with mana whenua Waikato-Tainui.

2.2 Correspondence

NA

3 Standing Items

3.1 Reports

3.1.1 Kaiārahi Report

Presenter: H Hohapata

The committee reviewed the Kaiārahi Report and discussed the integration **of Te Mana**

Ārai (TMA) principles into institutional policies and procedures.

Members acknowledged the work undertaken through the Policy and Procedures Committee and the progression of TMA into organisational policy frameworks.

RESOLUTION: MAAC approves the proposed format changes incorporating TMA principles into institutional policies.

Moved: Vivienne Merito
Seconded: Hana Hohapata
CARRIED

Hana Hohapata also provided updates relating to Bachelor of Nursing Māori, Postgraduate Midwifery and Digital programme developments.

3.1.2 Te Mana Ārai (TMA) Annual Review Report

Presenter: Hana Hohapata

Presented the first formal **TMA Annual Review Report**, highlighting key findings and recommendations.

- The existing framework is based on a Unitec model.
- The intention is to adapt and implement the framework consistently across MIT and Unitec.
- Following endorsement by Kaihautū, the report will be circulated to MAAC members.
- Wiremu Manaia acknowledged Hana's leadership in driving the kaupapa and thanked Veraneeca Taiepa for her support throughout the review process.

Discussion

- Vivenne Merito questioned whether additional staff training and engagement sessions could be undertaken to strengthen awareness and implementation of TMA principles.

- Hana Hohapata advised that TMA has not yet been fully integrated across all schools and programmes, particularly newer programmes.

- Wiremu Manaia noted that while TMA was adopted approximately two years ago, implementation has been inconsistent. Greater participation and staff training are required to achieve the intended outcomes.

- Veraneeca Taiepa advised that no formal workshop programme has been established yet, as the current focus is on reframing and embedding TMA across MIT and Unitec. Priority is being given to schools requiring additional development and support.

- Vivenne Merito emphasised the importance of broader socialisation of TMA across academic staff to ensure understanding and alignment when policy changes are introduced

- Hana Hohapata agreed, noting that the review report clearly identifies the priority

areas requiring attention.

Action: Wiremu Manaia to discuss with Martin Carroll whether the TMA Annual Review Report should be presented to the MIT-Unitec Academic Committee (AC).

3.1.3 Programme Advisory Oversight Committee
Presenter: Hana Hohapata

Advised that, through her involvement in programme advisory committee's stakeholder engagement activities, consideration should be given to MAAC representation on future stakeholder forums.

It was suggested that Ngaire Molyneux, Relationships Manager be considered as the MAAC representative on PAOC for 2027.

Action: Wiremu to discuss MAAC representation arrangements and report back look at the Ngaire Molyneux be the MACC representative on PAOC given her relationships role.

3.1.4 Student Council
Presenter: Beyonce Kahui

An update was provided noting that the Student Council remains a work in progress and there were no significant matters to report.

Voting for Student Council representatives for 2027 is currently underway.

Hana Hohapata acknowledged the contribution of student representatives and thanked them for their support of TMA-related discussions.

4. Academic Sub-Committee Updates

4.1 MAAC Sub Committee Representatives.
Presenter: Wiremu

An update on the nominated MAAC reps on MITU Academic Subcommittees. All nominations are now submitted with a rep and a proxy. A briefing paper will be tabled at the next AC meeting.

RESOLUTION: MAAC approves nominated reps to MITU academic sub-committees to go forward for AC approval.

Moved: Wiremu Manaia
Seconded: Viv Merito
CARRIED

4.2 *Research and Supervision Committee*
Presenter: Vivenne Merito

Advised that both she and Ngaire Molyneux have now been appointed to the committee to support cultural safety and reduce organisational risk.

A hui is scheduled for Friday, 9 October 2026 and progress is being made regarding

supervision frameworks and associated workshops.

4.3 Programme Advisory Committees

Discussion focused on strengthening Māori stakeholder engagement within programme development and review processes.

Key points included:

- Engagement requirements identified through the TMA Review.
- Concerns regarding insufficient Māori stakeholder engagement in recent programme development activity.
- Recognition that engagement must extend beyond iwi and include a broader range of Māori stakeholders and communities.
- Opportunities for Ngaire Molyneux to support PAC engagement processes through her experience and relationships.
- Iwi engagement approaches need to be practical and coordinated, particularly given the large number of programmes requiring consultation and stakeholder input.

4.3 Research Ethics Committee

Presenter: Hinewaimarama Reihana-White
Discussion

Whakamutunga | Closing

Ka wehe atu tātou	We are departing
I raro i te rangimārie	Peacefully
Te harikoa	Joyfully
Me te manawanui	And resolute
Haumi ē! Hui ē! Taiki ē!	We are united, progressing forward!

The meeting concluded at 9:35 am

Confirmed as a true and correct record:

Chair: Vivenne Merito

Date: 22/10/2026

Memo to:	Academic Committee
From:	Dr Rosanne Ellis, Chair MIT and Unitec Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee
Contributors:	Cynthia Almeida, Secretary MIT and Unitec Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee
Subject:	Subcommittee Chair Report – MIT and Unitec Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee
Classification:	In Confidence
Date:	20 October 2026

For Information

- **MBIE Transition Fund -** The Committee received an update on the MBIE Transition Fund and noted the development of an institutional process for expressions of interest, including proposal evaluation and support mechanisms for applicants.

- **Extension of Enrolment -** The Committee approved a final six-month extension for a Master's student to complete and submit their thesis. Approval was granted subject to a formal performance agreement, defined milestones, ongoing monitoring, and confirmation of appropriate supervision arrangements.

- **Postgraduate Grade Reporting -** The Committee reviewed grade reports for doctoral and master's research components, including courses of less than 60 credits. Members discussed emerging trends in grade distributions, supervision models, and student support mechanisms.

- **Three-Minute Thesis Competition -** The Committee determined that a Three-Minute Thesis (3MT) competition could not be effectively delivered within the remaining 2026 timeframe due to competing academic commitments and resource constraints. Planning for a 3MT competition will be incorporated into the 2027 work plan.

- **Committee Work Programme -** The Committee reviewed its remaining 2026 work plan and noted upcoming priorities, including:
  - Review of postgraduate support systems and structures.
  - Review of postgraduate activities and coordination.
  - Review and consolidation of postgraduate policies, processes, and documentation.

- **Strategic Direction**
  - The Committee discussed its evolving role in supporting strategic objectives relating to research growth, postgraduate capability development, and student success.

PGRSC Minutes-2026-10-09.pdf

Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee | MIT and Unitec
MINUTES

Date: 9 October 2026
Time: 1400 hrs.
Venue: MS Teams

1 Whakatuwheratanga | Opening

The Chair, Rosanne Ellis, welcomed members and proxies to the meeting.

1.1 Attendance & Apologies

Members	Role	Present	Apologies	Absent	Proxy
Dr Rosanne Ellis	Chair	√			
A/Prof Annabel Pretty	CoChair Professoriate	√			
Prof Hamid Sharifzadeh	Nominee, Professoriate/Principal Lecturer with postgraduate responsibilities	√			
Ioane Aleke Fa'avae	Pacific Representative		√		
Venusi Taomoepaeu (Proxy)	Pacific Representative				√
Ngaire Molyneux	Māori Representative		√		
Dr Mel Wong	Senior General Staff	√			
Dr Ahmad Wedyan	Senior General Staff	√			
Mithila Mahanama	Student Representative (Unitec)	√			

In attendance:

Cynthia Almeida	Secretary	√			
Hinewaimarama Reihana White	Maori Representative		√		

- Apologies were received by Ioane Aleke Fa'avae, Ngaire Molyneux and Hinewaimarama Reihana White.
- An apology for lateness was received from Mithila Mahanama.

Resolved: That apologies be accepted.

Moved: Hamid Sharifzadeh
Seconded: Annabel Pretty

CARRIED

Quorate Status
As per Standing Orders the quorum for a meeting is the majority of the current members, therefore the meeting was quorate.

1.2 Declaration of Interest *(if applicable)*

Nil

1.3 Confirmation of Previous Minutes

The minutes of the previous Postgraduate Research and Scholarships Committee were presented.

PGRSC Minutes-2026-09-08.pdf

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2026 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Moved: Mel Wong
Seconded: Hamid Sharifzadeh

CARRIED

1.4 Action Register

The Chair updated the Committee on the actions from previous meetings.

Action items:

ACTION REGISTER MEETING 08-09-2026

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
1.	Explore alternative meeting times to improve Ahmad's attendance.	Cynthia	Completed
2.	Dynamic tracker Follow-up with programmes that have not yet submitted their tracker update.	Cynthia	To follow up
3.	Continuing development of a Teams site for the Committee, including key documents, Meeting Papers and Minutes, Policies and Guidelines work plans, and internal and external supervisor Register	Cynthia	In progress
4.	Amend the audit documentation wording regarding the use of templates and review the potential consolidation of the Health and Safety form and Supervisor-Student Contract into a single document and distribute documentation for audit.	Cynthia	Under review

5.	Review and consolidation of postgraduate documentation, including: • Student-supervisor agreements • Health and safety documentation • Audit-related requirements • Broader review of postgraduate systems, processes, and support structures.	Cynthia/ Rosanne	Under review
6.	Members to provide feedback through the Student Regulations consultation process by the consultation deadline.	All Members	Completed
7.	Add the postgraduate support-center review to the PGRSC workplan.	Cynthia	Completed
8.	Advise the Committee on the approval pathway and process for examination accommodation for students with disability at postgraduate level. • Record the action and follow up on progress.	Fiona Cynthia	Completed (Note below)

Reference Item 8. Clarification was received from Fiona regarding support available through the Access for Success team for students requiring assessment concessions during assessment and examination processes.

Action: Cynthia to add the Assessment support information and relevant application forms to the Committee reference library.

2 General Business

2.1 Appointment of Co-Chair (PGRSC)

The Chair advised that, in accordance with the Committee's Terms of Reference, Annabel Pretty had been appointed as Co-Chair of the Postgraduate Research and Scholarship Committee (PGRSC).

The Chair noted that the appointment would provide additional leadership support as the Committee progresses key priorities, including implementation of the Applied Research Strategy, growth in postgraduate enrolments, enhancement of postgraduate student and supervisor support, and the review of postgraduate policies, processes and support structures.

The Chair thanked Annabel for accepting the role and acknowledged the ongoing contributions of Committee members, expressing appreciation for their engagement and responsiveness during a period of significant organisational change and consultation activity.

2.2 MBIE Transition Fund Update

The Chair provided an update on the recently announced MBIE Transition Fund. MBIE had issued a call for expressions of interest and proposals earlier in the week, with a series of webinars scheduled to provide further information on the funding mechanisms and application process.

Following the webinars, an institution-wide call for expressions of interest would be circulated to identify researchers interested in applying to the fund.

It was noted that only three applications could be submitted per funding mechanism. To support a coordinated approach, the Research Office would facilitate an internal workshop and establish processes to identify potential applicants, encourage collaboration, and form suitable bid teams. Additional support would be provided to strengthen and develop proposals, recognising the importance of maximising this funding opportunity.

In discussion, Hamid Sharifzadeh sought clarification on anticipated timeframes for expressions of interest and the proposed internal process. Rosanne advised that a communication and engagement plan was being developed and would be circulated shortly. A two-week internal timeframe for expressions of interest was proposed, with coordination of potential bid teams commencing over the following weeks.

Members suggested that expressions of interest should include brief information about applicants' research background, current research activities, potential collaborators, relevant research priorities, and proposed research topic areas. Rosanne agreed that this information would assist in assessing opportunities for collaboration and alignment with the fund priorities.

A question was also raised regarding the criteria that would be used to assess expressions of interest, given the limited number of applications that could be submitted. Rosanne advised that an internal review panel would be established to evaluate and prioritise proposals and that assessment criteria would be developed as part of that process.

Action: Research Office to develop and communicate the internal EOI process, timelines, and evaluation criteria.

3 Items to Approve

3.1 Request for Extension of Enrolment/Registration Period

The Committee considered a request presented by Annabel Pretty for a Master's student seeking a further six-month extension of enrolment to enable completion and examination of their thesis.

Members noted that the student had exceeded normal completion timeframes and had previously been granted periods of suspension and an extension. While all coursework, work-integrated learning, and other programme requirements had been completed, the thesis remained outstanding.

The Committee discussed the student's history of limited progress, including concerns regarding engagement with supervision, missed supervisory meetings, and repeated assurances of completion without sufficient evidence of progress. It was noted that two

supervision teams had supported the student during their candidature and that the current supervision team had advised that the thesis was not yet ready for examination. Members also noted concerns that the principal supervisor wished to step down due to the prolonged lack of progress, and that the barriers to completion appeared to relate primarily to student engagement rather than supervisory support.

Discussion included clarification of the student's enrolment history, periods of suspension, and the application of programme and institutional regulations relating to maximum enrolment periods, extensions, and the treatment of suspended enrolment. Members identified the need for further consideration of these provisions to ensure clarity and consistency in future cases.

The Committee acknowledged the student's commitment to completing the qualification and discussed the need to balance student support with the maintenance of academic standards. While recognising the significant challenges and limited progress to date, members agreed that a final opportunity should be provided, supported by clear conditions, enhanced monitoring, and appropriate supervision arrangements to maximise the likelihood of successful completion.

A performance agreement was proposed as a condition of any additional extension. The Committee discussed the inclusion of clearly defined milestones, regular engagement with supervisors, progress monitoring requirements, reporting expectations, and specified consequences should agreed conditions not be met. Consideration was also given to future supervision arrangements, including the appointment of a replacement principal supervisor if required.

Resolved: That a final six-month extension of candidature be approved, subject to:

- The student entering into a formal performance agreement.
- Clearly defined milestones and expectations being documented.
- Ongoing monitoring of progress.
- Specified consequences for non-compliance.
- Appropriate supervision arrangements being confirmed.

Members agreed that this represented a final opportunity to support the student's successful completion while maintaining academic standards.

Moved: Annabel Pretty
Seconded: Mel Wong

CARRIED

Action: Annabel Pretty to arrange a performance agreement and revised supervision plan for the student.

4 Items to Receive

4.1 MITU POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIPS COMMITTEE WORKPLAN 2026 (DRAFT)

The Committee reviewed activities scheduled for the remainder of 2026, including ongoing audit activities, a review of Committee membership, and planning for membership recommendations for 2027.

The Chair noted that the current year has involved a significant institutional transition and that additional project work has therefore emerged beyond standard committee responsibilities.

Members noted proposed areas of focus for November, including:

- A review of postgraduate support systems and structures.
- A review of postgraduate activities and coordination.

4.2 DYNAMIC TRACKER UPDATE

The Committee received an update on the Dynamic Tracker. It was reported that updates had been received from all Discipline Leaders, with the exception of Master of Creative Practice, as the Discipline Leader was on leave.

Action: Cynthia to follow up

4.3 Record of Grades Doctoral/Master Research - Semester 2-2025/Semester 1-2026 (Work Plan Item

The Committee received Doctoral/Masters' (90 credits and above) grade reports for Semester 2-2025 and Semester 1-2026, including research components of less than 60 credits. Members noted variations in grade distributions across programmes and observed that this was the first time the data had been presented in a heat map format.
Discussion focused on the value of the data for identifying trends, supporting continuous improvement, and informing future postgraduate initiatives. Members agreed the purpose of reviewing the data was to understand student outcomes and share good practice rather than evaluate individual programmes.

The Committee discussed supervision models, including differences between programmes with single-supervisor and two-supervisor arrangements, and the potential impact of supervision, professional development, and student support mechanisms on outcomes.

Members agreed there would be value in undertaking a broader review of postgraduate supervision, support structures, scholarships, supervisor capability development, and student success measures. The review was considered an important contributor to the implementation of the Applied Research and Rangahau Strategy and future planning for postgraduate growth and capability development.

Action:
Rosanne Ellis and Annabel Pretty to draft Terms of Reference for a review of postgraduate supervision, support, scholarships, and related postgraduate activities, and circulate to the Committee for feedback and approval.

SECTION 5 WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

None

SECTION 6 CLOSING

6.1.1 Any Other Business

Three-Minute Thesis Competition

The Committee considered the feasibility of holding a Three-Minute Thesis (3MT) competition before the end of 2026. Members acknowledged the value of the initiative but noted that the limited time remaining in the academic calendar, staff workload pressures, student examination commitments, and the significant planning and administrative effort required would make it difficult to deliver a successful competition this year.

Discussion focused on alternative ways to promote student engagement through the upcoming ITP Research Symposium. Members supported proceeding with student poster presentations and exploring the possibility of a student poster competition. The Committee also discussed using symposium activities to introduce students to 3MT concepts and, where feasible, provide coaching and preparation workshops.

The Committee agreed that deferring the formal 3MT competition to 2027 would allow sufficient time for planning, student preparation, supervisor engagement, and promotion, resulting in a stronger and more successful event.

Resolved:
The Committee agreed not to hold a Three-Minute Thesis competition in 2026 and to include planning for a well-supported competition in the 2027 work plan, with dates to be confirmed early in the year.

Action: Cynthia Natalia Almeida to add the Three-Minute Thesis (3MT) competition to the 2027 work plan.

6.1.2 Strategic Direction for the Committee

Towards the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair noted that the Committee's role is continuing to evolve beyond its traditional focus on compliance and academic approvals. She indicated that the Committee would play an increasingly important role in supporting strategic objectives related to research growth, postgraduate capability development, and student success.

The Chair emphasised the importance of using institutional data and outcome reporting to inform decision-making, identify areas for improvement, and guide future investment. The development of clear and consistent postgraduate systems, processes, and support structures was identified as an important priority as the new institution continues to mature. Members broadly supported a stronger evidence-informed approach to postgraduate planning, supervision development, and initiatives aimed at enhancing postgraduate student outcomes.

6.2 Committee Self-Assessment

Any feedback about this meeting, or about how the committee is operating in general, should be directed to Juee Jin, Secretariat Administrator, AC.

General comments or queries are also welcome to be provided to either the Chair or the Secretary, either inside or outside of meetings.

6.3 Whakamutunga | Closing

The meeting concluded at 1539 hrs.

Confirmed as a true and correct record:

Chair: **Rosanne Ellis**

Date: **10 November 2026**

ACTION REGISTER 2026-10-09

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
1. (1.4)	Assessment support information and relevant application forms to the Committee reference library.	Cynthia	
2. (2.2)	MBIE Transition Fund - to develop and communicate the internal EOI process, timelines, and evaluation criteria.	Rosanne	
3. (3.1)	Extension of Enrolment – to arrange a performance agreement and revised supervision plan for the student.	Annabel	
4. (4.2)	Follow up with Becca Wood for MCP update for the Dynamic Tracker	Cynthia	
5. (4.3)	Draft Terms of Reference for a review of postgraduate supervision, support, scholarships, and related postgraduate activities, and circulate to the Committee for feedback and approval.	Rosanne/ Annabel	

6. (6.1.1)	Three-Minute Thesis (3MT) competition to be added to the 2027 work plan.	Cynthia	
7.	Review and consolidation of postgraduate documentation, including: • Student-supervisor agreements • Health and safety documentation • Audit-related requirements Broader review of postgraduate systems, processes, and support structures.	Rosanne/ Annabel/ Cynthia	Under review

Memo to:	Academic Committee
From:	Dr Rosanne Ellis, Chair MIT-Unitec Academic/Research Committee
Subject:	Subcommittee Chair Report – MIT-Unitec Academic/Research Committee
Classification:	In Confidence
Date:	8 October 2026

For Information

- Committee members were encouraged to promote the **2026 North Island ITP Research Symposium** which will be held in person at the Manukau campus on the **3rd and 4th December**. Approximately 120–150 attendees are expected to attend. Planned streams include Pacific and Indigenous knowledge, Pacific Talanoa, early-career researchers and student poster presentations.
- The new Applied Rangahau Research Strategic Plan identifies the development of "**Research Clusters**" as an objective. Clusters aim to reflect the institution's distinctive research strengths, contribute to Tāmaki Makaurau and the wider Auckland region, and align with future government science investment priorities. Four proposed research clusters have been identified:

    1. **Māori and Indigenous Research** – supporting Māori and Indigenous research, cultural connectedness and community priorities.
    2. **Resilient and Healthy Environments** – spanning natural and built environments, including creative industries, architecture, landscape, engineering, building and construction.
    3. **Healthy Lives, Thriving Communities** – encompassing health, social practice, nursing, counselling, education, business and community wellbeing.
    4. **Future Technology, Future Workforce** – focusing on innovation, technology, workforce development and the future of work, including trade disciplines.

- The committee discussed the institution's approach to research data sharing and open access. There will be two distinct workstreams: short-term integration of MIT research outputs into the Research Bank, to establish a consistent approach across MIT and Unitec, and the longer-term development of research data management practices, including the managed sharing of raw research data where appropriate.
- The committee received a memo from the Research Ethics Administrator introducing a new requirement for the secure, permanent digital storage of research ethics documentation.
- The committee was updated on the MoE's review of the Centres of Research Excellence (CoREs) model, following consultation with tertiary education institutions. The next funding

round is anticipated to relate to 2029, with a call for new CoRE bids expected towards the end of 2027.

- The committee was updated on the final Cabinet-approved design for the Tertiary Research Excellence Fund (TREF). The institution is maintaining a watching brief on the detailed assessment metrics and the implications of remaining in the ITP stream versus moving into the university stream.
- The committee was updated on MBIE's release of four Science Investment Pillar Plans, which will guide government contestable research funding from 2026 to 2031. Most funding is expected to be managed through Research Funding New Zealand, with future funding applications required to align with the relevant investment priorities. The four pillars are:

    1. Technology for Prosperity
    2. Primary Industries and the Bioeconomy
    3. Environmental Sustainability and Resilience
    4. Healthy People and a Thriving Society.

MIT and Unitec Academic/Research Committee
MINUTES

Date: 8 October 2026
Time: 1pm
Venue: MS Teams

SECTION 1 – WHAKATUWHERATANA | OPENING

Item 1.1 Welcome and Apologies

The chair warmly welcomed members of the committee to the meeting, including new member Marilou Raduban as well as Ahmad Wedyan (proxy for Alaa Al Janabi), Sheona Watson (proxy for Maia Topp) and Nadesa Goundar (proxy for James Prescott).

Members:	Role	Present	Apologies	Absent	Proxy
Dr Rosanne Ellis	Chair	√			
Hadley Brown	Research Support Staff	√			
Natara Lata Pimoe	Student Representative		√		
A/P Vanessa Byrnes	Head of School		√		
Anna Wheeler	Co-opted Member	√			
A/P Deb Heke	Nominee, Māori Academic Advisory Committee	√			
Dr Alaa Al Janabi	Research Leader		√		Dr Ahmad Wedyan
A/P Linda Kestle	Professoriate	√			
Dr Maia Topp	Early Career Researcher		√		Sheona Watson
Dr James Prescott	Nominee, Pacific Academic Advisory Committee		√		Nadesa Goundar
A/P Marilou Raduban	Co-opted Member	√			

In attendance:

Brenda Massey	Committee Secretary			

RESOLUTION: That the apologies be received from Vanessa Byrnes, Maia Topp, Alaa Al Janabi, James Prescott and Natara Pimoe.

Moved: Anna Wheeler
Seconded: Ahmad Wedyan

CARRIED

Quorate Status

As per Standing Orders the quorum for a meeting is the majority of the current members, therefore the meeting was quorate.

Item 1.2 Declaration of Interest (if applicable)

Nil

Item 1.3 Confirmation of Previous Minutes

RESOLUTION: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2026 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Moved: Linda Kestle
Seconded: Hadley Brown

CARRIED

Item 1.4 Action Register

N/A

SECTION 2 – GENERAL BUSINESS

1. The Chair thanked committee members and proxies for their responsiveness, commitment and timely contributions to consultations on the TREF, student regulations, supervision training, ethics updates and other internal and external initiatives. The importance of subcommittee members' contributions was recently acknowledged by Academic Committee.

2. Members were encouraged to promote the 2026 North Island ITP Research Symposium. The details are as follows:
    - The symposium is being hosted by MIT-Unitec in partnership with Wintec and NorthTec.
    - It will be held in person only at the Manukau campus on the 3rd and 4th December.
    - The abstract submission deadline has been extended (to 13 October at this stage).
    - Approximately 120–150 attendees are expected to attend.
    - Planned streams include Pacific and Indigenous knowledge, Pacific Talanoa, early-career researchers and student poster presentations.
    - The organising group will expand as abstracts are received, with committee members potentially invited to review submissions and lead specific streams.

3. The new Applied Rangahau Research Strategic Plan identifies the development of "Research Clusters" as on objective. Following initial discussions with Academic Programme Managers, clusters aim to reflect the institution's distinctive research strengths, contribute to Tāmaki Makaurau and the wider Auckland region, and align with future government science investment priorities.

    Four proposed research clusters have been identified:

    1. **Māori and Indigenous Research** – supporting Māori and Indigenous research, cultural connectedness and community priorities.
    2. **Resilient and Healthy Environments** – spanning natural and built environments, including creative industries, architecture, landscape, engineering, building and construction.
    3. **Healthy Lives, Thriving Communities** – encompassing health, social practice, nursing, counselling, education, business and community wellbeing.

4. **Future Technology, Future Workforce** – focusing on innovation, technology, workforce development and the future of work, including trade disciplines.

The emerging framework is intended to ensure all schools and trade schools can identify with at least two clusters. Cross-cutting themes include Te Tiriti o Waitangi, AI, innovation and entrepreneurship, applied teaching and learning, and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

The proposed clusters and action plan for further development will be presented to the Senior Leadership Team.

Action: A visual framework and further detail, incorporating feedback received, will be brought to the next Research Committee meeting.

Clarification was sought on whether the proposed research clusters would replace existing research groups within schools and across the institution. It was confirmed that the clusters are not intended to replace existing research groups or change how research is undertaken. Rather, they will help articulate the institution's research strengths and capabilities, strengthen external and international partnerships, improve access to research funding, and support a shared understanding of the institution's research offering with other research providers and universities. The clusters are also intended to encourage cross- and transdisciplinary collaboration to address complex global challenges and communicate the institution's research impact more effectively. Further alignment with programme and course offerings may be explored as part of broader institutional planning.

Clarification was also sought on whether each research cluster would have a designated champion and whether academic staff could affiliate with multiple clusters. It is proposed that a series of short co-creation workshops be held with key schools and groups to develop the operational design of the clusters. These workshops would inform a practical playbook covering governance, funding and performance indicators (KPIs). Emerging characteristics of successful clusters include a mix of senior and early-career researchers, multidisciplinary collaboration, growth in postgraduate research, demonstrated pathways to research impact and translation, strong industry and external partnerships, connections between research and undergraduate teaching, and a thought leadership role that raises the institution's profile and influence nationally and internationally. Cluster leadership arrangements and staff affiliations will be considered as the operational model is developed.

4. The committee discussed the institution's approach to research data sharing and open access. It was clarified that this involves two distinct workstreams: short-term integration of MIT research outputs into the Research Bank, to establish a consistent approach across MIT and Unitec, and the longer-term development of research data management practices, including the managed sharing of raw research data where appropriate. Most research outputs are already made available through open access, whereas the sharing of underlying research data requires further consideration of best practice, data sovereignty, and appropriate systems and agreements. Existing data and material transfer agreements with external partners were noted.

   Action: Anna Wheeler, Rosanne Ellis and the Director Digital Strategy and Experience to meet to discuss research data management plans and work programme alignment.

Action: Anna Wheeler to present an item to the next Research Committee meeting on the timing and process for integrating MIT research outputs into the Research Bank.

SECTION 3 – ITEMS TO APPROVE

N/A

SECTION 4 - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Section 4.1 New Requirement for the Secure, Permanent Digital Storage of Research Ethics Documentation

The committee received a memo from Dr Evangelia (Valia) Papoutsaki, Research Ethics Administrator, introducing a new requirement for the secure, permanent digital storage of research ethics documentation. Any queries/clarifications should be sought directly from Valia via ethics@untiec.ac.nz.

Section 4.2 Centres of Research Excellence (CoREs) Review: Summary of Sector Engagement

The committee was updated on the MoE's review of the Centres of Research Excellence (CoREs) model, following consultation with tertiary education organisations. The review considered how CoREs should operate within the evolving science and innovation funding environment, including eligibility for non-university tertiary education organisations and the appropriate review cycle (currently every eight years).

Feedback highlighted the importance of CoREs in developing emerging researchers and providing funding certainty and continuity. The review cycle may be shortened to six years. Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs) are recognised as having a role and contribution to make. It was also noted that future CoREs should demonstrate clearer alignment with national needs and research priorities.

The next funding round is anticipated to relate to 2029 (the current CoREs are funded to 31 December 2028), with a call for new CoRE bids expected towards the end of 2027. Further direction is expected as Research Funding New Zealand arrangements and government priority research investment areas become clearer.

Section 4.3 Tertiary Research Excellence Fund Update

The committee was updated on the final Cabinet-approved design for the Tertiary Research Excellence Fund (TREF), which will comprise separate university and ITP/wānanga funding streams. Research degree completions will account for 30% of the annual funding pool (approximately $312 million), while external research income will account for 25%.

Recent workshops with the TEC have focused on the ITP research capacity metric, weighted at 2.5% of the total fund. A proposed measure is the allocation of 0.2 FTE research time to research-active kaimahi, which could support staff in negotiating and securing dedicated research time.

The institution is maintaining a watching brief on the detailed assessment metrics and the implications of remaining in the ITP stream versus moving into the university stream, where longer-term growth opportunities may differ. A decision is targeted for Q2–Q3 2027, informed by further TEC workshops and clarification of the remaining metrics.

Further updates will be provided to the Research Committee following the next TEC workshop.

Clarification was sought on how the proposed 0.2 FTE research allocation would be captured for research-active staff teaching on non-degree programmes. It was proposed that formal recognition of research activity in employment agreements would help protect allocated research time.

It was confirmed that the new TREF assessment framework is expected to apply from 2028, with the first funding distributed in 2029. This provides time to plan for implementation alongside the Applied Rangahau Research Strategy and institutional integration. Discussions will be required with Heads of School, Academic Programme Managers, unions and other key stakeholders to review role expectations, functions and employment agreements. The proposed allocation offers an opportunity to formally recognise and support research-active staff in non-degree teaching roles, with appropriate processes to be developed ahead of implementation.

Three points were raised regarding current research workload allocations and potential implications of the TREF framework:

1. Research allocations for degree-delivering staff: Historically, 0.2 FTE research time has been allocated to approximately 75% of staff teaching on degree programmes, rather than all staff. Clarification was sought on whether the proposed TREF requirements would change this to 100% of degree-delivering academic staff from 2028.
2. Research allocations for non-degree staff: Research-active staff teaching on non-degree programmes have also received allocated research time typically between 0.1 and 0.2 FTE. Clarification was sought on how these existing arrangements would be recognised under the new framework.
3. Workload allocation processes: Current practice in some schools involves the Research Leader and Head of School discussing staff research activity, workload, outputs and previous allocations before recommending research time to the Research Director. Academic Programme Managers are included in and informed of these discussions. Clarification was sought on whether these processes and responsibilities may change as the institution prepares for TREF implementation.

It was noted that the operational requirements for the TREF research capacity metric remain under development, with further detail needed before implementation. The proposed 0.2 FTE research commitment has not yet been formally confirmed, and feedback has highlighted the need to consider research impact alongside allocated time.

Workload planning for research-active staff, including those teaching on non-degree programmes, will be considered alongside the developing academic and teaching and learning plans, recognising the interdependencies with the Applied Rangahau Research Strategy. Once the TREF assessment metrics are confirmed, implementation will be developed collaboratively with academic leadership, People and Culture, Heads of School and Academic Programme Managers, taking account of student and staff needs, operational requirements and HR processes. It was emphasised that changes would not be imposed through a top-down directive.

Clarification was sought on whether the 30% weighting for research degree completions under TREF would be considered in future programme design decisions, particularly when choosing between taught and research-based master's programmes.

It was noted that the Applied Rangahau Research Strategic Plan includes objectives to grow research capability and increase postgraduate student numbers, including the development of a professional doctorate programme. These initiatives are expected to contribute to research degree completions. The committee also acknowledged the launch of the institution's first merged bachelor's programme in Applied Counselling and Social Practice.

Section 4.4 Science, Innovation and Technology Reforms: Pillar Investment Plans

The committee was updated on MBIE's release of four Science Investment Pillar Plans, which will guide government contestable research funding decisions from 2026 to 2031. Most funding is expected to be managed through Research Funding New Zealand, with future funding applications required to align with the relevant investment priorities.

The four pillars are:

- Technology for Prosperity
- Primary Industries and the Bioeconomy
- Environmental Sustainability and Resilience
- Healthy People and a Thriving Society.

The pillars were considered broadly aligned with MIT-Unitec's proposed research clusters, with potential opportunities across most schools and disciplines. Particular emphasis was noted on technology, interdisciplinary collaboration and proposals spanning multiple pillars.

The Transition Research Fund is the first funding scheme to apply these priorities, with funding mechanisms covering talent development, projects and programmes. Upcoming MBIE webinars will provide further guidance on the investment pillars and funding opportunities. The Research Office will continue monitoring developments and will work with research clusters and relevant teams to identify and support potential funding applications.

MIT-Unitec is limited to submitting three applications per Transition Research Fund mechanism. Staff have been invited to register their interest in applying and indicate their intended funding mechanism, with further guidance to follow the MBIE webinars.

Following the webinars, the Research Office will arrange an internal information session and establish a formal application process, including panel review to assess and select proposals within the application limits. Targeted writing support will be provided to strengthen submissions and maximise funding opportunities. This process will also help establish consistent internal procedures for future external research funding applications.

The internal application process and next steps will be communicated to interested staff following completion of the MBIE webinars.

SECTION 5 - ITEMS TO RECEIVE

N/A

SECTION 6 CLOSING

Section 6.1 Any Other Business

N/A

Section 6.2 Committee Self-Assessment

Any feedback about this meeting, or about how the committee is operating in general, should be directed to Juee Jin, Secretariat Administrator, AC.

General comments or queries are also welcome to be provided to either the Chair or the Secretary, either inside or outside of meetings.

Section 6.3 Closing Karakia

MEETING CLOSED: 1420 h

ACTION REGISTER

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
2.3	Present a visual framework and further detail on the proposed new research clusters to the next Research Committee meeting.	Rosanne Ellis	
2.4	Meet with the Director Digital Strategy and Experience to discuss research data management plans and work programme alignment.	Rosanne Ellis / Anna Wheeler	
2.4	Present an item on the timing and process for integrating MIT research outputs into the Research Bank.	Anna Wheeler	

Programme Advisory Oversight Committee

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 20 August 2026
Time: 2.00 – 3.00
Venue: Mt Albert campus, Room 110-2020
OR MS Teams

SECTION 1: Opening

1.1 Whakatuwheratanga | Opening

Kia tūturu tātou *(Let's be real)*
Kia manaaki tātou *(Let's be caring)*
Kia whai hiranga tātou *(Let's pursue excellence)*
Kia tūhonohono tātou *(Let's connect)*

Whano! Whano!
Haramai te toki!
Haumi ē!
Hui ē!
Taiki ē!

1.2 Welcome and Apologies

Members:	***Present***	***Apology***	***Absent***	***Proxy***
Julie Prentice (Chair)	✓			
Chris King	✓			
Pip Schollum-Manase		✓		
Observer:				
Hana Hohapata	✓			
Aiono Manu Fa'aea	✓			
Secretary:				
Duaa Belgacem		✓		

RESOLUTION: *That the apologies be received from Duaa Belgacem, Pip Schollum-Manase …….be accepted*
Moved:Chris / Aiono
Carried:

1.4

SECTION 2: Items to Approve

N/A

SECTION 3: Items to Receive

3.1 Previous Minutes

PAOC Minutes 18 June 2026

RESOLUTION: *That the Committee confirm the Minutes of meeting held on 18 June 2026 as a true and correct record.*
Moved: Hana,
Carried:

3.2 Action Register

N/A – Second meeting. No Actions to review.

RESOLUTION: *That the Committee receive Action Register*
Moved:Julie / Seconded; Juie
Carried:

3.3 **Monitors Report Review / Current PAC Survey Results**

RECOMMENDATION: *that the Committee receives the Reports*
Moved:
Carried:

SECTION 4: Items for Discussion

4.1 Verbal update from the Chair:

- Process to establish new PAC's – update
  - Hospitality, Floristry, Hairdressing
  - Health & Wellbeing
  - Languages
  - Mechanical Engineering

4.2 Proposed PAC Structures August 2026 (Chris King)
4.3 PAOC role in monitoring PAC meetings / Minutes (Julie)
4.4 Additional Members of PAOC (Julie)

SECTION 5: Closing

5.1 Any other business

5.2

2026 Meeting Date	**Venue**
Thursday 29 October 2.30 – 3.30	Mt Albert Campus 110-2020

5.3 Closing karakia

Whakamutunga | Closing

Ka wehe atu tātou
I raro i te rangimārie
Te harikoa
Me te manawanui
Haumi ē! Hui ē! Taiki ē!
We are departing
Peacefully
Joyfully
And resolute
We are united, progressing forward!

3. Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec

Programme Advisory Oversight Committee

4. (a subcommittee of Academic Committee) Terms of Reference

Approval details

Version number	1.0
Issue date	23 January 2026
Approval authority	Academic Committee
Date of approval	23 January 2026
Document owner	Deputy Chief Executive Academic
Contact person	Director, Pathways and External Engagement
Date of next review	September 2026

Version control

Version	Summary of changes	Approved by	Date of Approval
0.1	New draft version (last updated 2026-01-16)	DCEA	
1.0	Approved version	Academic Committee	2026-01-23
1.1	Approved changes	Academic Committee	2026-08-05

1 Background

The Programme Advisory Oversight Committee is established by the Academic Committee as a Standing Subcommittee of the Academic Committee.

The primary reason for the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee is to ensure that the Programme Advisory Committees are working effectively to optimise the Institute's engagement with external professions, industries, Māori, Pacific, Disabled, iwi and communities, in order to ensure that the Institute is providing relevant and excellent quality vocational education and training.

2 Responsibilities

The Programme Advisory Oversight Committee is charged by the Academic Committee to:

- Provide oversight of the effectiveness Programme Advisory Committees and report to Academic Committee accordingly;

- Draw to the attention of the Academic Committee any identified risks to the quality of courses, programmes and qualifications from an industry perspective, which may be recorded in the Academic Risk Register, and make recommendations for their further analysis and mitigation;
- Recommend to the Academic Committee amendments to the Terms of Reference and Membership of the Institute's Programme Advisory Committees;
- Provide advice generally to the Academic Committee and Executive of the Institute on its engagement with professions, industries, hapū and communities in relation to its academic activities;
- Provide expert advice to the Academic Committee on external engagement policies for the good governance of the Institute's academic activities; and
- Undertake an annual self-review (using a process prepared by the Institute) of its effectiveness.

3 Delegations

The Programme Advisory Oversight Committee holds no standing delegations.

4 Membership

4.1 **Members**

Members will be approved by the Academic Committee and will comprise the following:

- Director, Pathways and External Engagement, *ex officio*
- Director, Schools and Performance, *ex officio*
- General Manager, Schools, *ex officio*
- Five (5) Programme Advisory Committee Chairs, nominated by the Deputy Chief Executive Academic on advice from the Director, Pathways and External Engagement, for a period of two (2) years with the possibility of renewal for a second consecutive two (2) year term only.
    - Programme Advisory Committee Chairs may delegate their PAOC representation to a senior staff member or another industry member from their respective Programme Advisory Committee.
- One (1) senior Māori staff member, nominated by the Deputy Chief Executive Academic on advice from the Director Māori Education and Director Māori Success, for a period of two (2) years with the possibility of renewal for a second consecutive two (2) year term only.
- One (1) senior Pacific staff member, nominated by the Deputy Chief Executive Academic on advice from Director, Pacific Success, for a period of two (2) years with the possibility of renewal for a second consecutive two (2) year term only.

4.2 **Chair and Deputy Chair**

The Chair will be the Director, Pathways and External Engagement.

The Chair may appoint a Deputy Chair, who will deputise in the Chair's absence.

4.3 Co-opted members

At the discretion of the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee, and with the approval of Academic Committee, up to three further members may be co-opted or seconded to the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee.

4.4 Observers

Non-voting observers from Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec may attend meetings, with or without speaking rights, at the discretion of the Chair.

4.5 Terminating membership

Members of the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee, other than those *ex officio*, may revoke their membership at any time by giving four weeks' written notice in writing to the Chair.

Any and all Members of the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee may have their Membership revoked by resolution of the Academic Committee.

4.6 Members' characteristic, skills and experiences

Membership should reflect a broad set of applicable characteristic, skills and experiences, including:

- a deep commitment to connecting the Institute meaningfully with the professionals, industries, employers and communities it serves in order to improve the relevance and quality of that service;
- demonstrated knowledge and experience, and a commitment to, Mātauranga Māori;
- preparedness to commit to the depth of honesty, transparency, analysis, thought and contribution required for the task; and
- ability to work collegially and in accordance with Institutional values.

5 Modus Operandi

5.1 Standing Orders

The Programme Advisory Oversight Committee is not bound by the *Standing Orders* of Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec. However, it is encouraged to use these *Standing Orders* as a guide.

5.2 Quorum

Half the current membership plus one member of Programme Advisory Oversight Committee constitutes a quorum.

If the requirement for a quorum is not met, the meeting can proceed, with any recommended actions/motions requiring endorsement by a quorum before they become binding.

5.3 Secretarial Support

The Programme Advisory Oversight Committee shall be supported by a designated, trained staff member appointed by the Chair to act as the Secretary to the Committee.

The Committee Secretary is not a member of the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee, and shall not act as a proxy in the absence of an appointed member.

5.4 Meetings

The Programme Advisory Oversight Committee will recommend for approval to the Academic Committee the schedule of meetings for the following year, with no fewer than four (4) meetings per academic year.

These meetings are not open to the public, unless determined otherwise at the discretion of the Chair, in order to provide opportunity for the Committee to provide free and frank advice to the Institute.

5.5 Reporting

The Programme Advisory Oversight Committee will submit its written Minutes to Academic Committee. These may be submitted in draft form upon the approval of the Chair. If amendments are made at a subsequent meeting of the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee then the amended Minutes will also be reported to the Academic Committee.

The Chair will accompany the written Minutes with a summary memo, including recommendations from the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee to the Academic Committee and highlighting any other matters from the Minutes which the Chair considers merit the Academic Committee's attention.

5. Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec

Programme Advisory Committee

6. (a subcommittee of Academic Committee) Terms of Reference

Approval details

Version number	1.0
Issue date	23 January 2026
Approval authority	Academic Committee
Date of approval	23 January 2026
Document owner	Deputy Chief Executive Academic
Contact person	Deputy Chief Executive Academic
Date of next review	September 2026

Version control

Version	Summary of changes	Approved by	Date of Approval
0.1	New draft version (last updated 2026-01-16)	DCEA	
1.0	Approved version	Academic Committee	2026-01-23

1 Background

Programme Advisory Committees are established by the Academic Committee as Standing Subcommittees of the Academic Committee.

The primary reason for the Programme Advisory Committee is to provide expert industry, profession, hapū and community guidance and insights to ensure that the Institute's academic offerings align with current needs and future strategic directions.

2 Responsibilities

The Programme Advisory Committee is charged by the Academic Committee to:

- Ensure that proposed and current academic offerings meet the needs of employers and industry by equipping graduates with workplace-relevant skills, knowledge and experience at entry level and throughout relevant career paths;
- Endorse academic programme redesign and applications for new programmes to be developed;

- Participate in various programme review processes;
- Facilitate partnerships between the Institution and relevant industry, professional and community contacts;
- Provide advice to the relevant School/s on emerging industry trends, challenges, and opportunities to inform programme development;
- Draw to the attention of the Programme Committee any identified risks to the quality of courses, programmes and qualifications from an industry perspective, which may be recorded in the Academic Risk Register, and make recommendations for their further analysis and mitigation;
- Undertake an annual self-review (using a process prepared by the Institute) of its effectiveness.
- Collaborate with the International Academic Advisory Committee as appropriate.

While not a responsibility *per se*, Programme Advisory Committee Members may also be invited to undertake important activities including but not limited to:

- Attend and participate in Programme events such as Careers Days, prizegivings and special events;
- Provide guest lectures;
- Serve as judges for competitions;
- Host student placements.

The Head of School is charged by the Academic Committee to:

- Induct the Programme Advisory Committee members into the Institute, the School and the relevant programmes.
- Provide to the Programme Advisory Committee copies of submissions made to external regulatory bodies (including, but not limited to, Industry Skills Boards, NZQA, Professional Bodies and External Monitors), and resulting reports from those entities, for their consideration and input.
- Present information on graduate outcomes and academic programme performance as applicable (ākonga retention and success, priority group performance, performance against professional standards).
- Present to the Programme Advisory Committee any other information that it may reasonably request to assist in exercising its responsibilities.
- Present to each meeting a report indicating how advice raised previously by the Programme Advisory Committee has been addressed.

3 Delegations

The Programme Advisory Committee holds no standing delegations.

4 Membership

4.1 Members

Members will be approved by the Academic Committee and will comprise the following:

- Head of the School that delivers the relevant programme/s, *ex officio*
- Chair of the relevant Programme Committee/s, *ex officio*
- At least four (4) and no more than six (6) Members drawn from industries, professions and communities relevant to the programmes, nominated by the Head of School on advice from the Programme Advisory Committee, appointed for a period of two (2) years, renewable for a single additional two-year term at the discretion of the Chair.
- At least two (2) and no more than four (4) Members drawn from graduates of the relevant programmes within the past five years, nominated by the Head of School on advice from the Programme Advisory Committee, appointed for a period of two (2) years, renewable for a single additional two-year term at the discretion of the Chair

4.2 Chair and Deputy Chair

The Chair will be appointed by the Deputy Chief Executive Academic on the recommendation of the Committee from among the industry, profession and community Members.
Appointments to the Chair will be for a period of two years and may be renewed by mutual agreement of the Chair and the DCE Academic.

The Chair may appoint a Deputy Chair, who will deputise in the Chair's absence.

4.3 Co-opted members

At the discretion of the Programme Advisory Committee, and with the approval of Academic Committee, up to three further members may be co-opted or seconded to the Programme Advisory Committee.

4.4 Confidentiality and Conflicts of Interest

Members must maintain confidentiality regarding sensitive discussions and information.

Members will declare conflicts of interest before engaging in discussions or decision-making.

Members will act professionally, respectfully, and collaboratively to achieve the group's objectives.

4.5 Observers

All Members of the relevant Programme Committee/s are expected to attend Programme Advisory Committee meetings as non-voting observers.

All Members of the Programme Teaching Teams are encouraged to attend Programme Advisory Committee meetings as non-voting observers.

Members of the Institute's Senior Leadership may attend and present to the Programme Advisory Committee.

Other non-voting observers from Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec may attend meetings, with or without speaking rights, at the discretion of the Chair.

4.6 Terminating membership

Members of the Programme Advisory Committee, other than those *ex officio*, may revoke their membership at any time by giving four weeks' written notice in writing to the Chair.

Any and all Members of the Programme Advisory Committee may have their Membership revoked by resolution of the Academic Committee.

4.7 Members' characteristic, skills and experiences

Membership should reflect a broad set of applicable characteristic, skills and experiences, including:

- demonstrated expertise in the relevant industry, profession or community;
- a deep commitment to supporting education and workforce development;
- the ability to provide strategic insights based on expertise and understanding of industry needs;
- willingness to contribute to annual monitor visits/consistency reviews to give feedback on the programme as a key stakeholder; and
- the ability to work collegially and in accordance with Institutional values.

5 Modus Operandi

5.1 Standing Orders

The Programme Advisory Committee is not bound by the *Standing Orders* of Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec. However, it is encouraged to use these *Standing Orders* as a guide.

5.2 Quorum

Half the current membership plus one member of Programme Advisory Committee constitutes a quorum.

If the requirement for a quorum is not met, the meeting can proceed, with any recommended actions/motions requiring endorsement by a quorum before they become binding.

5.3 Secretarial Support

Each Programme Advisory Committee shall be supported by a designated, trained staff member appointed by the School to act as the Secretary to the Committee.

The Committee Secretary is not a member of the Programme Advisory Committee, and shall not act as a proxy in the absence of an appointed member.

5.4 Meetings

The Head of the relevant School will recommend for approval to the Academic Committee the schedule of Programme Advisory Committee meetings for the following year, with no fewer than two meetings per academic year.

The Open Session of each meeting will be open to the public; non-Members may be excluded from any Closed Session, which is for items where there is a need to protect the rights of persons or organisations.

5.5 Reporting

A Programme Advisory Committee will submit its written Minutes to the relevant Programme Committee. These may be submitted in draft form upon the approval of the Chair. If amendments are made at a subsequent meeting of the Programme Advisory Committee then the amended Minutes will also be reported to the Programme Committee.

The Chair will accompany the written Minutes with a Cover Memo, including recommendations from the Programme Advisory Committee to the Programme Committee and highlighting any other matters from the Minutes which the Chair considers merit the Programme Committee's attention.

Copies of all Programme Advisory Committee Minutes and Cover Memos will also be provided by the Head of School to the Programme Advisory Oversight Committee prior to its next scheduled meeting.