

Āta-tuhi: Te Korowai Kahurangi Analysis of the 2020 Interim (Mid-Year) PEP Process 19 October 2020

Contributors: Jayne Mercier, Maureen Perkins, Sue Crossan and Eric Stone

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to:

- Provide evaluative commentary on the 2020 Interim Programme Evaluation and Planning (the “interim PEPs”) process
- Make recommendations for continuing improvement in the work of growing capability in programme evaluation

Executive Summary

Process: The interim PEP round included reports from 74 programmes with a focused approach as supported by Quality Alignment Board (QAB) (May 2020). The interim PEP process was supported by Te Korowai Kahurangi and Te Puna Ako through the development of templates, rubrics and support provided to writers and PAQCs by Te Korowai Kahurangi staff. These actions were in response to feedback from the 2019 end-of-year (EoY) PEPs and Internal Evaluation and Review (IER) feedback. Reports of those programmes participating in the External Evaluation and Review (EER) were reviewed by Te Korowai Kahurangi staff and given feedback.

The Te Korowai Kahurangi team have reviewed their performance in supporting self-assessment and evaluation in interim PEPs against four evaluative questions as described in the report and made a number of recommendations for continuous improvement.

Evaluative Commentary: The overall assessment of Te Korowai Kahurangi’s performance in supporting the interim PEPs process is **good**. This rating is based on completion of all (74) interim PEPs by Schools, timely management of the process, use of the templates which enhanced the evaluative quality and consistency of reports and use of the rubrics which ensured more accurate self-assessment.

A partnership approach with Programme Academic Quality Committees (PAQCs) supported self-assessment in Schools, whilst the timely review and feedback of reports allowed for further capability building. Aggregation of results shows consistency in performance and self-assessment within and between schools. Commentary is supported by data received from a survey of report writers.

Recommendations: The report identifies a number of actions. These are summarised into key steps for preparation for the EoY PEP process. We ask that QAB particularly note the process and capacity recommendations which require timely decisions.

Process and Capacity

- Develop timeframes for the EoY PEPs. These are sufficient to enable robust Āta Kōrero and Āta Tuhi to be completed by Te Korowai Kahurangi staff and report writers (Owners: Te Korowai Kahurangi, Heads of Schools (HoSs))
- Identify focus areas and review sample for EoY PEPs by Te Korowai Kahurangi, informal EER feedback may assist with this (Owners: QAB)
- Identify Āta kōrero processes i.e. team led, or Te Korowai Kahurangi led (Owners: QAB)
- Ensure resourcing to meet timelines and process is understood and supported by Schools

Template and Data Development

- Refine templates and rubrics as per feedback and identified improvements in this report, including SMART goal development, matching template more clearly to Power BI dashboards (Owner: Te Korowai Kahurangi)

Capability Development

- Provide support to Schools for the following: Power BI use, identification of other PEP data sources, SMART goals, Course Evaluation Planning (CEP) completion and quality (Owner: Te Korowai Kahurangi)

Background

The overall purpose of the PEP is four-fold:

- To monitor and improve performance in delivering positive outcomes for our students and other stakeholders
- To monitor and improve our ability to reflect on the effectiveness of our actions in doing the above
- To increase consistency in educational performance and self-assessment across the organisation
- To report on educational performance and self-assessment capability to our key external stakeholder NZQA

Focus Areas

The Quality Alignment Board (QAB) supported in principle (Minutes 20 May 2020) that interim PEPs would take a focussed approach:

- Successful Course Completion (SCC) – part of Key Evaluative Question (KEQ) 1
- Graduate outcomes, with a focus on the graduate survey - part of KEQ2
- Implementation of various actions relating to improvement strategies and related plans (e.g., the “I see me” initiatives) - part of KEQ4
- Impact and support relating to Covid19, the campus lockdown and the shift to emergency online learning - part of KEQ4
- Progress against smart goals set in previous PEPs

Programme Selection

In total, 74 programmes submitted an interim PEP, although some reports combined programmes, for example where a graduate diploma may be nested within a degree. Not all programmes were required to complete an interim PEP. Programmes exempt were those expiring due to Mandatory Review of Qualifications (MROQ) or the 2018 suspension of programmes.

All 74 interim PEPs were reviewed by the PAQC who provided a self-assessment capability rating. Twenty-six of these programmes were further reviewed by Te Korowai Kahurangi staff. These were selected on their relevance to the upcoming External Evaluation and Review (EER).

Loop closing

The 2019 EoY PEP process report and Internal Evaluation Review (IER) feedback identified a number of improvements required to lift PEP evaluative writing and self-assessment capability: These were:

- Focus on evaluative writing Āta tuhi (reporting)
- Better use of Unitec targets, School targets, priority group targets
- Better use of external benchmarks
- Strengthen the use of educational performance and self-assessment rubrics
- Judge more reliably, “What is “Excellent”, “Good”, Marginal” and “Poor”?
- Feedback to be provided in a timely manner, after review

Evaluating the interim PEP Process

To rate Te Korowai Kahurangi's performance in supporting the interim PEP process and to report on recommended improvements, the following four evaluative questions were used:

1. How well were interim PEPs completed and the process managed?
2. How well was accurate and evaluative assessment of programme educational performance supported?
3. How well was reflection and self-assessment capability in the interim PEP process supported?
4. How well was consistency in interim PEP reporting across the organisation supported?

A four-point rating scale (Excellent, Good, Marginal, Poor) and associated criteria is used to evaluate performance against these questions (Appendix A – Rubric 1).

Commentary

Evaluative Question 1: How well were interim PEPs completed and the process managed?

Assessment against this question is **good** for the following reasons:

- Completion of *all* interim PEPs, using the agreed template with all but a handful presenting data and making clear, detailed evaluative comments
- Reviewing of *all* interim PEPs, by the PAQC, and a rating of self-assessment capability made
- Adaption and development of resources due to a shortened timeframe (3 weeks) to account for the disruption of COVID19
- Provision of support for teams to conduct their own Āta korero through briefings and support for writing via templates and 'go-to' persons
- Review of identified interim PEPs, by Te Korowai Kahurangi staff, within agreed timeframes and provide timely advice to writers
- Moderation of the interim PEP reports was consistent across the Te Korowai Kahurangi team

The above evidence suggests Te Korowai Kahurangi supported the interim PEP process to occur in a timely fashion despite the disruption of COVID19, provided mechanisms of support for Āta korero and writing to enhance evaluation and provided feedback on reports to build capability. Lead in time for PEP implementation is area for improvement.

Timeline

An initial timeline was developed as follows:

20 May	QAB pending discussion on resourcing and feasibility supports in principle the interim PEP Focus Areas
24 Jun	Course survey results published
28 Jun	End of (standard) semester 1
29 Jun – 12 Jul	Grade processing and CEP
6 Jul	Interim PEP given final approval to go ahead
15 Jul – 9 Aug	Request PEP template from Te Korowai Kahurangi giving 5-business days' notice
19 Jul	Template released
13 Jul – 14 Aug	Āta-kōrero Evaluative conversations occur
15 Aug – 31 Aug	PAQC evaluation of interim PEP reports
31 Aug	Deadline for submission of interim PEP reports to qab@unitec.ac.nz

1-15 Sep	Evaluation of process and outcomes of interim PEP cycle
----------	---

Later dates were amended due to the second COVID lockdown in Auckland, with some interim PEPs submitted in September and the review of these continuing until the 25 September.

However, a survey of interim PEP report writers, which had a 56% response rate (n=24) noted that the capacity and time to complete reports was one of the biggest areas that would support better evaluative interim PEP writing (n=10) and a number of comments about deadlines and time constraints were made throughout the survey. Some staff had to write two or more reports which can be time-consuming and divert writers from other duties, particularly when writing staff are student facing. This is a gap, which needs to be considered within Schools to ensure sufficient workload allocation for the interim PEP process.

Āta kōrero

Given the focus on Āta tuhi and disruptions to workflows due to COVID 19, it was agreed that School teams would facilitate their own Āta kōrero, with the acknowledgement that this may not be a full Āta kōrero. In addition, Te Korowai Kahurangi and Te Puna Ako staff did not have the capacity to facilitate Āta korero as had been done previously.

Cultural advice was sought from Kaihautū, where it was agreed that the tikanga may change over time without losing the kaupapa. Academic Programme Managers (APMs) were asked to identify staff in each team to facilitate this process and take notes. Briefing workshops were delivered by Te Korowai Kahurangi in July/early August with two workshops on facilitating Āta kōrero and two on interim PEP writing. Each team was also allocated an interim PEP 'Go to' person who could advise on the writing process as needed, aligning with the value of Mahi Kotahitanga. Teams exercised their Rangatiratanga, with many not seeking support, whilst some received extensive support. Most teams approached those in Te Puna Ako or Te Korowai Kahurangi that they had relationships with, which suggests the importance of the go-to person already having a relationship with the team. All information about Āta korero and Āta tuhi was available on the nest.

Survey responses showed that 52% (n=13) of respondents either did not find the Āta kōrero process helpful or did not use it. Whilst the Āta kōrero process was modified as described above, it shows that more work is needed to build capacity for Te Korowai Kahurangi to lead Āta kōrero, or more capability development in schools to lead their own processes in ways that are useful if Unitec is committed to Āta as a reflective and evaluative process. However, it was noted that a number of valuable Āta korero were happening during PAQC committees where reports were discussed. This is recognised that these conversations did not necessarily include all programme team members. Ownership of programmes should sit with teaching staff so their input would be valued.

Gaps

Timeframes could be improved moving forward, with further planning of the PEP process in advance, and greater capacity within Te Korowai Kahurangi and Schools to complete Āta kōrero and Āta tuhi well. The Interim PEP team including staff from Te Korowai Kahurangi and Te Puna Ako had 2-3 weeks to prepare templates, rubrics and briefings however this was impacted by COVID19 and the EER preparation. A way to address this gap is to continue to develop good templates and processes that can be rolled out year-on-year. In addition, discussing PEP focus and process could be added to the QAB workplan.

Identified Actions

- Continued refinement of PEP process (Te Korowai Kahurangi)

- Clear timeline for EoY PEP developed by 31st October (Te Korowai Kahurangi, HOSs)
- Ensuring PEP writers have sufficient workload allocation for the task (HOSs)
- Capacity and capability building for Āta korero in the EoY PEP round and a process agreed for how this will be undertaken (Te Korowai Kahurangi and HOSs)

Evaluative Question 2: How well was accurate and evaluative assessment of programme educational performance supported?

The rating given to this focus area is **good** for the following reasons

- Development of a template and rubric to guide evaluative writing, which were rated highly in a survey of interim PEP writers as being helpful (template as helpful 100%, focus area rubrics as helpful 96%, example paragraphs as helpful 96%)
- Power BI data supplied to teams and live access for all staff
- Pre-population of some template areas
- Feedback on interim PEPs was given in timely and clear way to inform further development
- Interim PEP writers and Heads of Schools (HOSs) were included in feedback

The actions above were seen to enhance accurate, consistent and evaluative self-assessment in most areas and addressed gaps in rubrics and benchmarking. A key area for improvement has been identified in regards to supporting data analysis for programmes where some Power BI data is not relevant, such as ongoing training in using Power BI, and help with identifying additional data sources for PEP writing.

In some cases, the understanding of pre-population was not clear as to what was to be provided.

Interim PEP template and rubric development

Whilst 2019 was focused on Āta kōrero and evaluative conversations, 2020 has a greater focus on Āta tuhi (writing and reporting). Internal review, IER panels and informal feedback from Academic Programme Managers (APMs) identified a number of areas for Unitec to make improvements in self-evaluation. These included strengthening the use of rubrics, benchmarking against previous years, use of programme, School and priority group targets, use of external benchmarks and more reliable judgment of ratings based on a range of data sources.

In line with these areas for improvement a template was developed for the interim PEP, which included:

- An educational performance rubric for each focus area based on NZQA Rubric 1
- Optional tables for representing data for SCC and GESC
- Example of evaluative writing under each Focus Area and PAQC feedback
- Pre-populated cover sheet and current SMART goals
- A capability in self-assessment rubric based on NZQA Rubric 2
- designed to enhance Rangatiratanga and Whakaritenga, by supporting teams to effectively tell their programme's success story

The success of these templates and rubrics can be measured by the completion of 100% of required interim PEPs, improvements in self-assessment, as discussed below, and survey feedback.

Survey feedback of 100% of respondents (n=24) rated the template as either somewhat or very helpful. The rubrics and example paragraphs also rated highly, with 95% of respondents identifying them as somewhat or very helpful. Other resources which were seen as helpful included the self-assessment rubrics at the end of the template (74% rated as somewhat or very helpful), the PAQC self-evaluation process (63% rated as helpful) and the interim PEP briefing sessions offered by TKK (60% identified as somewhat or very helpful) Power BI data was also seen to be helpful, but it

appears that the live dashboard was more helpful (78% rated somewhat or very helpful) than the PDFs (48% rated as helpful). These results highlight the success of providing staff with Power BI access and suggests that it may be useful to phase out PDFs, which are time-consuming to produce, but quickly out of date. This lag can impact performance ratings and the time to produce PDFs could be better used increasing capability in Power BI use, which highlighted by 46% of respondents (n=11) as helping them to improve their evaluative writing.

Templates provided clear links to where Course Evaluation Planning (CEP) data could be used to inform the interim PEP. Survey responses showed that in total 66% (n=16) of respondents used either the CEP dashboard or CEP PDFs. Several interim PEP writers in the survey commented on needing good CEP data to inform writing. As CEPs are identified as an important self-evaluation process and can be a key source of PEP data, some actions could be identified to help improve CEP uptake such as discussing CEPs in grade ratification meetings and incorporating CEPs into staff ADEP processes and continuing to provide capability development in CEP writing.

Te Korowai Kahurangi has identified a number of improvements to the template and rubrics, which will be actioned for future PEP iterations. This includes areas such as being clearer about priority targets in rubrics and including SMART goals in narrative commentary under each KEQ. Survey feedback has also identified additional improvements, such as providing a blank template along with the exemplar.

Review of interim PEP reports

Each interim PEP was reviewed by the programme's PAQC against the Capability in Self -Assessment Rubric and a staff member from Te Korowai Kahurangi was present in most PAQCs to support self-assessment, again supporting Mahi Kotahitanga. A team of three Te Korowai Kahurangi staff further reviewed submissions from those programmes involved in EER over a three-week period, a total of 29 out of 74 programmes. For 15 of these programmes, which were an EER programme focus, their 2019 end of year report was also re-reviewed. Reports were reviewed against the Capability in Self-assessment Rubric, with peer moderation of a number of reports.

Comments and feedback were provided on each interim PEP report with a focus on identifying changes that would lift self-assessment capability. Where changes were identified, the feedback was returned to APMs and HOSs on or before 25 September with the invitation to amend and resubmit to the QAB inbox by 30 September ready for final submission to NZQA. If amendments resulted in any changes in performance or self-assessment ratings, these were to be resubmitted to the relevant PAQC first. For programmes in the EER, additional commentary was provided for End of Year 2019 Submissions should the team wish to further incorporate this. These changes went through the same resubmission process described above. Interim PEP Report writers and HOSs were also informed if their PEP did not require any changes.

Reports were not given a formal rating from Te Korowai Kahurangi, who took a partnered approach to evaluation with PAQCs, in line with Rangatiratanga and Mahi Kotahitanga. Te Korowai Kahurangi staff observed an improvement in self-evaluation capacity, particularly with more realistic ratings of performance, which also led to more accurate self-assessment ratings at PAQC level. The improvement may be due to APMs, who usually write reports being more experienced in this process, and the template and rubric supporting teams to improve evaluative writing and more accurately assess performance.

Schools which produced some strong reports include:

- Bridgepoint
- Community Studies

- Creative Industries

Gaps

An identified gap was noted in some reports where poor performance ratings were given for Focus Area 1 and may have been skewed by deferrals due to COVID 19, or reporting periods outside of the semester. This meant some programmes were not accurately assessing or reflecting on student success. In addition, some reports focused on only one or two measures to assess performance, rather than making judgements based on a range of sources. Upskilling teams in looking at other data, and identifying where there are problems in Power BI data, and using all of the rubric criteria may help to address this gap. This is supported by survey responses which showed that along with time (n=10) help with using Power BI (n=11) and help with identifying other data (n=10) were identified as key areas of support that would help PEP writing.

A targeted approach was used to review a sample of Interim PEPs. Priority was given to those programmes that were in the up-coming EER. This may have meant that some programmes needing support with their interim PEP were not identified or reviewed in this round. Identifying how programmes are prioritised for review may be helpful in future.

Identified Actions

- Upskill teams in using a range of data to assess performance where Power BI data is less useful (Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Identify how PEPs are prioritised for review for the EoY PEP (QAB)
- Continue to upskill writers in accessing their own Power BI data and phase out PDFs (Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Ensure report templates match PowerBI dashboards for ease of report completion (Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Continue to develop templates and rubrics as per user feedback and Te Korowai Kahurangi staff reflection (Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Continue to support CEP completion to act as a strong source of PEP data. (Te Korowai Kahurangi)

Evaluative Question 3: How well was reflection and self-assessment capability in the interim PEP process supported?

The rating given to this focus area is **good** for the following reasons:

- development of Self-evaluation rubric
- a partnered approach to evaluation
- feedback on reviewed interim PEPS was given in a timely and clear way to inform further development
- APMs/writers were included in feedback

The actions above supported accurate and consistent self-evaluation in most programmes, with support to further enhance self-assessment through review of the interim PEPs. A partnered approach enhanced Mahi Kotahitanga and Rangatiratanga in self-evaluation was used. A gap has been identified in relation to the identification of and reflection on SMART goals with actions identified to address this gap.

PAQC Evaluation

In 2019 PAQC evaluations were noted to be an area for improvement. In the 2019 EoY PEP, 67% of the evaluation ratings given by Te Korowai Kahurangi were poor or marginal. Overall, this area improved with a partnered approach to self-evaluation taken between the PAQC and Te Korowai

Kahurangi. A member of Te Korowai Kahurangi was available in each PAQC to support discussion and as a result there is greater accuracy in PAQC ratings and PAQCs' Rangatiratanga in relation to self-evaluation has been enhanced. All PAQCs rated programme self-evaluation as either good or excellent and Te Korowai Kahurangi observers noted that ratings were carefully considered against the rubrics. A small number of reports received suggestions in the review stage to reconsider their PAQC rating.

Interim PEP Feedback

As noted above, reviewed programmes received feedback and most chose to resubmit before final NZQA submission based on this feedback. Responses from writers to the feedback were generally positive. An identified gap in the last round was that feedback was only given to HOSs and not forwarded to APMs or teams in some cases. In this interim PEP round all feedback was sent to report writers, with the interim PEP writer and HOS copied in.

A clearer process for documenting feedback on PEP reports from Te Korowai Kahurangi and whether or not this has been incorporated by Schools could be developed. Whilst feedback provides suggested rather than mandated changes, Unitec's overall self-assessment could be improved by documenting this process more clearly, for example at the end of the template after the PAQC review comments.

Gaps:

One identified gap in the reviewed reports was that SMART goals were not often referred to in the relevant Focus Area commentary or evaluated for their impact on success. Not all programmes identified new SMART goals from the interim PEP and Te Korowai Kahurangi staff noted that some teams required capability development for creating SMART goals.

This gap limited quality self-assessment in some reports, where the reflective process did not always refer to previous self-assessment and continuous improvement.

Interestingly, in the survey SMART goals were only identified by 25% (n=4) of respondents as an area for development in PEP writing. This suggests there may be a gap between School's perception of what a SMART goal should look like and Te Korowai Kahurangi expectations. Further capability building is needed in this area.

Actions:

- Include SMART goal commentary throughout the template to ensure reflection on their impact (Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Upskill schools in SMART goal development (Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Clearly document PEP review process and feedback (Te Korowai Kahurangi)

Evaluative Question 4: How well was consistency in interim PEP reporting across the organisation supported?

The rating given to this focus area is **good** for the following reasons

- Partnered approach to evaluation
- Development of template and rubrics
- Increased consistency of ratings within and between schools
- Increased agreement of ratings between Schools and Te Korowai Kahurangi

Increased consistency and agreement of ratings suggests that the approaches taken to support evaluative self-evaluation have been mostly effective and that there is better understanding of self-

evaluation across Unitec. A gap has been identified in accuracy of self-assessment in one School, with additional support provided to APMs in this area who are new to this process.

Performance and Self-Evaluation Ratings

An overall aggregation of ratings across Schools shows that educational performance and self-assessment ratings within Schools and across programmes were generally consistent. The most commonly achieved performance rating was good and the most commonly achieved self-evaluation rating was good.

These ratings reflect Unitec's development with its performance since the last EER, and the increased capability of schools in self-assessment and evaluative writing.

In addition, these ratings were generally assessed to be accurate by Te Korowai Kahurangi team members, both in Te Korowai Kahurangi support in PAQCs and in reports that were reviewed. This is an improvement from 2019, where ratings between programmes and PEP reviewers (Te Korowai Kahurangi and Te Puna Ako staff) were often different, with PAQCs considering self-assessment as good, whilst reviewers rated it as marginal or poor. This change may be due to clearer rubrics and Mahi Kotahitanga through Te Korowai Kahurangi presence at PAQCs which has enhanced programme's Rangatiratanga in relation to self-assessment.

However, one School, Trades, did appear to be less accurate in its self-assessment than other Schools, with a number of rating changes suggested from report review. Te Korowai Kahurangi is working with this School, particularly APMs, to continue to improve self-assessment capability. A number of these inaccuracies were addressed through the interim PEP review and resubmission process, which have acted as capability development process and highlight the value of review in supporting good self-evaluation. Capability and consistency in self-assessment within Schools could be further enhanced through inviting Schools to share the interim PEPs that were reviewed and refined with programmes which did not have an interim PEP review. This could help to address the fact that not all interim PEPs were able to be reviewed.

For further triangulation of educational performance and self-assessment ratings, aggregated school ratings have been compared against overall Unitec Self-Assessment data (See Appendix B). Whilst there are some differences between the Focus Areas for the interim PEP and measures in the self-assessment, there appears to be overall consistency between ratings. This comparison serves to further highlight consistency of self-assessment across different areas of Unitec and shared understanding across the organisation about what good educational performance and self-assessment looks like.

The development of templates and rubrics has supported consistency, with most schools providing comparable data and commentary. This will allow for increased reflection of trends within and across programmes, and enhanced measurement of the effectiveness of Unitec-wide strategies such as I See Me.

Gaps

The Āta kōrero process was team led in this Interim PEP round, rather than Te Korowai Kahurangi or Te Puna Ako led. This change was mostly due to time and capacity constraints, as well as a desire to enhance school's Rangatiratanga in the process, but could have created a gap in consistency, as not all facilitators were trained. Limited attendance at the briefings meant that some teams may not have run a full Āta kōrero. This gap was identified early on and all information was put on The Nest with PowerPoints to guide the process. Despite this possible gap, interim PEPs were generally completed well as evidenced throughout this report and feedback on reviewed reports may help to

further guide development in both Āta kōrero and Āta tuhi. As noted under question 1, time and capability development are required to support good Āta kōrero

Actions

- Clearly determine the Āta Kōrero process and support for EoY PEPs and provide adequate time for upskilling a wider pool of facilitators and writers (Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Continue to identify any gaps in self-assessment through targeted review of EoY PEPs and provide support for APMs or report writers in these areas (Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Invite schools to share their reviewed PEPs with programmes where PEPs were not reviewed to build capability in self-assessment (Te Korowai Kahurangi and APMs)

2020 End of Year PEP reports

Insights from this process have identified several steps for preparation of the EoY PEP reports, which can be broken into three key areas:

Process and Capacity

- Clear timeframes for end of year PEPs developed and communicated with enough time given to both Te Korowai Kahurangi and report writers to ensure robust Āta Kōrero and Āta Tuhi
- Identify focus areas for EOY PEPs and focus areas for targeted PEP review by Te Korowai Kahurangi, informal EER feedback may assist with this.
- Identify Āta kōrero processes i.e. team led, or Te Korowai Kahurangi led and ensure adequate resourcing for this

Template and Data Development

- Refine templates and rubrics as per feedback and identified improvements in this report, including SMART goal development, matching template more clearly to Power BI dashboards.

Capability Development

- Provide support to schools for the following: Power BI use, SMART goals, CEP completion and quality

Appendix A – Rubric 1: Criteria for rating Te Korowai Kahurangi support performance

Rating	Criteria
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is exceptional • Highly effective contributing processes – Te Korowai Kahurangi processes support timely, accurate, consistent and evaluative self-assessment across the organisation • Very few gaps or weaknesses in PEP processes developed and support provided • Effective strategies have been implemented to overcome any gaps and weaknesses • SMART actions identified with clear description of how they will contribute to further success • Actions linked to TNK
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is generally strong • Effective contributing processes – Te Korowai Kahurangi processes support timely, accurate, consistent and evaluative self-assessment in most areas • Some gaps or weaknesses in PEP processes developed and support provided and these may have some impact on performance • Strategies to address gaps and weaknesses are generally effective but may not have fully overcome challenges • Further actions identified with description of how they will contribute to further success • Some actions linked to Te Noho Kotahitanga
Marginal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is variable • Inconsistent contributing processes – Te Korowai Kahurangi processes support timely, accurate, consistent and evaluative self-assessment in some areas with some not undertaking good evaluation • Gaps or weaknesses in PEP processes developed and support provided clearly impact performance • Strategies to overcome challenges may be inconsistent or not addressing all areas • Some further actions identified but may not be clear on how they will contribute to success
Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is weak and/or ineffective • Ineffective contributing processes – Te Korowai Kahurangi processes do not support good self-evaluative assessment. • Gaps or weaknesses in PEP processes developed have significant impact on performance • Strategies to overcome challenges are not identified or ineffective

Appendix B: Aggregated School Performance and Self-Assessment Ratings from the interim PEP compared with Unitec's Self-Assessment Summary by School. (as at 1 October 2020)

The following tables compare aggregated performance and self-assessment ratings from the interim PEP by school with the overall Unitec Self-Assessment for EER by school.

	Interim PEP Ratings							Unitec Self-Assessment Ratings						
School Name	School overall	FA 1 - SCC	FA 2 - GESC	FA3 – Strategy Implementation	FA 4 – Covid Response	FA5 Smart Goals	PAQC Review Self-Assessment Capability	School overall	School SCC	School QCR	Programme	GESC	Implementation	Response
Applied Business	Good	Good	Marginal	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Marginal	Good	Good	Excellent
Architecture	Good	Marginal	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Marginal	Good		Good	Excellent	Good
Bridgepoint	Good	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent
Building and Construction	Good	Marginal	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good		Good	Good		Good	Good	Good
Community Studies	Good	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Excellent		Excellent	Marginal		Excellent	Good	Excellent
Computer Engineering and Applied Technology	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good		Good	Marginal	Good	Poor	Marginal	Good
Creative Industries	Good	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Good		Excellent	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Excellent
Environmental and Animal Sciences	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent		Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent
Healthcare and Social Practice	Good	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Excellent		Good	Good	Poor	Excellent	Good	Excellent
Trades and Services	Good	Marginal	Good	Marginal	Good	Marginal	Good		Marginal	Good	Marginal	Good	Good	Excellent
Unitec Pathways College	Good	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Good							

* blank cells refer to instances where ratings were not available at the time of writing