

---

<b>To</b>	Te Poari Whai Kounga   Quality Alignment Board	<b>From</b>	Jackie Tims Te Korowai Kahurangi
<b>Title</b>	Consistency Reviews	<b>Date</b>	11 March 2020

---

**Recommendation/s**

That Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board receive the update on 2020 - Consistency Reviews and provide feedback on the reporting approach described within this memorandum.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to provide Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board with an update on the status of Consistency Reviews and to seek feedback on the approach to reporting on consistency reviews.

**Commentary**

The attached report outlines the preparation and outcomes for Consistency Reviews. Unitec are continuing to meet the review deadlines and, in the latest submissions, have received 'sufficient' outcomes.

From the next report, all Consistency reviews from Semester 1 2020 forward will be reported on across three main metrics:

- Preparation for the Review
- The Outcome from the Review
- The Management of follow up actions

Each of the above will be rated using the standard NZQA focus area rubric in Appendix 1:

Where possible, the rating will be agreed in collaboration with the programme leadership/team.

The following will be considered when determining the ratings:

<b>Preparation</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Management of follow up actions</b>
<i>The rating is based on whether:</i>	<i>Rating is based on following:</i>	Initially, a rating will be provided based on the following:
The Programme Leadership/ programme team has a good understanding of what Assuring Consistency is about	<b>Excellent</b> if outcome is sufficient and meets rubric criteria and practices used are exemplified in the report	<b>Excellent</b> – the action plan disseminates beneficial practices and the actions required to manage gaps in self-assessment capability or the programme are SMART, minor or not required
Evidence is being collected from graduates/end users each time students graduate	<b>Good</b> if outcome is sufficient and meets rubric criteria	<b>Good</b> - the actions required to manage gaps in self-assessment capability or the programme address all issues are SMART and minor
How representative the sample of evidence is from both graduates and employers/end users (of graduates)	<b>Marginal</b> if initial result is “Not Sufficient” but final result is “Sufficient”	<b>Marginal</b> - the actions required to manage gaps in self-assessment capability or the programme are significant, do not address all issues or are not SMART
Sufficient external moderation is being undertaken and is validating the achievement of outcomes The self-assessment capability of the programme team and programme leadership (i.e., in writing the report)	<b>Poor</b> if final outcome is "Not Sufficient"	<b>Poor</b> - No action plan developed when needed
		On an ongoing basis, the rating will be based on:  The extent to which actions are being effectively managed/addressed (as per the plan).

Adopting this approach will provide greater visibility regarding the preparedness of programme teams (and the institute as a whole) to successfully engage in a consistency review, to more clearly understand the outcomes from the reviews, and how well the required actions are being managed. This will support better outcomes for Unitec and ensure ongoing improvement in this key quality assurance process as well as further embed evaluation into our daily practice.

## Next Steps

Te Korowai Kahurangi will continue to support programme teams with their reviews and to track, and report on the Consistency process.

## Attachments

Consistency RAG 2020\_03\_06

---

## Contributors

Eric Stone

Kakala Vainikolo

## Appendix 1:

NZQA Focus Area rubric to be used for evaluating consistency reviews

Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance is exceptional</li> <li>• Highly effective contributing processes</li> <li>• Very few gaps or weaknesses</li> <li>• Any gaps or weaknesses have no significant impact and are managed very effectively</li> </ul>
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance is generally strong</li> <li>• Effective contributing processes</li> <li>• Few gaps or weaknesses</li> <li>• Gaps and weaknesses have some impact but are mostly managed effectively</li> </ul>
Marginal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance is variable</li> <li>• Inconsistent contributing processes</li> <li>• Some gaps or weaknesses have some impact, and are not managed effectively</li> </ul>
Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance is unacceptably weak</li> <li>• Ineffective contributing processes</li> <li>• Significant gaps or weaknesses have significant impact, and are not managed effectively</li> <li>• Does not meet minimum expectations or requirements</li> </ul>