
To	Te Poari Mātauranga	From	Simon Tries, Manager, Te Korowai Kahurangi
Title	Academic Board Oversight of QMS	Date	24 January 2020

Recommendation/s

That Te Poari Mātauranga:

- Review the appended *AB Coverage of QMS 2020* and confirm the details therein
- Adopt the “Next Steps” outlined in this memorandum

Commentary

Unitec’s 2018 External Evaluation and Review raised significant concerns about Academic Board’s effectiveness in overseeing Unitec’s Quality Management System (QMS). The QMS is outlined in the [Academic Statute](#) and Academic Policies and Procedures, and governed by Academic Board and its Committees through the relevant Terms of Reference.

A review of Unitec’s QMS has now been completed. The review focussed in particular on any existing gaps in how Academic Board could best assure itself that it could maintain appropriate oversight of, and input into, academic matters at Unitec. Academic matters in this context incorporate:

- the strategic perspective - whether Unitec’s academic related strategies are appropriate and their desired outcomes are being achieved; and
- the operational perspective - whether the supporting academic systems are functioning as intended and delivering the desired outcomes, and whether appropriate actions are being taken to achieve improvements.

Specific gaps in the QMS have not been explicitly stated as a holistic view of how the requirements of the QMS continue to be overseen was considered most useful. The review of the QMS has been cross-referenced against NZQA’s Evaluative Quality Assurance Framework, including the six Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) used for External Evaluation Reviews and the Tertiary Evaluation Indicators which support these KEQs. The result is outlined in the appended *AB Coverage of QMS 2020*.

The *AB Coverage of QMS 2020* outlines how Academic Board can assure itself that it will gain sufficient oversight of the QMS through the receipt of relevant reports and ongoing status updates of key quality systems and the functioning of the various Academic Board committees. The *AB Coverage of QMS 2020* outlines in a straightforward manner for Academic Board and its committees:

- what each committee can expect to receive
- the frequency of receipt of the report/item
- the intent of the report/item being received
- the likely provider of the report/item

Committees of Academic Board are charged through their terms of reference with specific responsibilities. For example, consideration of applications (e.g., for a programme or a research proposal) or consideration of a summary report on the functioning of a particular system; for example, programme evaluation, teacher competency development (badging) or research performance.

Academic Board then maintains oversight through the receipt of:

- Committee Chairs' reports where the work of the committee is summarised and any matters of note raised for Academic Board consideration
- Summary reports which consider how particular systems are functioning against expectations – these will generally first be considered by a committee of Academic Board which would consider the matter in detail and set or confirm any actions to be taken, as well as track progress against those actions.
- Regular status (RAG) reports which provide a 'quick view' of key academic quality systems (e.g., degree monitoring, programme closure, academic risk etc.) or progress against matters of particular interest (i.e., relevant Unitec strategies, the Academic Quality Action Plan, Priority Group Directors' reports on their Operational plans, etc.)

To achieve the expected level of assurance for Academic Board the summary reports noted above need to address both the relevant *process* (how well the process supported the achievement of the desired outcomes for that iteration/cycle) and the *outcomes* (were targets met, including analysis over time/across priority groups, etc.). They must also report on the achievement or otherwise of any previously identified actions and identify any new actions to be undertaken to achieve improvement. While the Academic Statute provides some details regarding the approach to be taken when reporting against some aspects of the QMS, it would be worthwhile for Academic Board to consider what additional aspects it would like reported on.

Those expected to provide the reports outlined in the *AB Coverage of QMS 2020* have not been consulted. It is Academic Board's responsibility to ask the right questions by considering what it needs to know and how frequently and to require this of the business, whilst being cognisant of the demands that such requests place on the business and its own role as a governance committee.

Next Steps

Following Academic Board's consideration and any amendments to the *AB Coverage of QMS 2020*, it is recommended that Academic Board:

- formally notify its committees and relevant parts of the institute of its requirements and seek confirmation of a date by which Summary Reports will be able to be provided.
- require the relevant committee to:
 - o determine the high-level content of the summary report (i.e., what specifically it wants to be reported on) after providing any advice to that committee
 - o report back to the next possible Academic Board meeting on its decisions
- Finalise its workplan based on the responses received

Attachments

AB Coverage of QMS 2020

People Consulted

Steve Marshall, Lead, Quality Partnering



For Discussion

Simon Nash, Director Ako