To	Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board	**From**	[Sue Wake]
			[Landscape & Interior]
Title	PAQC Chair's Quarterly Report	**Date**	2020/ 10 / 09

Grey text outlines what needs to be addressed in the report.
Blue text provides further guidance on how to respond to the question
Please remove both before you submit your report.
Keep your responses short - you shouldn't need more than a couple sentences for most of the sections.

1. Overview
There has been one meeting since the last report on 31/7/20. This meeting was held 9/9/20 with the main aim of discussing and approving the interim PEP's.

General Committee Health Check

What is going well?
We are slowly adjusting to the format and requirements of this (relatively) new committee and starting to feel more comfortable with it.

What improvements can be made?
It is still difficult to understand all the acronyms used and the role and relevance of all the embedded documents peppered through the agenda

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

The biggest issue faced by this PAQC is dealing with the lack of APM for the whole of this semester to date.

Progress against 3 (max.) key actions

- According to the last PAQC agenda, "*A revised work-plan will be created from the combined action plans of the 2020 interim PEPs and 2019 Monitors Reports." This is not yet available since we are not in a priority group for EER, so we have yet to receive feedback on the PEPs.*

- We will discuss PEP actions and monitors' reports in the next PAQC and this will form into key actions.

- There is an ongoing issue with not receiving the monitor's report for the BLA programme. This issue has been escalated to HoS. It is expected a new monitor will be appointed for ongoing.

Risk management

Process
Our process has changed slightly due to lack of APM – updating risk register is now being done by HoS. We will discuss any major changes at the next PAQC.

Outcomes
We are in the process of following up DEF grades to improve SCC rates.
We are aware that expected increases to some programmes (eg NZCLD and NZDL) will raise the risk profile due to the need for more/larger teaching spaces and part time staff.

2. Student support and achievement

Priority Group Strategies

Process

The PAQC is confident that strategies are leading to positive outcomes. We have an LOP (learning outreach person) in the school now and staff have attended the required workshops on "I see me" initiative.

Outcomes

The PAQC expects that as these initiatives such as 'I see me' become more embedded, SCC and engagement should increase, where the issue is students dropping out due to not relating to the courses and content being delivered. Where there are others circumstances leading to students not completing, these initiatives are unlikely to have a positive effect.

Some programmes gave extensions of time due to Covid interuptions, but overall the programmes finished more-or-less on time. The Masters by project in LA/Arch was delayed with the holding of workshops and exams.

Student Success

Student Outcomes
The PAQC is confident that most of its programmes will achieve their targets, including priority groups. It is, however, worth noting that small cohorts mean that if only a very few students (who are priority) do not complete due to deciding the course is not for them or they are unprepared for the work required – the target may not be reached.

Grades and Completions
We are confident that the very few remaining missing or deferred grades will be dealt with by our processes (AAQ) is working with the relevant DL. A clear update will be reported to the next PAQC meeting.

Student Feedback

Process
This PAQC is satisfied that student evaluation is sufficient and effective. Some courses were surveyed with paper evaluations and some are included in the Unitec-wide online survey

Outcomes
Summary of response rates for programmes – Reported via TKK tracking
Comment on the extent to which the PAQC is satisfied with survey response rates.

The paper surveys get a much greater response rate and lecturers can see immediately what they need to address. The online surveys are often statistically non-viable due to low response rates and therefore give a very slanted view. However, it is valuable to have the online version for writing PEPs since it is available on the dashboard.

Summary of issues and improvement plans
Neither the in-class paper evaluation or the online survey have a system for providing a feedback loop to students. If we re-instigated a system of SGID evaluation (small group instructional diagnosis), there is a feedback loop built in. The disadvantage is the time it takes (approx. 1 hr) and the need for a trained facilitator.
This PAQC has not discussed evaluation feedback to students, at all.

3. Academic quality outcomes

Moderation

Moderation plans
This PAQC uses a tracker to show that pre and post internal moderation has been done. All moderation documents are held on Onedrive.

Moderation outcomes
The PAQC is assured that moderation is occurring but this was not dealt with in the period for which this report refers to.

Summary of any known issues and any mitigation plans
See above. This report period did not discuss moderation.

Research

This was not relevant to the PAQC meeting this report covers.

4. Programme design, delivery and review

Course Evaluation and Planning

Process
There is a new system of online CEPs and uptake has been a little slow. There have been some training sessions offered for this and it is expected that this will improve in future.

Outcomes
The PAQC meeting covered by the period of this report did not deal with CEPs. We are confident this will be greatly improved by the end of the year when CEPs for sem 2 will be completed and evaluated to develop and improve courses.

Programme Evaluation and Planning (PEP)

Process
Despite difficulties such as lack of APM and delays receiving the template, this PAQC received and discussed interim PEPs from all programmes it is responsible for.

Outcomes
TKK partner was present at the PAQC meeting where the PEPs were evaluated (Eric Stone) and his input was valuable in guiding us and DLs undertook to write up extra commentary as rationale for ratings, after the meeting concluded. PAQC is confident about this process and outcomes.

Degree Monitoring

Process

Please see previous comments about the BLA monitor's report for 2019 not being received. This has been escalated to HoS and TKK.

Outcomes

See above.

Consistency Review

Process

One programme has been successfully reviewed (NZCLD) this year and others are expected in the next few years. The PAQC is confident that systems are sufficient to manage this process well.

Outcomes

We received a very good report commending our graduands who were very successful in either moving to further their studies or landing good employment that is related to their degree.

Professional Accreditation/Other

Process

This has been deferred to 2021 for both BLA and MLA/MARCH

Outcomes

No outcomes yet.

Stakeholder Engagement

Process

This will be discussed at the next PAQC meeting. A new IAC is in the process of being created to represent the Landscape Design programmes (NZCLD and NZDL). This was decided last year due to it being determined that IAC for BLA was not relevant for NZCLD/NZDL.

Our BA keeps the stakeholder engagement log.

Outcomes

This will be put into the agenda for the next PAQC meeting (see above)

Programme Review

Process

Along with Professional Accreditation, this has been deferred until 2021.

Outcomes

None yet.

Graduate Outcomes

Process

This has not been discussed at the PAQC meeting being reported on here, but it is contained within the PEPs that were discussed. Graduate outcomes will be added to the agenda for the next PAQC meeting and the AAQ will give update from the dashboard.

Outcomes

For example, the consistency review collected this data for NZCLD and it was found that students felt one of the two GPOs was more relevant to their post-Unitec employment that the other (the one relating to supervision).

Reference:
[PAQC Terms of Reference](#)

Programmes overseen by the PAQC:

MLA, MARCH, BLA, NZDL, NZCLD, NZDI5, NZDI6