Interpreting your evidence

Answer each of the six KEQs with supporting evaluative insights using the NZQA's Tertiary Evaluation (outcome and process) Indicators (summary and Full) and NZQA's Rubric (excellent/good/marginal/poor) to guide your self-ratings. A guide that brings the KEQs and TEIs together can be found at: http://aws-website-qadtertiaryevaluation-r6aq8.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com/

For each KEQ you will be asked **What? How? Why?** and **So What?** Thus: Summarize key insights in relation to the KEQ – How do you know this? What evidences them from the data and other information and feedback you have gathered? Why do successes or gaps/weaknesses exist? What is creating them? And then note specific actions already being taken or that you plan to take, looking ahead.

These responses – your evaluative comments – should convince the reader that your performance rating is fair and accurate. To help you, the template provides prompts for what kind of evidence can inform each KEQ.

Because internal and external realities change over time all programmes, no matter how good, are works in progress. The value of a PEP lies in its robust and honest analysis and effective goal-setting toward continuing improvement.

In terms of description, only include comments that add to 'the story' of the performance of your programme(s). Ideal commentary is concise, engaging, and leaves the reader confident it stems from, and is supported by, robust evidence.

- Statements should be evaluative, not descriptive. Wherever possible, include specific information which enables strengths and successes, gaps, weaknesses, and emerging or continuing issues to be quantified. Show and speak to **why** something is a strength or shortcoming, rather than just stating the facts – where is it coming from, what is causing it, how do you know that?

- Use data and benchmarks wherever possible – compare performance to benchmarking data or show trends over previous years. Compare outcomes to SMART goals set previously. This helps to put raw data into context, and to show that standards are improving and your programme is relevant and engaging.

- Be clear about where there are genuine strengths in your programme and speak to those, rather than writing about normal features, which anyone would be expected to know. Compliance with statutory or contractual obligations, for example, is a norm, not a strength.

- Show the impact of both strengths and weaknesses – if surveys and reviews are undertaken to assess effectiveness, how are the results being acted upon? If there is an issue, how is it impacting on learners and other stakeholders?

- Make statements clearer and more robust by showing how judgements have been reached ('CEPs show that…')

- Avoid vague statements ('Some aspects of governance need to be improved' – which aspects? How do they need to be improved? OR 'This suggests that' – do the investigative work to evidence clarity OR 'Feedback has been positive' – what exactly are students/stakeholders saying?)

- If a weakness or emerging or continuing issue is particularly significant and poses a major risk to the programme, this needs to be shown as a priority for action. Note it clearly and set a SMART goal.