

PAQC Review of PEPs and Rubric for Rating of Self-Evaluative Capability

Once a programme team has completed their report, it comes to the PAQC for review.

This review is **not** to proof-read the report (unless the writing is particularly not good). It is to:

- Note the strengths and best practice from the report to be celebrated
- Record any issues the programme is facing that require beyond-School support to address
- Assess the appropriateness (particularly the relevance) of the SMART goals the team has set in the table at the end of the report. The team will be accountable for the progress of these to the PAQC so it is important that these are SMART, and the top 3-5 actions the team should be taking.
- Rate using the rubric below the capability in self-evaluation of the programme team as evidenced by their report. ***This is not about their performance but about their ability to self-assess.*** Please explain your rating and provide a recommendation or two as to how this rating could be maintained or improved.

This rubric is a rubric for External Evaluation and Review from the NZQA.

Rubric 2: Criteria for rating Capability in Self-Assessment for Key Evaluation Questions and Focus Areas

Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self-assessment is exceptional and comprehensive• Strong evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities• Very few gaps or weaknesses• Any gaps and weaknesses have no significant impact and are managed very effectively
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self-assessment is generally strong and comprehensive• Evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities• Few gaps or weaknesses• Gaps or weaknesses have some impact but are mostly managed effectively
Marginal	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self-assessment is inconsistent in quality and coverage• Limited evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities• Some gaps and weaknesses have some impact, and are not managed effectively
Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self-assessment is generally ineffective or weak• No or minimal evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities• Significant gaps or weaknesses have significant impact, and are not managed effectively• Does not meet minimum expectations or requirements

Notes:

1. It is important that separate eyes than those who wrote the report, are key in reviewing it. It is not acceptable for the report writer(s) to draft the PAQC response.
2. Some PAQCs divide the reports up amongst their members to be read and reviewed, bringing proposed wording to the committee. Ideally, to ensure wider ownership at governance level of the evaluative reporting of the programme evaluations – and knowledge of them – at least two people not involved in teaching or managing the programme should review a given report, agreeing together on what they recommend the review say.
3. Teams should provide no more than 3-5 SMART goals. Ask them to reduce if there are more than this (for the reason above)