



minutes

TE POARI MĀTAURANGA | ACADEMIC BOARD

MEETING OPENED: 0832h

Date: 2020-02-05

Scheduled Start: 0830h

Scheduled End: 1130h

Actual End: 1200h

Location: Building 110-2019

1. Whakatuwheratanga | Opening

1.1. Karakia Timatanga | Opening Prayer

Manawa mai te mauri nuku
 Manawa mai te mauri rangi
 Ko te mauri kai au
 he mauri tipua
 Ka pakaru mai te pō
 Tau mai te mauri
 Haumi e, hui e, taiki e!

*Embrace the power of the earth
 Embrace the power of the sky
 The power I have
 Is mystical
 And shatters all darkness
 Cometh the light
 Join it, gather it, it is done!*

1.2. Mihi Whakatau | Welcome Speech

1.2.1. Committee Self-Assessment

Today: Areas for Committee Improvement in 2020

Next: TBC

1.2.2. Important Dates

Submissions due: 2020-02-19

Next meeting: 2020-03-04

1.3. Tae Ā-Tinana & Ngā Whakapāha | Attendance & Apologies

Mema Poāri Tae Ā-Tinana | Present

1. **(Chair)** Simon Nash
2. Andrea Thumath – Dep. 1130h
3. Anna Wheeler – Arr. 0849h
(For: Annette Pitovao)
4. Anne McKay – Dep. 1147h
5. Arun Deo – Dep. 0912h
(For: Marcus Williams)
6. Chris King – Dep. 1147h
7. Falaniko Tominiko
8. Glenn McKay
9. Kate Barry
10. Lee Baglow – Arr. 0848h
11. Liz Rainsbury
12. Merran Davis

13. Simon Tries
14. Toni Rewiri – Arr. 0838h
15. Tracy Chapman – Dep. 0916h

Ngā Whakapāha | Apologies

1. Annette Pitovao
(Proxy: Anna Wheeler)
2. Helen Vea
(No proxy; family bereavement)
3. Katie Bruffy
(No proxy)
4. Marcus Williams
(Proxy: Arun Deo)

MOTION

That Academic Board accept the apologies for the meeting.

Moved: F Tominiko

Seconded: G McKay

MOTION CARRIED

Kōrama | Quorum

A minimum of 9 members was required; the meeting was determined as holding quorum.

Absences

(None)

Hunga Mahi | Staff in Attendance

1. Daniel Weinholz (Secretary)
2. Sinead Hart – Arr. 0906h; Dep. 0942h
3. Steve Marshall
4. Sue Crossan – Dep. 0956h
5. Trude Cameron

1.4. Mahia Atu | Matters Arising

(None)

1.5. Pitopito Kōrero o Ngā Hui | Minutes of the Previous Meeting/s

ACTION → Simon Nash (Chair, Academic Board) – To coordinate an induction meeting for newer / interested members on topics including committee citizenship, protocols and procedures.

Regular Meeting of 2019-12-11

Item 2.3. Quality Assured Research Output (QARO) Targets

Discussion between members on the wording of the Motion led to clarity of understanding that the wording relates to as it originally came to the committee, which is not necessarily the same as the wording at the future meeting that the item was deferred to.

In this case, the recommended motion at the meeting of 2019-12-11 was to keep the original QARO Targets. After discussion, the committee agreed for the QARO Targets to be revised and to defer the item to 2020-02-05.

[Note: At the current meeting (below, Item 2.1. Revision of QARO Targets), the revised targets were approved and the wording of the Motion reflects this.]

MOTION

That Academic Board approve the Minutes of:

- Regular Meeting: 2019-12-11
- Standing Committee Meeting/s: 2020-01-21

Moved: T Chapman

Seconded: A Thumath

MOTION CARRIED

1.6. Ngā Tautapu Arotake | Actions for Review

(See following pages.)

Committee:
Document:
Updated:

Te Poari Mātauranga | Academic Board
Committee Actions Table
2020-02-05

S		M		R	T	A
Source	Action #	Specification	Measure / Progress	Responsibility	Time Target / Closed	Achievement Status
2019-05-08	Action-048 <i>(Formerly: Standing-005)</i>	<p>Renewal Plan + Renewal Strategy + Waitākere Strategy Strategic Plans and Strategies are to be presented to and approved by Academic Board.</p> <p>2019-11-13 Committee Self-Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Action very much needs to close in the December meeting. Neither the Renewal Plan, Renewal Strategy, Waitākere Strategy nor Manaakitia Te Rito were presented to and approved / endorsed by Academic Board before release. It is unknown if these were endorsed by the Heads of Schools and the Priority Group Directors. The Student Council has not been consulted on the Waitākere Strategy. As a collective, the Committee has neglected to exercise its mandate regarding the approval of these Strategies. <p>ACTION: In response to this self-assessment, the Chair of Academic Board shall prioritize to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Arrange for the Waitākere Strategy to be presented to and endorsed by Academic Board 2019-12-11. Investigate whether consultation with Student Council / representatives has been adequate. Consider how best to compensate for the lack of Academic Board approval of the Strategies. 	<p>Renewal Plan 2019-09-11: The two ratified strategies are expected to come to Academic Board 2019-10-09. The ratified Renewal Plan is expected to come to Academic Board 2019-11-13. 2019-10-09: The Renewal Plan, Renewal Strategy and Waitākere Strategy will be presented together to Academic Board 2019-11-13. 2019-11-13: The Renewal Plan, Renewal Strategy and Waitākere Strategy were not presented. 2019-12-11: Renewal Plan and Manaakitia Te Rito Renewal Strategy shall be presented in 2020 for Academic Board to received. Reporting against this shall begin in 2020. 2020-02-05: Dual presentation of Manaakitia te Rito Renewal Strategy and the Renewal Plan set for Academic Board 2020-03-04.</p> <p>Renewal Strategy 2019-05-08: Draft to be presented to Academic Board 2019-06-12. 2019-06-12: No update 2019-07-10: The Strategy shall soon go for checking to ELT and the Commissioner, before presentation as a draft to all staff at Tū-Arotake Checkpoint. 2019-08-14: Out for consultation with staff. Expected to come to Academic Board 2019-09-11 for ratification, alongside the Waitākere Strategy. 2019-09-11: Work is underway, based on staff feedback, to visually incorporate the Unitec values into the diamond and priorities. News on its ratification by the Commissioner is expected at Academic Board 2019-10-09. This will then inform the Renewal Plan and forecasts for 2020. 2019-10-09: Finalising design for release to staff. 2019-11-13: Design has been completed and released as <i>Manaakitia Te Rito</i>. 2019-12-11: Renewal Plan and Manaakitia Te Rito Renewal Strategy to be presented in 2020 for Academic Board to received. Reporting against this shall begin in 2020. 2020-02-05: Dual presentation of Manaakitia te Rito Renewal Strategy and the Renewal Plan set for Academic Board 2020-03-04.</p> <p>Waitākere Strategy <i>"Investigate equity of student experience across the Mt Albert and Waitākere campuses, and face-to-face and online, and instigate improvement initiatives, particularly in regard to access to study spaces, classroom resourcing, support services and the library."</i> 2019-05-08: Waitākere Success Strategy in progress with David Glover and Linda Aumua. They are opening 3 weeks of consultation with West Auckland community stakeholders, utilising data from Auckland Tourism, Events & Economic Development (ATEED). RoVE is not expected to impact this work, as it aligns with the Minister's aims. 2019-06-12: No update 2019-07-10: No significant update. Item name corrected from "Waitākere Success Strategy" to "Waitākere Strategy". 2019-08-14: Expected to be ready for Academic Board 2019-09-11. 2019-09-11: Work is almost at the final draft. It shall also go through ratification by the Commissioner and Academic Board, just like the Renewal Strategy, and is expected at Academic Board 2019-10-09. 2019-10-09: Strategy has now been endorsed by ELT and Commissioner. 2019-11-13: Presented back to Waitākere staff for feedback. Being shared with external stakeholders. 2019-12-11: Refer to Item 2.11. Waitākere Strategy. (COMPLETE)</p>	Merran Davis	2019-12-11 Waitākere Strategy COMPLETE TO PRESENT 2020-03-04 Manaakitia te Rito Renewal Strategy & Renewal Plan	Completed
2019-06-12	Action-032	<p>Programme Development – Business Case Threshold Define the "significant" programme development threshold which triggers the requirement for submission of a Business Case. Recommend any necessary / resulting refinement to the Programme Change and Improvement Procedure.</p>	<p>2019-07-10: A paper was written and presented to ELT. Their response was a request for further information on the current status of business cases, the process and requirements of composing business cases and what role AB does / should have in the signoff process that ELT ultimately oversees. Simon Tries and Simon Nash shall consult broadly, including Marketing and Commercial Services, for feedback on the adequacy of the current process. Simon Tries shall report back to Academic Board 2019-08-14 on the a) business case threshold, and b) business case process map. 2019-09-11: The work is currently with ELT. 2019-10-09: Work in progress with Simon Tries, Simon Nash and Kristine Brothers. 2019-11-13: No progress to report. Deferred to Academic Board 2019-12-11. 2019-12-11: No progress. 2020-02-05: In progress. Nothing yet to report.</p>	Simon Nash Simon Tries Kristine Brothers Nick Sheppard	2019-07-10 2019-08-14 TBC	Active
2019-07-03	Action-047 <i>(Formerly: Standing-001)</i>	<p>Review of Semesterised Delivery</p>	<p>2019-05-08: Nothing to report. Merran expects this will constitute part of the initial work of RoVE. 2019-07-10: The Committee agreed to keep this item alive, pending until the RoVE announcement in a few weeks. 2019-08-14: Keep on the agenda, pending establishment of NZIST. 2019-09-11; 2019-10-09; 2019-11-13; 2019-12-11; 2020-02-05: No change.</p>	Simon Nash	TBC	Low Priority

2019-07-10	Action-038	<u>Remediation of Student Debt</u> Develop a proposal and scope for further investigation to identify proactive strategies to remedy and / or prevent outstanding student debts in partnership with Champions and Service Leads, and to identify how to incorporate it into the Academic Quality Action Plan.	2019-08-14: Update deferred to Academic Board 2019-09-11. 2019-09-11: Andrea Thumath shall submit a paper to Academic Board 2019-10-09. 2019-10-09: Progress has been made. Currently collaborating with Student Finance. Full report to be presented to Academic Board 2019-11-13. 2019-11-13: Refer to Item 4.1.4. > Exceptions (June). Analysis work continues. When it concludes, it shall complete both the Exception and this Action. 2019-12-11: N/A 2020-02-05: Aim to report back with a memo to Academic Board 2020-03-04.	Andrea Thumath Marcus Williams	2019-10-09 2020-03-04	Active
2019-11-13 Item 1.7.	Action-046	<u>Committee Work Plan 2020</u> Ensure that the Committee Work Plan is ready for 2020 and actively used throughout the year.	2019-12-11: Work in progress, currently focussed on the QMS Stocktake. 2020-02-05: Work in progress, related to Item 3.1. Review - Quality Management System.	Simon Nash (Chair, Academic Board)	2020-02-05	Active

Next:

Action-049

1.7. Committee Work Plan

From: Simon Nash (Chair, Academic Board)

[Note: Still under development and refinement through the Te Korowai Kahurangi stocktake of Quality Management System reporting requirements and development of the Academic Risk Register.]

Discussion agree to aim for the Quality Management System to be approved for implementation from the next meeting of Academic Board 2020-03-04. After this, the Committee Work Plan for Academic Board will be redeveloped. Similarly, the Committee Work Plans for the Subcommittees will need to be reviewed and updated.

Related: Item 3.1. Review – Quality Management System (QMS)

1.8. Academic Quality Action Plan (AQAP) Updates

From: Simon Nash (Executive Director, Academic)

Tracking of Outcomes rather than Activities was intended to be presented to Academic Board 2020-02-05, but was not ready in time. The adjusted aim is to present this to Academic Board 2020-03-04. Tracking of Outcomes is necessary in order to set Goals which are important for EER.

Programme Evaluation & Planning work is underway and on track to be all in to Quality Alignment Board by 2020-02-20.

Committee Reflection: The Chair emphasized that directing Academic Board and the AQAP to ask hard evaluative questions is a key priority for 2020.

2. Mea Hei Whakaae | Items to Approve

Note: Proceedings directed by the Chair to Item 2.6. EPI Targets for International Success

2.6. International EPI Targets 2019-2022

From: Tracy Chapman (Director, International Success)

Not much publicly available data on International EPI Targets was able to be found, so data from within Unitec itself was used as the main source. The Director expressed being confident of the institute's ability to achieve the targets.

Discussion included the following points.

- This item is not proposing any new or additional initiatives beyond what is in the current International Success Strategy or Operational Plan.
- Current initiatives should either maintain or improve our EPI achievement.
- Further investigation may be warranted into the accuracy of Unitec's data and into how it compares to different ITPs with different programmes.
- The targets for Student Retention and Student Progression already exceed the ITP Sector. Thus, these targets were left untouched in order to allow more of the limited

resources to go toward improving achievement of other EPI Targets. The Executive Director of Student Success supported this approach.

- Although Retention and Progression could remain steady, this does not mean that Course Completion and Qualification Completion will not improve. Course Completion and Qualification Completion can improve due to increased satisfaction in Student Experience.
- The development of a target for Student Retention (2nd Year) could be valuable.

Evaluation of all points then lead Academic Board to recommend that the targets for Student Retention and Student Progression should *not* be left steady, but that the institute should aim for increased achievement each year.

ACTION → Tracy Chapman to review the Student Retention and Student Progression targets, and add some rationale and data to support how they can improve each year.

MOTION – Deferred to a later meeting of Academic Board

That Academic Board approve the following EPI Targets for International Course Completion and Qualification Completion to achieve parity with the ITP Sector actuals whilst maintaining performance for Student Retention (1st Year) and Student Progression, which are higher than current ITP Sector results.

2018 EPI Summary based on TEC Data	Tertiary EPI (Education Performance Indicator) Targets and Actuals - International						
	ITP Sector Actual 2018	Unitec Actual 2018	Proposed 2019	Proposed 2020	Proposed 2021	Proposed 2022	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Course Completion	91.1	89.6	90.05	90.50	91.00	91.5	Parity with ITP sector
Qualification Completion	65.2	63.4	64.00	64.60	65.5	65.5	Parity with ITP sector
Student Retention (1st Year)	73.5	86.4	86.4	86.4	86.4	86.4	Maintain current level
Student Progression	67.3	69.8	69.8	69.8	69.8	69.8	Maintain current level

Moved: N/A

Seconded: N/A

MOTION deferred

Note: Proceedings directed by the Chair to Item 4.1.3. Strategic Report for International Success

4.1.3. International

From: Tracy Chapman (Director, International Success)

MOTION

That Academic Board receive the Strategic Report for International Success.

Moved: A Thumath

Seconded: T Rewiri

MOTION CARRIED

Note: Proceedings directed by the Chair to Item 2.1. Revision of QARO Targets.

2.1. Revision of Quality Assured Research Outputs (QARO) Targets

Related: Academic Board 2019-12-11, Item 2.3. QARO Targets

From: Arun Deo on behalf of Marcus Williams (Director, Research and Enterprise)

Discussion included the following points.

- The targets apply across the whole institute.
- The proposed targets were originally set at 2.5 and have now dropped to 1.5.
- Comparable targets at other ITPs are unknown and are not publicly available information. QAROs from other ITPs are published as the PBRF results, but these do not show how much FTE funding was invested to achieve them. Each ITP has their own database and investment model.

The committee agreed that the original concern over the targets had been addressed, and that the revised targets are reasonable, knowing that the next few years will present new challenges across the sector.

MOTION

That Academic Board approve the setting of the Quality Assured Research Outputs target at 1.5 per degree teaching staff FTE, per year, until 2022.

Moved: L Rainsbury

Seconded: M Davis

MOTION CARRIED

2.2. Review – AC2.6 Student Appeals Procedure

Related:

- Academic Board 2019-12-11, Item 2.4. Review – AC2.6 Student Appeals Procedure

From: Sue Crossan

A slideshow was presented outlining the changes, context and next steps for this mahi. This included a response to the three Actions raised at Academic Board 2019-12-11. These were recorded in the Minutes of 2019-12-11 as follows.

ACTIONS for Sue Crossan and team.

- Allow for a final appeal to the Chief Executive.
- With solid rationale, exclude Level 9 and 10 programmes from the regular Appeals process (Sue Crossan, Marcus Williams, Simon Tries).
- Establish clear rules and guidelines for Informal Resolution of complaints and consistency of practice across Unitec.

The response to these was as follows.

- Final Appeal – Added to the Procedure.
- Level 9 & 10 Programmes – After further discussion, this concern turned out to be a misunderstanding, and therefore needed no adjustments.
- Guidelines for Informal Resolution – Drafted with more work to do on the document presentation.

In addition, discussion raised / clarified the following points.

- Final Grades – The rationale for limiting Academic Complaints only to Final Grades was twofold. Firstly, allowing non-final grade complaints simply opens up far too many possibilities for complaints than could possibly be processed; indeed, given that courses have no set number of assessments, it would be impossible to know the maximum number of complaints that could be made. Limiting it to the final grade of a course means that the scope of possible complaint numbers can be better defined. Secondly, grades achieved during a course, compared to at the end of a course, compose formative assessment, meaning that students who are unsatisfied with their initial grade/s in the semester will often recognize areas of weakness in their knowledge / habits and subsequently adjust their efforts, resulting in a satisfactory final grade. A low non-final grade can thus form part of the learning experience.
- Moderation – Informal resolution of complaints within Schools could include Moderation as a useful tool to de-escalate and / or resolve matters before they reached Final Grade level. Sue Crossan agreed to add this into the drafted Guidelines.
- Informal Resolution – Students are expected to engage with both Student Support and the School to achieve Informal Resolution prior to lodging an Academic Complaint.
- Final Appeal – A procedural flaw is the only grounds on which a Final Appeal can be made to the Chief Executive. The substance of an appeal is not valid grounds for a Final Appeal.
- School-side Appeal – An Appeal by a School / Staff against a Complaint decision is not an option. Confidence should be in the neutrality of the independent investigator. Allowing such an appeal against a complaint decision would open the process too wide. Staff could possibly appeal any and every complaint made against their grading.
- Statute of Limitations – The “15 days” has been extended from the original 10 days and begins from when the grades are published. This extension allows time (3 days) for Informal Resolution inside the School. The 15-day timeframe also has flexibility if needed, acknowledging that various factors can delay / complicate investigations. In addition, if Informal Resolution is expected to take more than three working days, then the complaint coordinator can notify the student of when resolution is expected to conclude. The setting of 15 days as the standard timeframe in order for students

to progress through their study plan without delay (e.g. a Semester 1 course that is a pre-requisite for a Semester 2 course).

- Purpose – The recommendations being made are intended to bring improvements to action, tracking and clarity.
- Communications – Students need to clearly understand that if they disagree with a final grade, then they need to begin the process as soon as possible. One past complaint was lodged eight weeks after the grade was published.
- Effective Date – This procedure shall come into effect immediately following approval by Academic Board (today).

In addition, Sue Crossan shall undertake the following edits.

- Academic Complaints Procedure, Section 5.1 – Insert a new step a) to state that a student may engage with Student Support prior to lodging an Academic Complaint Form.
- Academic Complaints Procedure, Section 5.2.b – Insert the word “days” so that it reads as “Within 2 working days of receipt ...”

Academic Board commended Sue Crossan and her team for their great work, and acknowledged Trude Cameron for her earlier work on the matter.

Additional summation was made that:

- Informal Resolutions within Schools will be a new practice.
- As per the memo (Next Steps, Item 2) and the decision of Academic Board (March 2017), the Academic Resolutions Committee will be formed new.
- Complaints investigators will need to be recruited as needed and available.

MOTION

That Academic Board approve the changes to *AC2.6 Student Appeals Procedure*.

That Academic Board receive the associated documents listed in the memo.

1. Review Rationale
2. Academic Complaint – Procedure
3. Academic Complaint – Flowchart
4. Academic Complaint – Decision Tree
5. Academic Complaint – Steps for Investigators
6. Academic Complaint – Email Template for an Investigation Outcome
7. Academic Complaint – Student-facing Information
8. Academic Complaint – Application Form
9. Academic Appeal – Procedure
10. Academic Appeal – Flowchart
11. Academic Appeal – Notice Form
12. Academic Appeal – Student-facing Information
13. Unitec Web Page Information – Complaints and Appeals
14. Guidelines for Informal Resolution

Moved: A McKay

Seconded: K Barry

MOTION CARRIED

Note: *Proceedings paused by the Chair from 0942h to 0954h.*

2.3. Amendments – Student Complaints Resolution Procedure

Deferred from: Academic Board 2019-12-11, Item 2.5.

Related: Item 2.2. Review of AC2.6 Student Appeals Procedure

From: Anna Wheeler on behalf of Annette Pitovao (Director, Student Success)

The amendments contain no substantial changes. The main change is to refer students to the academic complaints procedure rather than the non-academic one.

MOTION

That Academic Board approve the amendments to the *Student Complaints Resolution Procedure* as listed in the Memo, in order to align with the revised *Student Appeals Procedure* and the new *Academic Complaint Procedure*.

Moved: C King

Seconded: T Rewiri

MOTION CARRIED

2.4. Amendments – AC1.2 Programme Regulations Procedure & AC1.2.9 Admission Requirements Procedure

Deferred from: Academic Board 2019-11-13, Item 2.8. Procedure Changes – Programme Regulations Procedure and Admission Requirements Procedure

Related: Academic Board 2019-12-11, Item 2.2. Further Work on the Admission, Enrolment & Fees (AEF) Policy

From: Steve Marshall

Generic Regulations, compared to Programme-specific Regulations, are not recognized as a thing within NZQA. NZQA simply works with Programme Regulations and does not differentiate between Generic or Specific. Thus, if we make a Type 2 change to Unitec's Generic Regulations, this would require it to be registered with NZQA as a Type 2 change for every single programme in Unitec that uses the Generic Regulations. Many programmes do not follow the Generic Regulations, using the phrase that "Generic Regulations to not apply to this programme" or similar.

The use of policy and procedure for governance is viewed as being better than the use of Generic Regulations. Additionally, communications with students are necessary to help them understand what is required. Usage of policy, procedure and communications as a package tool rather than Generic Regulations would better align Unitec with the approach of NZQA and other ITPs.

If a student is partway through their programme, then the regulations that hold effect are the ones they first applied and enrolled under. This applies unless specific transition arrangements are made and applied under a specific clause of the regulations.

ACTION → Programme Regulations – Steve Marshall to double-check the NZQA website regarding the Level 8 entry requirements / programme regulations, and then respond to Liz Rainsbury as to whether or not A and B grades are required.

Programme Regulations are visible to students through the Unitec website and the Student Handbook located on Moodle. If they wish to access previous versions, they would need to contact their School.

MOTION

That Academic Board approve the changes to the *Programme Regulations Procedure* and the *Admissions Requirements Procedure*, in order to align with the revised *Admissions, Enrolment and Fees Policy*, specifically in the:

1. Programme Regulations Procedure including:
 - a. Removal of the requirement for Generic Regulations to apply to all Unitec programmes
 - b. Clarification of the requirements of stand-alone Programme Regulations
2. Admission Requirements Procedure including:
 - a. Reframed as 'guidelines' and added to the new template
 - b. Removal of Certificate of Proficiency, Short Course Eligibility and Exclusions clauses to the *Admissions, Enrolment and Fees Policy* and associated procedure
 - c. Replacement of Unitec 'English Language Entry Requirements for International Students' table with direct link to the corresponding NZQA table.

Moved: G McKay

Seconded: T Rewiri

MOTION CARRIED

2.5. Review – AC2.5 Examinations Regulations

From: Simon Tries (Manager, Te Korowai Kahurangi)

No major changes came out of the review. The main changes are simply to add consistency and alignment, and add formatting such as a simplified view for students.

Discussion canvassed a number of points. These shall be considered by Te Korowai Kahurangi, but were not significant enough to impede approving this item. If later amendments are needed, then memos shall be submitted as such.

- *Administration of Examination Procedures, Section 3.16* – Suggested that a provision be made for when a student needs to leave the room to use the restrooms. Such as case would mean that they should be accompanied by an invigilator. This means that a second invigilator would be required to remain with the main body of students in the examination room.
- *AC2.5 Examinations Regulations (Revised), Section 4.1* – Suggested that a new definition of "open book" be developed which can accommodate digital examinations of the future. However, as yet, no actual need for this is known. *Section 4.1.c* does allow for specification of a requirements of "the type of electronic device to be used". This needs to be interpreted along with *Section 4.2.1* which states that electronic copies of material are not allowed in an Open Book examination.

MOTION

That Academic Board approve the amendments to the Examination Regulations which have been reformatted as:

- Examinations Regulations
- Administration of Examinations Regulations

Moved: L Rainsbury

Seconded: K Barry

MOTION CARRIED

3. Mea Hei Kōrero | Items to Discuss

3.1. Review – Quality Management System (QMS)

From: Simon Tries (Manager, Te Korowai Kahurangi)

Discussion raised a number of points.

- After the QMS is finalized, then the Work Plans for Academic Board and its subcommittees can be developed.
- Assurance that the QMS is operating could be drawn from the agendas of the Academic Governance Committees (AGCs).
- The spreadsheet attachment contains a large bulk amount of data which is not easily digested by committee members. Categorizing or subgrouping the items could help make it more readable.
- Subcommittee Chairs have not been consulted yet because the current phase of work is to confirm what it is that Academic Board wants to know and see being done in the subcommittees. Only a few lines of the QMS are expected to be truly new; most if it should already be in operation. After confirmation from Academic Board, then other Chairs / Directors / Managers will be consulted.
- The Nest could be used to create a more engaging presentation of the QMS that enables readers to understand how it operates.

ACTION → Simon Tries, Simon Nash, Steve Marshall – Investigate how The Nest could be used to develop a more user-friendly / visual / intuitive way to understand the content of the QMS.

MOTION

That Academic Board review the appended *AB Coverage of QMS 2020* and confirm its details, and endorse the next steps, being that Academic Board:

- Formally notify its subcommittees and relevant parts of the institute of its requirements and seek confirmation of a date by which Summary Reports will be provided.
- Require each relevant subcommittee to:
 - Determine the high-level content of the summary report after providing any advice to that subcommittee.
 - Report back to the next possible Academic Board meeting on its decisions
- Finalise its Work Plan based on the responses received.

Moved: A Thumath
 Seconded: C King

MOTION CARRIED

3.2. Attendance at Academic Governance Committees 2019

From: Simon Nash (Chair, Academic Board)

Discussion raised / clarified the following points.

- Staff do receive a time allowance to undertake committee activities. The Heads of School have had discussions in order to bring consistency of allowance across the Schools. If staff are not fulfilling their obligations to a committee, then their Head of School should be notified.
- If a member is unable to attend, then they should send a proxy. Whether a member is Absent or send Apologies without a proxy, it means that representation is missing at that meeting.
- In future, a member handbook / guidelines should be developed. At present, the issue is addressed case by case.
- Ako Ahimura has a high rate of Absences. Consideration is being given to reducing the number of meetings per year and definition of the nature of the committee's work. Low attendance could reflect low perceived value by the members.
- Quality Alignment Board had a high number of Total Absences, mainly due to the one final meeting of 2019 which was inquorate. This does not accurately represent the typical level of attendance.
- Tracking attendance and making it explicitly known is a good institutional practice.

MOTION

That Academic Board receive the report on *Attendance at Academic Governance Committees (2019)*.

Moved: A McKay
 Seconded: F Tominiko

MOTION CARRIED

3.3. Course Durations Issue – Final Report

From: Simon Tries (Manager, Te Korowai Kahurangi)

Commendation was given for a very clear report on such a large piece of work. It is a shame that the issue arose at all, but we are in a much better position now. In the entirety of the process, no one was found to be deliberately engaged in malpractice.

Mechanisms are being developed to increase confidence that such an issue of this magnitude and surprise will not happen again. Notably, these are the work of defining and developing the Quality Management System (top-down approach) and the Academic Risk Registers to be maintained by Programme Academic Quality Committees (PAQCs) (bottom-up approach). These two approaches will improve coverage of risks and raise confidence.

***Committee Reflection:** Academic Board needs to not only have confidence but also clearly articulate and produce evidence of why it has confidence.*

The PAQCs shall act as a “critical friend” to their related Academic Programme Managers (APMs) in relation to the Academic Risk Registers. An APM shall create the Academic Risk Registers, which will then be governed by the PAQC. The PAQC will then be accountable to Quality Alignment Board and Academic Board. In 2020, PAQCs will have their governance responsibilities emphasized.

MOTION

That Academic Board receive the attached memo which was provided to ELT and the Final Report on the Course Durations Issue, noting that the Memo and Report have been provided to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority.

Moved: T Rewiri

Seconded: C King

MOTION CARRIED

4. Ngā Tukunga | Items to Receive (Regular)

4.1. Strategic Reports

4.1.1. Māori

From: Toni Rewiri (Director, Māori Success)

Exceptions 2.2.3 and 2.2.4

Discussion canvassed many points including the following.

- The Director could directly approach the Heads of School / Department Managers.
- The Director could follow the School Operational Plans, *I See Me* initiatives and the monthly reporting that goes to Nick Sheppard (Executive Director, Schools and Performance).
- Māori Success has a special place among the other Success Strategies due to its relationship to the Treaty of Waitangi and living Te Noho Kotahitanga.
- PAQC meetings did have a standing item on Mātauranga Māori in the past and it was eventually removed due to the lack of content to report.
- Now that Māori Champions are embedded in Schools, they could monitor and promote Māori Success in that setting. This reporting would flow up to Academic Board through the Director.

ACTION → Toni Rewiri and Glenn McKay to work together on a solution to Exceptions 2.2.3. and 2.2.4. and present a proposal to ELT, then also present it to Academic Board if appropriate.

4.1.2. Pacific

From: Falaniko Tominiko (Director, Pacific Success)

Committee Reflection: *A reviewed and improved memo template has now been adopted across all the Priority Group Director Reports.*

“No highlights” means nothing *outside of* the strategy / plan achievements.

The Pacific Takitahi is being drafted and is awaiting for recruitment of the final of three new Pacific Navigator staff.

PowerBI now has a new Missing Grades Dashboard with filters for each of the priority groups.

Note: *Item 4.1.3. was moved forward in proceedings.*

4.1.4. Under-25s

From: Andrea Thumath (Director, Under-25s Success)

Clarification - Rumaki Reo is immersion within mainstream secondary schools.

4.1.5. Student Success

From: Annette Pitovao & Helen Veia

** Reporting system TBC.*

4.1.6. Industry Engagement

Related: Academic Board 2019-12-11, Item 2.7. Industry Advisory Committee Guidelines

From: Heather Stonyer (Away)

** Reporting system TBC.*

Note: *Items 4.1.7. and 4.1.8. were discussed together.*

4.1.7. Waitākere Strategy + 4.1.8. Manaakitia te Rito | Renewal Strategy

ELT prefers to avoid producing a report solely for Academic Board.

ACTION → Merran Davis – Present a proposal on behalf of ELT to Academic Board 2020-03-04 for how to report progress against the Waitākere Strategy and Manaakitia te Rito | Renewal Strategy. This will include nomination of who shall be responsible for each of these reports.

MOTION

That Academic Board receive the Strategic Report/s for:

- Māori
- Pacific
- Under-25s

Moved: S Tries
Seconded: A Thumath

MOTION CARRIED

4.2. Subcommittee Reports

4.2.1. Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec

From: Marcus Williams URC

** No new meetings to report.*

4.2.2. Te Komiti Tikanga Matatika

From: Marcus Williams UREC

** No new meetings to report.*

4.2.3. Te Komiti Whakahaere a ngā Pia

From: Marcus Williams PGRSC

** No new meetings to report.*

4.2.4. Te Komiti Whakamana Hotaka Hou

From: Simon Tries AAC

** No new meetings to report.*

4.2.5. Ako Ahimura

From: Simon Nash AA-LTC

** No new meetings to report.*

4.2.5.1. Teacher Capability Development

Author: Maura Kempin (Manager, Te Puna Ako)

Summary of 2019 being developed for Academic Board 2020-03-04.

ACTION → Secretary & Chair – Ensure that Maura Kempin is ready to present to Academic Board 2020-03-04.

4.2.6. Te Poari Whai Kounga

From: Simon Tries QAB

** No new meetings to report.*

MOTION

No motion was required due to no Subcommittee Reports having been presented.

4.3. Quality Management System (QMS) Reports

4.3.1. Programme Management

From: Simon Tries (Manager, Te Korowai Kahurangi)

4.3.1.1. Programme Development

** No report*

4.3.1.2. Programme Reviews (5-year Reviews)

** No report*

4.3.1.3. Expiring and Discontinued Programmes

Originally, this item presented two RAG Tables. Redevelopment has merged these into a single RAG Table in response to feedback from previous Academic Board meeting reflections.

MOTION

That Academic Board receive the Programme Management Report/s.

Moved: K Barry

Seconded: A McKay

MOTION CARRIED

4.3.2. Degree Monitoring

From: Simon Tries (Manager, Te Korowai Kahurangi)

Author: Steve Marshall

Committee Reflection: Future reports against this item need to be written on the current standard committee memo template.

NZQA has confirmed that Unitec does not have to provide the funding for the new work described in “NZQA changes in process” in the memo.

MOTION

That Academic Board receive the Degree Monitoring Report.

Moved: A Thumath

Seconded: A McKay

MOTION CARRIED

4.3.3. Self-Assessment

** Reporting system still TBC.*

4.3.4. Academic Risk Register (ARR)

From: Simon Nash (Executive Director, Academic)

A live link to the ARR on Sharepoint was provided in the memo.

Discussion noted that:

- The ARR will be shared with APMs for feedback on 2020-02-12.
- The ARR should focus on academic and pastoral care risks more than on financial risks.
- The ARR and the Institutional Risk Register (IRR), which is maintained by ELT, need to work together.

ARR Input System Development

At present, the ARR has been populated through a top-down process. A mechanism needs to be developed for items to also flow into the ARR through a bottom-up process. Ideally, this should be active by the start of Semester 1. It should enable risks to bubble up from programmes with meaningful feedback, commentary and descriptions. A possible system could include:

1. Academic Programme Managers (APMs) maintaining Programme Risk Registers (PRRs).
2. Programme Academic Quality Committees (PAQCs) reviewing the PRRs.
3. Quality Alignment Board (QAB) governing the PRRs and providing an overall analysis to Academic Board.
4. Academic Board making decisions and recommendations, and collaborating with ELT and its IRR.

ACTION → Simon Nash; Merran Davis / ELT – Agree on how the IRR should appear on each Academic Board agenda alongside the ARR.

ACTION → Simon Nash; Simon Tries – Finalize the design of how the ARR shall receive meaningful input from both institutional and programme levels. A functional ARR is

expected for presentation to Academic Board 2020-03-04. Academic Board does not expect it to be perfect, but it is imperative that an ARR of some form becomes active as soon as possible.

4.3.5. NZQA and ITP Sector

Te Korowai Kahurangi now has a page on The Nest that reports on this information. From now on, this agenda item shall have a memo presented against it when an update occurs that Academic Board should note or otherwise act on. The report will contain a link to the main update page located at:

<https://thenest.unitec.ac.nz/TheNestWP/teaching-and-research/te-korowai-kahurangi/governance-2/nzqa-ityp-updates/>

This item shall remain on the Agenda for reporting by exception.

4.3.6. Reform of Vocational Education (RoVE) and Unitec Workstreams

From: Trude Cameron (Operations Manager, Schools)

This item shall stay on the agenda for reporting by exception.

5. Ngā Rīpoata | Other Reports

5.1. Accuracy of Teacher Capability Development (TCD) Reporting

Related:

- Academic Board 2019-12-11, Item 4.2.5.1. Teacher Capability Development
- Ako Ahimura 2019-10-17, Item 4.1. Teacher Capability Development Evaluation

From: Maura Kempin (Not present) (Manager, Te Puna Ako)

ACTION → Chair and Secretary to follow up with Maura Kempin to ensure the report is completed and ready for Academic Board 2020-03-04.

MOTION – Deferred to a later meeting

That Academic Board receive the report on *Teacher Capability Development (TCD) Reporting – Accuracy*.

Moved: N/A

Seconded: N/A

MOTION deferred

6. Kupu Whakamutunga | Closing

6.1. Ētahi Kaupapa Anō | Any Other Business (AOB)

(None)

6.2. Committee Self-Assessment

Topic: *Areas for Committee Improvement in 2020*

Stimulus questions:

- *What are our areas for improving committee practices?*
- *How can the committee fulfil its purpose better?*
- *Anything else you would like to do to improve your own performance.*

ACTION → Simon Nash, Simon Tries & Daniel Weinholz – Develop a more structured complementary approach to Committee Self-Assessment to which uses the NZQA language of excellent / good / marginal / poor.

ACTION → Simon Nash (Chair, Academic Board) – Set up induction meeting as detailed under Item 1.5. discussions.

Committee Reflection: (Time: 1147h) *The Chair apologised for not closing the meeting at the scheduled time of 1130h, being in the habit of closing at 1200h as was the custom in 2019.*

Feedback from attendees included the following points.

- Exception Reporting – Academic Board should focus more on informative exception reporting rather than standardized reports containing large amounts of data.
- Quality and usefulness of the information in this meeting was much better than had been seen in 2019.
- Contributors named and listed on memos builds confidence that the institute is working together better.
- Not yet confident that messages / information from Academic Board is actually being heard / received by academic staff through the various representatives and communication systems.
- Uncertainty about the extent to which operational matters should be raised in Academic Board discussions / considerations.
- Minutes of Academic Board and Action Reminder – Very well written and useful. The Secretary was commended for his work.
- Quality Management System, AQAP and Academic Risk Register – Great to see these being developed. They are a big step in the right direction. The AQAP especially helps to keep the many various memos and reports heading in the same direction.
- Pacific representation – With the new funding for Pacific staff, representation at Academic Board and its subcommittees will be able to be better shared resulting in better attendance and input by nominees / proxies. Falaniko Tominiko shall remain the representative at Academic Board.
- Strong agenda and good quality discussions of relevant issues.
- Self-Assessment, Continuous Quality Improvement & EER – We need to remain mindful that Academic Board shall be under the spotlight at EER. Special sessions should be scheduled to prepare Academic Board for questioning on matters of governance, risk, communications, change management and more.

- Staff Engagement and Change Fatigue – Consideration should be given to how, in the face of so much change having happened and still happening, that Academic Board can communicate and align staff activity in a motivating and compelling way as Semester 1 begins.
- Items for discussion sometimes receive low levels of feedback from committee members. Consideration should be given as to why this may be so and how it can be improved. One approach may be through prior notice to members of which agenda items hold the highest priority.
- Timing – The start time of 0830h is better than 0900h.

6.3. Karakia Whakamutunga | Closing Prayer

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

MEETING CLOSED: 1200h

READ & CONFIRMED

Chair:



Date: 07 / March / 2020