

То	Te Poari Mātauranga	From	Simon Tries, Manager,
	Academic Board		Te Korowai Kahurangi
Title	Process for managing academic risk	Date	6 April 2020

Recommendation/s

That Te Poari Mātauranga:

- consider the approach outlined for the management and oversight of academic risk at United
- support the formation of a cross institute Academic Risk Working Group
- consider for adoption the institute level academic risks detailed in this memorandum
- require that all PAQCS review the risks associated with their programmes and report to QAB in time for the April 22 meeting.

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to outline the status of academic risk management at Unitec and to propose further amendments to improve our approach to managing academic risk.

Using the Risk Registers - APMs

Unitec now has functional programme level risk registers in place for nearly every programme (with the exception of those programmes with very few students and which are soon to be discontinued). To date, several sessions have been held with the Academic Programme Managers (APMs) group in conjunction with one on one support for individual APMs to develop understanding and support them in the management of academic risk. With the odd exception all programme risk registers have been completed.

Academic Programme Managers are continuing to engage in the management of risks for their programmes, including in response to the challenges brought about by the unexpected campus closure due to Covid-19. Currently, there is a degree of variability to which this is actively done, as well as the extent to which the use of the risk registers is seen as adding value, nevertheless, good progress has been made. Further ongoing support will be required to ensure that the management of programme level risks is fully understood and embedded.

APMs are currently expected to update their risk registers every 4-6 weeks in preparation for discussion at their PAQC meetings.

Using the Risk Registers - PAQCs

The <u>Academic Risk dashboard</u> in PowerBI allows PACQs to view the risks for the programmes they oversee. It is not clear how many PAQCs have yet considered the risks for their programmes. This will be known once the first quarterly PAQC Chair's reports are received by the Quality Alignment Board (next meeting 22 April).

Recommendation 1:

That all PAQCS review the risks associated with their programmes and report to QAB in time for the April 22 meeting.



When PAQCs' meet, the expectation is that the APMs' discuss what is being done to mitigate any high level risks and that the respective PAQC is confident that the mitigation plan is appropriate (actions, timeframes, etc.) and effective. In this instance, the role of the PAQCs is to hold the APM to account (along with the Head of School, who is also a member of the PAQC) for the delivery of the actions mitigating the risks. PAQCs are expected to challenge respective APMs on the risk ratings to ensure they are as accurate a representation as possible.

PAQC Chairs are required to report quarterly on a range of matters, including programme level risks.

Using the Risk Registers - QAB

Currently, risk management processes require QAB to undertake several key functions relating to academic risk, including to:

- Consider institution level themes emerging from the programme level risk registers and the actions required to mitigate these
- Provide assurance that PAQCs are effectively managing the risks within their programmes
- Consider specific institution level risks (see below)
- Report to Academic Board on its findings and any (progress on) actions being taken
- Report to PAQCs on its findings and the actions being taken.

In order to undertake the above in an effective and efficient manner, QAB require a thematic analysis of all the risks to be undertaken prior to meetings. Members may consider these and what, if any, actions may be required. Currently this activity sits with Te Korowai Kahurangi (though it has yet to actually occur). In the spirit of continuously building institutional capability and to enhance the possible outcomes of this process, it would be more appropriate for a small group with cross institute representation to undertake this mahi and report to QAB.

Recommendation 2:

That a cross institute Academic Risk Working Group be formed to:

- Review programme level risks for cross-institute themes and provide recommendations on actions to be taken.
- Undertake quality control measures to ensure that PAQCs are managing risks effectively.
- Consider the likelihood and consequences of institute level academic risks and any actions and controls to be implemented.
- Report on its findings, actions and recommendations on a regular basis.
- Co-opt additional members with specialist skills as required;

Possible members of the Academic Risk Working Group are:

- Lee Baglow, Head of School, Trades and Services
- Simon Tries, Manager, Te Korowai Kahurangi; Chair, Quality Alignment Board
- Sue Emmerson, Team Leader Academic Programme Managers
- Trude Cameron, Schools Operations Manager
- Rowena Fuluifaga, Manager, Learner and Achievement, Student Success

Using the Risk Registers – Academic Board

Academic Board needs assurance that academic risks are being effectively managed across the institute. The process described above, including QAB's role in reporting to Academic Board, is designed to provide this assurance. Additionally, Academic Board has the opportunity to interrogate



the academic risk register and required information from, or actions by, different parts of the institute.

Institute level risks

There are currently 14 programme level risk areas to be considered on a regular basis (two of which do not apply to all programmes):

Programme risk category	Programme level risk area	
Outcomes	 Programme Targets not met EFTS continue to decline and no improvement in revenue streams 	
People	3. Staff capability and/or capacity does not meet learner needs4. Staff culture does not meet the values-based culture of Te Noho Kotahitanga	
Process	 Academic systems and processes don't support the success of students Evaluation and monitoring of Programme is not effective Programme design or delivery does not meet the needs of stakeholders Programme does not have sufficient resources (teaching spaces, consumables) to support delivery Student / Graduate feedback not used to effect positive change Students are not adequately supported in their learning 	
Compliance	 11. Assessment is not effectively managed/ validated or does not ensure achievement of outcomes 12. Programme delivery does not meet requirements of Programme Approval and Accreditation (and related) Rules (including: course durations, timetabled hours, learning hours, sub-contracted delivery, teaching location approval) Some programmes only: 	
	 13. External requirements not met (i.e., Regulatory/ Professional requirements) 14. Level 7+ programmes: Quality and quantity of research is insufficient to meet statutory requirements and contribute to student success 	

In addition to the programme level risk areas, there are a number of institute level academic risks which should be considered.

Recommendation 3:

The following are proposed for discussion and possible adoption as institute level academic risks:

- 1. That academic governance is not effective in supporting academic outcomes
- 2. That the achieved outcomes of the Academic Quality Action Plan will not result in a lift in Unitec's EER category
- 3. That the academic risk management process is not effective in managing academic risk
- 4. That the Quality Management System does not provide assurance
- 5. That the Academic Portfolio is not effectively managed



Attachments

Risk management flow chart (attached below)

People Consulted

Andrea Thumath, Director, Unitec Pathways College and Director Students Under 25s Success

Lee Baglow, Head of School, Trades and Services

Annette Pitovao, Director Student Success

Toni Rewiri, Director Māori Success

Tracy Chapman, Director International Success

Trude Cameron, Schools Operations Manager



