Programme Level Risk Areas

There are fourteen key risk areas relating to programme delivery:

Programme Targets not met

> Programme targets include, for all students and our priority group students (Māori, Pacific, Under 25, International): Successful course Completion, Qualification Completion, First Year Retention, Progression, Graduates in Employment and/or Further Study

EFTS continue to decline and no improvement in revenue streams

> In simple terms, the number of students enrolled in a programme.

> EFTS=Equivalent Full Time Student = 1 student completing 120 credits/year or equivalent (i.e., 2 students completing 60 credits each/year or 8 students completing 15 credits each/year)

Staff capability and/or capacity does not meet learner needs

> Staff capability refers to the ability of existing staff to deliver the programme. Highly capable staff are well qualified in their industry and are effective teachers/support staff

> Staff capacity refers to the number of staff on hand to teach the number of student enrolled across the courses being delivered in the semester/timeframe

Staff culture does not meet the values-based culture of Te Noho Kotahitanga

> Relates to staff understanding of Te Noho Kotahitanga and living the values of Te Noho Kotahitanga through their work life

Programme does not have sufficient resources (teaching spaces, consumables) to support delivery

> Refers to the physical resources required to teach the courses within the programme. Includes: consumables, physical and online teaching spaces, technical or mechanical infrastructure (e.g., Wi-Fi), etc.

Programme design or delivery does not meet the needs of stakeholders

> Includes identification of key stakeholders, confirmation that the stakeholders being engaged with are representative of the industry, the existence of a plan for engagement and the evidencing of that engagement and how what was learned is being used to inform design and delivery of the programme.

Evaluation and monitoring of Programme is not effective

> Varies by type of programme but includes: degree monitoring, course evaluation and planning, programme evaluation and planning, consistency reviews, graduating/5-year reviews, professional/regulatory body accreditation and monitoring

Academic systems and processes don't support the success of students

> Includes the many processes which support students: Variation of Enrolment (VOE), Change of Grades, Affected Performance Considerations, Grade ratification and publication, Completions checking, Graduation, re-enrolment, etc.

Student / Graduate feedback not used to effect positive change

> Includes whether feedback is gathered, how representative the feedback is, whether that feedback is being used at course/programme level to identify what's working well and what needs improving, whether those improvements are made, and whether how the feedback has been used is fed back to the provider of the feedback (i.e., students/graduates)

Students are not adequately supported in their learning

> Includes pastoral support provided by teaching teams, school support people, centralised support teams, and consideration of the value/impact of the support provided.

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)

> In broad terms, this includes whether the programme is being delivered as it is approved and whether all necessary approvals have been sought

Assessment is not effectively managed/ validated or does not ensure achievement of outcomes

> Includes the extent to which internal and external pre and post moderation is managed, including the existence and use of moderation plans. Also includes whether moderation occurs and validates the assessment tools and assessment decisions used within the programme.

Level 7+ programmes: Quality and quantity of research is insufficient to meet statutory requirements and contribute to student success

> Does not apply to level 1-6 programmes. Includes whether the programme team is sufficiently involved in research (is the programme taught by those mainly engaged in research) and whether the links between research and curriculum are clear and effective (links to *Programme delivery does not meet requirements of Programme Approval and Accreditation (and related) Rules…* above)

> Equates to "Orange" on the Research Productivity Traffic Light (RPTL) report)

External requirements not met (i.e, Regulatory/ Professional requirements)

> Applies to any programmes with a regulatory or professional body. Includes the extent to which the regulatory/professional bodies requirements are met