To	Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board	**From**	Gerard Lovell [PAQC, School of Computing]
Title	PAQC Quarterly Report for April 2020	**Date**	2020 / 04 / 06

Overview

A brief overview of the work of the PAQC since the last report which may include:

General Committee Health Check *(Each report)*

Brief answers to the following questions completed by the Chair. These are focussed on the work of the Committee and should include any issues that need to be/have been escalated.

What is going well?
The committee has met twice – once to approve the PEPs and once to attend to regular business.

What improvements can be made?
That the members understand the new role of the PAQC as governance and not day-to-day operations
Recruitment and Training of members

What support is needed (actions required)?
Training in the roles for chair, staff and students

Progress against 3 (max.) key actions

A brief summary of progress against key actions from the Action Planner from the last cycle with a focus on how the action has made a difference. This is prepared by the Chair, with assistance from APMs, or provided from minutes of the discussion from the relevant meeting.

- ## Action items from previous meeting

• Meeting Date	Item No	Action	Responsibility	Progress	Closure
7/06/2019	3	Student Outcomes – Cross-Credits	BCS Academic Leader	The Academic Manager of Aspire2 which was Ntec's new identity, was keen to have a formal cross credits agreement with Unitec and the BCS AL was to work on it after receiving necessary documents for mapping credits transfer.	**Closed**

			APM (Academic)	On 16.12.2019 the ex-BCS AL (now appointed as APL, Vocational) explained the matter was still with the Unitec legal team and she would check the progress and report.	
16/12/2019 19/03/2020				APM (Academic) advised the Unitec legal team resolved the matter a few days ago and a letter was sent to Aspire2 stating the existing arrangement would officially end on 20 June,2020.	
18/10/2019	2.4.1	Degree Monitoring	Acting AL for the BCS and GDCMP	Response to monitor's report to be submitted at the next PAQC meeting	**Closed**
16/12/2019 19/03/2020	2.4.2	Response to external moderation report for ISCG8047 Cyber Security & Cloud Computing	Iman Ardekani, Postgraduate programme coordinator	The external moderator questioned whether Multiple Choice questions in the test were suitable for a Level 8 course and recommended a marking rubric could be used for better feedback about assessments. There was no update available. The postgraduate programme coordinator was no longer on the committee. It was decided that the committee would ask programme coordinator to report back.	Pending On-going

Priorities (3-5) for cycle

A brief summary of the 3-5 top priorities of the Committee for the coming year based on the specific AQAP related targets in the Committee work-plan. This is prepared by the Chair, with assistance from APMs, or provided from minutes of the discussion from the relevant meeting.

Not discussed. However the previous chair regarded external moderation as a priority and many courses were approved for moderation. This chair and secretary cannot find the details we need to track moderation for the courses that were sent to the moderator to them being tabled.

Risk management

A brief statement of the most impactful risks to be closely monitored given that this is the first time they have been looked at. This is prepared by the APM, with assistance from the Chair, or provided from minutes of the discussion from the relevant meeting.

The risk management matrices have not yet been presented to the committee.

Quality Reporting

Programme Evaluation (PEP)

Report on the overall quality of the self-evaluation of each programme based on the PAQC Evaluation process.

Summary of high level themes that the review of PEPs provided for the PAQC to consider and monitor

This is prepared by the Chair and APMs based on evaluations and minutes of discussion at meetings.

The PAQC (the chair and the two APMs) met on 3 March 2020 to approve the PEPs for 2019.

PAQC Review of BCS & GDCMP Final PEP Report for 2019

Q: Evaluative Capability   What rating does the PAQC put on the quality of self-assessment of the programme team across this PEP?   Excellent/Good/Marginal/Poor - **Good**
Explain the reason for this rating.
There is a good understanding about the Priority Group.   Improved practices in self-assessment are evident.   Some CEPs show excellent understanding of self-assessment and critique
Q: What actions would the PAQC recommend the programme team take **to maintain** (if 'Excellent') **or to improve their capability in self-assessment?**
Sharing of good practices within the team   Improving capabilities for writing evaluative reports   Initiating more and more good practices in dealing with students

PAQC Review of MComp & PGDCG Final PEP Report for 2019

Q: Evaluative Capability   What rating does the PAQC put on the quality of self-assessment of the programme team across this PEP?   Excellent/Good/Marginal/Poor - **Excellent**

Q: Explain the reason for this rating.
Strong self-assessment capability Activities from last year have led to improvements Identified weaknesses are school wide and work is going on to address them
What actions would the PAQC recommend the programme team take **to maintain** (if 'Excellent') **or to improve their capability in self-assessment?**
There has to be a mechanism put in place for continued and enhanced communication within the programme team

PAQC Review of NZCITE Final PEP Report for 2019

Q: Evaluative Capability What rating does the PAQC put on the quality of self-assessment of the programme team across this PEP? <mark>Excellent</mark>/Good/Marginal/Poor - **Excellent**
Q: Explain the reason for this rating.
The teaching team as well as the coordinator understand the programme well and are able to implement changes in a timely manner. The team also understand the student body well and are, therefore, able to provide the required level of pastoral care. Additionally, the team works well with other parts of the organisation to ensure students are well supported and the required level of teaching is delivered.
Q: What actions would the PAQC recommend the programme team take **to maintain** (if 'Excellent') **or to improve their capability in self-assessment?**
Maintain the current level of work

PAQC Review of NZDIS5 2019 Final PEP Report

Q: Evaluative Capability What rating does the PAQC put on the quality of self-assessment of the programme team across this PEP? <mark>Excellent</mark>/Good/Marginal/Poor - **Excellent**
Q: Explain the reason for this rating.
As a new programme, the team is demonstrating consistent self-assessment which leads to better outcomes for students
Q: What actions would the PAQC recommend the programme team take **to maintain** (if 'Excellent') **or to improve their capability in self-assessment?**
Maintain the current level of work

PAQC Review of DComp 2019 Final PEP Report

Q: Explain the reason for this rating.

Good reflective practice has been demonstrated

Degree Monitoring 2019

Summary of key recommendations and response to report - provided by Chair

Programme responses to monitors' recommendations

Monitors'
Recommendations &

Saved in

[\\uniad.unitec.ac.nz\staffshare\1. Schools\Computing and Information Technology\Programmes\Monitoring-Quality Administration\Monitoring 2019](#)

Appeals/Complaints *(as required)*

Summary of any Appeals/Complaints - summary by Chair/APM based on data provided by TKK or student services. Will include statistics for the volume by course, and No. approved or declined provided via TKK tracker.

Not Applicable

Summary Information & Compliance Overview

The following are summaries collated and populated by TKK in collaboration with the Chair and APMs.

Not Applicable

Grades
Statistical summary of previous semester grade ratification including resolution of previous outstanding grades

Grade Summary for Semester 2 2019 (1194)

Programme	Term	Student Head Count	No of Courses offered in the Semester	No of Grades posted	Status	SCC % (for 2019)
BCS	1194	225	37	749	All completed	85.29%

GDCMP	1194	55	34	161	All completed	93.90%
NZCITE (4)	1194	19	3	52	All completed	72.73%
NZDIS5	1194	24	7	66	All completed	78.57%
MComp	1194	26	7	12	12 CTG Grades	100.00 (in 11920
PGDCG	1194	69	17 (including Ls 7 BCS and GDCMP courses)	234	All completed	97.650%
DComp	1194	10	1	None	All CTG for Thesis	NA

Summer School 2019-20 (1196)

Programme	Term	No of students enrolled	No of courses offered	Number of grades posted	Status	No of Failed grades
BCS & GDCMP	1196	53	3	53	All completed	5 and 1 W grade

Successful Course Completion in 2019 (Semesters 1 & 2)

Programme Code And Name	Total EFTS	Student Headcount	SCC %
(BCS) Bach Computing Systems	113.00	242	85.29 %
(DCOMP) Doctor of Computing	3.25	10	
(GDCMP) GDip Computing	26.63	65	93.90 %
(MCOMP) Master Computing	7.88	22	100.00 %
(NZCIT) NZCert Info Tech Essentials	13.75	29	72.73 %
(NZDIS) NZDip Information Systems (L5)	7.00	15	78.57 %
(PGDCG) PGDip Computing	21.25	64	97.65 %
Total	192.75	447	86.91 %

Semester 2 2019 Grade Approval Tracker for the School of Computing is saved at the following location

Completions

Statistical summary of Completions including Graduation confirmation and any requests for correction of errors

Chair's Report – Completions 1194 & 1196

Completion Term	Programme	No of students completed for Graduation
1194	NZCITE	14
1194	NZDIS5	7
1194	BCS	25
1194	GDCMP	25
1194	PGDCG	29
1194	MComp	1 so far *
1194	DComp	-
1196	GDCMP	3
1196	PGDCG	1

- *For MComp students, Thesis (ISCG9026 or ISCG9027) submission date was in mid-March. So far only one student has been completed, others will be done as and when students are awarded Final Grades by Marcus William

Moderation

Moderation Planning

Attached spreadsheet contains information about the school's internal and external moderation plans and outcomes since 2018

Spreadsheet saved in the school folder

\\uniad.unitec.ac.nz\staffshare\1. Schools\Computing and Information Technology\Programmes\Moderation-Quality Administration

The secretary and chair have tried to establish the progress of moderation for 2019.

The previous chair pointed this out as an issue but there does not seem to be one place where all information is kept. These figures are the best we can find.

Semester 1, 2019

Programme	Approved	Moderated	Tabled at PAQC
MComp/PGDCG	5	3	?
BCS/GDCMP	13	6	0*
NZDIS5	4	?	0

*It appears that three courses have had lecturer's comments written but not yet tabled.

Semester 2, 2019

Programme	Approved	Moderated	Tabled at PAQC
MComp/PGDCG	0		
BCS/GDCMP	13	?	0
NZDIS5	3	?	

In semester 1, 2019, a number of part time lecturers did not submit their moderation material. The school has reduced its dependency on casual teaching staff and it is hoped this type of outcome will be reduced in the future.

The moderation plan for semester 1, 2020 has been approved. Semester 2 plan is still with the APMS.

The school does not have any formal moderation MoU with any institution which increases the difficulty with completing regular external moderation. The APM's have had an initial meeting with the campus manager and HOS at MIT with the intention of developing a moderation cluster. Wintec has also been invited to be part of that cluster – this invitation may be extended to Toi Ohomai now that all ITP's are part of the NZIST. Work on developing a robust fit for purpose external moderation system is ongoing. Currently most pre-degree and degree level courses are externally moderated by academics from the EIT or Wintec while some Level 8 courses are sometimes moderated by lecturers at AUT and the University of Auckland.

In the past, when the report from the external moderator was returned, it was sent to the lecturer for comment and then the report and lecturer's comments tabled at the PAQC. The moderation plan template should clearly show at what stage the moderation is. The AQA needs to escalate if a certain amount of time has passed and nothing has happened.

There appears to be some confusion over the moderation process and who needs to do what by when. We need a spreadsheet that is looked after by the AAQ and records the course to be moderated, the date that the material was completed by the lecturer, the date that it was sent to the moderator, the date the moderator replied, the date the report was sent to the lecturer, the date the lecturer responded, the date that the report and response was table at PAQC.

The AAQ needs to be given direction on how long they wait for action from the parties concerned. Also in the past the APM has been left out of the process and needs to be incorporated somewhere. The moderation process needs to be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Course Evaluations (CEP)
Completed for previous cycle –*via Dashboard/ School APM*
Deployed and underway for new cycle - *via Dashboard/ School APM*

School	Main Programme	Active Courses in 1202	Online CEPs as on 1 April 2020	Percentage
School of Computing	BCS	36	20	55.56%
School of Computing	GDCMP	1		
School of Computing	MCOMP	8	5	62.50%
School of Computing	NZCIT	3	2	66.67%
School of Computing	NZDIS5	4	4	100.00%

Industry Engagement
IAC (Industry Advisory Committee) scheduled – *Not available yet*