
To	Te Poari Whai Kounga Quality Alignment Board	From	Sue Wake Landscape and Interior Design
Title	PAQC Chair's Quarterly Report	Due Date	2021/02/25

1. Overview

This overview provides brief reflection of the work of the PAQC during 2020.

General Committee Health Check

What worked well?

The committee is settling into its role well. Members understand their duties better than 2020.

What improvements have been/will be made for 2021?

None to note, it is really just that we have a better understanding of requirements and how it all fits together from courses/course co-ordinators through to DL, APM and then to our secretary, Julia Gu.

What support is required (actions required) to achieve these improvements?

None – it is working well and Julia is a tower of strength and organisation.

What issues (if any) need to be escalated to Quality Alignment Board | Te Poari Whai Kounga?

None to note

Progress against 3 (max.) key actions

1. All interim PEPs have been completed and approved and all actions in the PEPs are closely monitored for progress.
2. Programme changes (Type 2) have been completed for NZDL and approved by NZQA.
3. Contentious issues resulting from the development of the risk register were discussed and any issues have been escalated to QAB – this was particularly important during 2020 due to the effects of 'lockdown' on students learning and welfare. For example, APC applications were a priority to manage as a way of alleviating student stress.

Risk management

Process

Please see above for an outline of the value of the risk register. However, late in 2021 some members of the PAQC expressed concerns and requested clarification on the Prog Risk Matrix, which indicated high risk for Level 7+ programmes – eg decline in research outputs and EFTS, which is out of the control of teaching staff.

Outcomes

The effect of falling enrolments is a high risk within this PAQC for some programmes (eg BLA, MLA). One problem is the gap between applications and actual enrolments. Some of this is out of the control of the PAQC.

Another high risk for programmes that currently have greatly increased numbers is managing to provide adequately in terms of space and resources (including staff and budget items).

Also, there is always the threat of further lockdowns and how this may impact on student successful course completion.

The PAQC acknowledges these risks/issues and if they are felt to be getting beyond the capability of the PAQC, they will be escalated to QAB.

2. Student support and achievement

Priority Group Strategies

Process

The PAQC acknowledges that staff have been to workshops etc for institutional strategies such as “I see me” and it is confident that lecturers will embed this within their course teaching. There was a mandatory requirement for staff to do a Living Te Noho Kotahitanga badge in 2020, although this did not include part time staff.

Outcomes

This PAQC expects there will be an improved SCC in situations where application of this new knowledge by staff is relevant to making a difference to students.

We also have a dedicated Pastoral Care officer and it is expected that this will help with catching situations early.

Student Feedback

Most useful for teaching staff is when we carry out paper surveys in-class. This means the whole class is represented, while the online surveys get sent late in the year and response rate is low. This means the feedback from just a few students (who may have a grievance) can dominate.

This PAQC is satisfied that the paper version works well and should be continued, but the whole area of evaluation should be formalised by coming through the PAQC meetings for discussion of the response from course co-ordinators.

Outcomes of issues and improvement plans

This PAQC is not sure how the student feedback loop can be closed for this kind of evaluation (eg filling in paper or online copies). The best student evaluation system for this is the SGID, which is much more structured and collaborative and removes the problem of discussing lots of individual points with the class. SGID has a built-in feedback loop and its method of capturing feedback is by group rather than individual, so there is less likelihood of ‘outlier’ information dominating. The downside of it is that it requires a trained facilitator and takes around 1 hr to conduct.

This PACQ wishes only to table the evaluations that are done throughout the year and discuss general points of change that come out of it. It is worth noting that this material is very sensitive and can cause distress to staff who are targeted in evaluations.

3. Academic quality outcomes

Moderation

Moderation plans

A moderation plan is in place.

Moderation outcomes

This PAQC is satisfied that the approved moderation plan is being followed. External moderation is occurring as per the plan and reports plus our responses are tabled through this committee for discussion and recording.

Summary of any known issues and any mitigation plans

Tracking of moderation occurs through reports and responses, that be then translated into action points (via the PEP process).

Research

This PACQ receives information about research active staff from RPTL report and all programmes are satisfactory (meet Unitec requirements).

4. Programme design, delivery and review

Course Evaluation and Planning

Process

CEP 2020 Sem 1

CEP 2020 Sem 2

This is a new system and there was some slowness and non-compliance that is being caught up now. This PAQC is confident that CEPs are being completed and this is being followed up by APMs.

Outcomes

The value of the CEPs is to feed into the PEPs and this will be a vehicle for positive change.

Programme Evaluation and Planning (PEP)

Process

This PAQC has strong confidence in the PEP process, although the Ata-korero process was found to be less useful. The interim PEPs were completed on time, remarkable given all the other unforeseen events that occurred – eg covid-19 lockdowns, APM absent on sick leave for term 3.

Outcomes

The PAQC is confident that all of the programmes are being evaluated, action points determined and follow-through is occurring through this committee.

Degree Monitoring

Process

Monitoring is occurring and is being monitored by this PAQC. Reports are received by this committee and reminders to chase these up is passed on during the meeting. There was a historic monitor problem for the BLA – the monitor would not complete the report despite numerous follow-ups. This monitor has been changed for 2020.

Outcomes

This committee is still waiting on the two monitoring reports from 2020 for BLA and Masters of L/A & Arch by project. This is being followed-up.

Consistency Review

Process

We are waiting to hear dates of the Consistency Review for NZDL (overdue), the Interior programmes are not due yet. There has been some storage of information about graduands, however, there is no official process for this and it is left to the DL to hold this information.

Outcomes

There was one consistency review in 2020 for NZCLD. From this came two action points and these are being monitored. One is to do with the point immediately above, the problem is, we are not well resourced to keep alumni data. The second is about liaison with industry and we deal with this via the industry advisory group for landscape design.

Professional Accreditation/Other

Process

There is one programme within this PAQC that requires professional accreditation (BLA) and two that require industry external moderation (Interior diplomas). The BLA accreditation is overdue but it was deferred last year due to Covid-19. It is expected to happen this year around mid-year.

The interior programmes went through their external moderation and the report is awaited.

Outcomes

This will have to be reported on later.

Stakeholder Engagement

Process

This is an area that should be more regulated. I am not aware of a stakeholder engagement strategy for each programme. For NZCLD/NZDL there is an IAC and a meeting was held late in 2020. This chair is not aware of IAC's for other programmes and this wasn't discussed at the recent PAQC.

Outcomes

There will be an agenda item in the next PAQC that addresses this.

Programme Review

Process

No programme reviews are planned. There is a version change to do for two programmes – NZDL and NZCLD but given the current environment of change, it is prudent to wait and find out more about the ramifications of this.

Outcomes

N/A

Graduate Outcomes

Process

The information on Power BI for graduates who complete the survey and indicate that they are employed is a rather incomplete picture of whether graduates meet the graduate outcomes of the programme. Also, the numbers of respondents is very low, making the data not very robust for commenting on trends.

The extent to which graduates and their employers/end users feel the programme has met the graduate outcomes for the qualification is best addressed via the Consistency Review for programmes that have them. For other programmes (eg MLA, BLA) this is best done as part of accreditation.

Graduate Survey Dashboard

Outcomes

See above

Reference:

PAQC Terms of Reference