
To Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board

From Gerard Lovell
[Computing]

Title PAQC Chair's Quarterly Report

Date 2020/10/08

1. Overview

A brief overview of the work of the PAQC since the last report.

My last report was 30 July 2020. This report covers the meetings of the 16 July 2020, 27 August 2020 and the special meeting dedicated to the approval of the interim PEPs on 3 September 2020.

The report identified what we have done in these three meetings as they relate to the headings supplied. If there was no item on the agenda for a specific headings but there is a process in place this has been discussed.

General Committee Health Check

What is going well?

The head of school finally attended a meeting. He has since been replaced. A lecturer resigned and has been replaced by a senior lecturer. The committee for this quarter consisted of three ex officio members, one senior lecturer, two lecturers (one of whom is the chair) and a representative from another PAQC. It has taken a while to get the membership together.

However now (to be reported in the next meeting) the longest serving ex officio member has been in the position since July 2020. Student representation is still a problem as the first nominee did not attend but another student has been invited to the next meeting.

What improvements can be made?

I still feel we are under resourced. What's the point if we give 0.1 allocation to a staff member when they are already working at 1.1. Who is doing the resourcing? I can again request more resources from the new HOP for next year but the result may be the same as this year and there aren't any.

There seems to be a pattern for these reports and PEPs that the writing will only find out what questions to answer at the end of the period. This is poor management. The format for the fourth report should now be available so that we can put items on the agenda that QAB wants us to discuss.

The same applies to PEP. It is now October and I am sure we will have questions to answer in the PEP that are surprises.

What support is required (actions required) and/or what issues need to be escalated to Quality Alignment Board | Te Poari Whai Kounga?

On the meeting of 16 July concerns were raised about the CEP template. Not sure if this has gone any further or if our feedback was given.

Progress against 3 (max.) key actions

Choose three actions that the PAQC feels have been completed in the recent cycle. This should be a brief summary of progress against key actions from the Work-plan 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.

Here I have chosen from the 27 August meeting three actions that have been closed.

4/06/2020	1.6.	Mahi Tātai Work-plan	<p>PAQC Work- plan to include PEP SMART Action Plans, Monitoring Action Plans and any other plans that the PAQC as a governance committee, would monitor. The APMs were requested to add this to their Programme Committee agenda and update the achievement status of each plan and report back to the PAQC, as and when needed</p> <hr/> <p>27/08/2020 - The Quality Partnering Team Lead advised the current Work Plan was no longer relevant and a new one would have to be developed based on the new 2020 Interim PEP reports and new monitors' reports and responses.</p>	APMs		Closed
4/06/2020	1.7.	Rēhita Raru Risk Register	<p>The APM for the pre-degree programmes said an emerging risk that the NZCITE was facing was that a considerable number of students were enrolling in week 1 or 2 after start of its 8-week block courses. The loss of learning time was now evident in low success rates in the programme. The lead of quality partnering team said if it was endemic, the structure of the programme might need to be looked at.</p> <hr/> <p>27/08/2020 – The NZCITE programme coordinator analysed the results of late starters vs those who</p>	The NZCITE programme coordinator to report back about the volume of late enrolments with more information about its impact		Closed

			attended from the start of the semester and concluded initial absence did not affect pass rates.			
16/07/2020	1.7.	Rēhita Raru Risk Register	<p>Risk Registers for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes were updated. But the new APM for the pre-degree programmes needed some training before he could update risk registers for his programmes. The Lead of Quality Partnering Team asked the secretary to let the TKK manager know about his training need</p> <hr/> <p>27/08/2020 – New APM's Risk Register training completed</p>	Secretary	ASAP	Closed

Risk management

Process

How does the PAQC gain assurance that the key risks across its programmes are being effectively managed?

This is a standing item on each agenda. At both business meetings, the APMs reported on any changes that they have made to the risk register. The APMs explained why “Extreme” had been given to one row.

Outcomes

Provide a summary of the most significant (High and Extreme) risks within the PAQC’s programme/s and how the PAQC is assured that these risks are being effectively managed. Include any significant specific COVID-19 related risks.

The PAQC has not been provided a summary in the minutes although I think we looked at something in one of the meetings. We have not looked at risks that have been assessed as “High” (on agenda for next meeting).

The PAQC discussed and questioned the APMs and were satisfied. There were no follow up actions. We gain assurance by having the APMs comment on the changes they have made to the register.

2. Student support and achievement

Priority Group Strategies

Process

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is assured that actions arising out of relevant institutional strategies (i.e., embedding of “I See Me” initiatives) are being implemented within each of the PAQC’s programmes. If the PAQC is not confident or is unclear, what action has PAQC taken to gain assurance?

This item was covered in the interim PEPs. These PEPs identified what each programme was doing. The PAQC is assured as there was no discussion at the meeting to the contrary.

Outcomes

Outline the outcomes that the PAQC expects to see as a result of the actions being taken. Comment on the extent to which the expected outcomes are on track or being achieved. Is the PAQC confident that the expected outcomes will be achieved? Why? Outline any actions that the PAQC has taken as a result.

I would need to ask the PAQC members what they expect to see as a result of these actions. I think there may have been something in the “I see me” initiative when originally imposed but nothing in the past three months.

Student Success

Student Outcomes

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC:

- *is confident that programmes are (on track to) achieving their targets, including for priority groups.*

- *is satisfied that the necessary actions are being taken and that sufficient progress is being made to progress any actions relating to student outcomes.*

There is a standard item on student progress. There has been no discussion item over the past three months.

The PAQC chair does not know and is not assured. There is an item on the agenda for the next meeting to look at this.

Grades and Completions

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is confident that any missing or deferred grades are being appropriately followed up.

Where there are missing/deferred grades from 2019 or earlier, provide a summary, including timeframes, of what is being done to resolve these.

It was noted that the Grade Approval subcommittees have approved grades for semester 1.

It is noted that students had graduated in various programmes.

It was reported that there were no pending grades from any programmes from past semesters

PAQC chair is confident that the process is working.

Student Feedback

Process

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is satisfied that the mechanisms being used to gather feedback from students is effective.

There is a standard item on the agenda. I don't know who tables these. There has been no items on the agenda during the past three months.

The PAQC has commented in the past that the same type of survey is done and the same complaint about a low response rate is made (when it is actually good for this type of survey). Time to think outside the box.

Outcomes

Summary of response rates for programmes

The response rates have not been tabled at a PAQC.

Summary of issues and improvement plans

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is confident that course survey outcomes are being considered and acted upon, and that the loop with students is being closed.

As nothing has been tabled, I cannot comment.

3. Academic quality outcomes

Moderation

Moderation plans

Comment on the extent to which moderation is effectively planned for each programme, and the extent to which the PAQC has oversight of, and has approved, the internal and external moderation plans for each of its programmes. If not, why not, and when will this be completed?

The external moderation plan was tabled and updated with the master's courses.

Moderation outcomes

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is assured that internal and external moderation is occurring and that it is confirming that assessment is fair, valid and consistent.

After discussion, the revised plan was approved, therefore the PAQC was assured.

Summary of any known issues and any mitigation plans

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is aware of any issues relating to moderation and the confidence it has in the actions being taken to resolve those issues

The chair is aware that the external moderation for 2019 is being tidied up.

The chair is also aware that the 2020 plan is looked after by TKK.

The chair is presently not in a position to say whether TKK will do a better job than the previous moderation co-ordinator.

Research

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is satisfied that all relevant research requirements are being met, including that programmes at Level 7 and above are taught mainly by staff engaged in research.

I don't think this is a standard item for the agenda. It has not come up in the last quarter. I know that the management committee had a report from the Research champion for the school but nothing has been tabled over the past quarter.

4. Programme design, delivery and review

Course Evaluation and Planning

Process

Comment on how the PAQC gains assurance that Course Evaluation and Planning is being undertaken. What actions is the PAQC taking to address any non-compliance?

Concerns were raised about the new template. The template is not user friendly and is hard to follow. Lecturers need to copy information that is already recorded in the system. When the CEP is written the data in Power BI is absent.

I expect that the status of the CEPs to be reported to the meeting by TKK. There has been no report over the past three months.

Outcomes

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is assured that the CEPs process is being used to effect positive change.

The PAQC does not have confidence that the new template is beneficial. Because of this, the PAQC does not have confidence in the process.

Programme Evaluation and Planning (PEP)

Process

Comment on the level of confidence the PAQC has in the programme evaluation and planning (PEP) process, the timeliness of completion and the use of Āta-kōrero evaluative conversations. If there are major concerns, state what these are and what action the PAQC has taken to resolve them.

The completed PEPs were evaluated at the meeting of 3 September. We did not discuss the level of confidence we have in the process. We did do the PAQC evaluations with the help of Eric Stone to interpret some rubric statements. The action plans are available at each meeting and if there has been a change the APM reports on it.

Outcomes

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is assured that programmes are being effectively evaluated, that action plans are appropriate and actions are being implemented as required.

The PAQC gave the PEPs that

New Zealand Certificate in Information Technology Essentials (NZCITE4) - Good

New Zealand Diploma in Information Systems (NZDIS5) - Good

New Zealand Diploma in Cyber Security (NZDCS) - Good

Bachelor of Computing Systems (BCS) and Graduate Diploma in Computing (GDCMP) - Good

Master of Computing (MCOMP) and Postgraduate Diploma in Computing (PGDCG) - Good

The PAQC is assured that all programmes are being effectively evaluated and actions implemented

Degree Monitoring

Process

Comment on whether the PAQC is assured that any degree monitoring required for its programmes in 2020 is being effectively managed (i.e., monitoring is scheduled), or any actions being taken to ensure monitoring will occur.

The PAQC approved the monitors and set dates for BCS & GDCMP and MComp & PGDCG.

The PAQC is assured that the process is working correctly.

Outcomes

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is assured by the outcomes from the monitoring visit and that any recommendations made in the report are being actioned. Summarise the (progress against) key actions from the report and how PAQC is assured that these are being effectively managed.

The BCS & GDCMP was held on 22 September. The report has not yet been received.

Consistency Review

Process

Comment on how PAQC is assured that any consistency reviews required for its programmes over the next four years is being effectively managed (i.e., evidence from graduates and 'end users' is being gathered), or any actions being taken to ensure preparation of consistency reviews is being effectively managed.

The dates were reported for the next consistency review for three of the programmes – NZDCS in 2023 and NZCITE and NZDIS in 2025. One of the smart goals in the interim PEP deals with the progress of getting the data needed.

Outcomes

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is assured by the outcomes from any consistency reviews. Summarise the key actions from the report and why PAQC is assured that these are being effectively managed.

No reports available- we had no graduates when the last consistency reviews were held.

The PAQC chair is not assured that this process is effectively managed. This ties in with the graduate survey.

Professional Accreditation/Other

Not applicable for our programmes

Stakeholder Engagement

Process

Comment on how the PAQC is assured that there is a clear and appropriate stakeholder engagement strategy for each programme.

Comment on the extent to which stakeholder engagement is evident. What actions has or will the PAQC take (if any) to ensure that programmes are being well informed by the needs of stakeholders.

The PAQC chair has never heard of a stakeholder engagement strategy or a stakeholder engagement log. Neither has been tabled at a recent meeting.

The committee received the minutes of the IAC meeting of 1 July 2020.

Outcomes

Comment on the extent to which programmes are being informed by feedback from stakeholders, including the level of evidence.

Sounds like there are more things I do not know about. I am not assured for this topic.

Programme Review

Process

Comment on how PAQC is assured that any programme reviews required for its programmes are being effectively managed (i.e., programme review is scheduled), or any actions being taken to ensure programme review will occur.

Don't remember this topic coming up. I don't know which programmes have them and which do not.

Certainly NZCITE and NZDIS programmes were reviewed when the revised qualification was released and changes made (see programme development and improvements below).

Outcomes

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is assured by the outcomes from the Programme Review process. Summarise the key actions from the report and why PAQC is assured that these are being effectively managed.

Programme Development & Improvements

Type 1 changes were tabled for the MCOMP.

Type 2 changes were presented by the BCS APM. She had worked with her Programme Development Group for BCS and GDCMP to make these changes. There was much discussion and the PAQC endorsed the changes with minor changes.

Type 2 changes were presented by the NZCITE/NZDIS APM. As the qualification had been revised, the programme documents needed to be changed. These changes were made by the Programme Development Group for NZCITE and NZDIS. There was discussion and the PAQC endorsed the changes.

The PAQC is confident that the process is working well.

Graduate Outcomes

Process

Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is satisfied with the collection and use of graduate outcome data. Consider: graduate survey response rates, other data collection mechanisms.

Comment specifically on whether there is a plan (being developed) to collect outcome data from graduates and employers/end users on the extent to which graduates meet the graduate outcomes

I cannot see that this is a standard item on the agenda. Nothing has been tabled in the past quarter. I do not know the process of tabling them.

Outcomes

Comment on the extent to which PAQC is satisfied that graduates are achieving the graduate outcomes for the qualifications they have achieved.

I cannot comment without the information

Reference:

[PAQC Terms of Reference](#)

Programmes overseen by the PAQC:

New Zealand Certificate in IT Essentials (NZ2594); New Zealand Diploma in Information Systems (L5) (NZ2597); New Zealand Diploma in Cyber Security (L6) (NZ3837); Bachelor of Computing Systems (CA2209); Graduate Diploma in Computing (CA2297); Master of Computing (CA2270); Post Graduate Diploma in Computing (CA2271); Doctor of Computing (CA2311)



For Receipt

PAQC Secretary to complete