

Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Academic Committee

Date of Meeting: 24 March 2021

Title	Ako Ahimura Review on Student Course Surveys, Institutional Summary, Semester 2 2020
Provided by:	Maura Kempin
Authored by:	
For:	INFORMATION

Recommendation

That Academic Committee receives Ako Ahimura's Review on the Student Course Surveys, Institutional Summary, Semester 2 2020

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to inform Academic Committee of key findings from a review of the Institutional Summary, Student Course Surveys, Semester 2 2020 and the recommendations made by Ako Ahimura to focus action where most needed help ensure continuous improvement.

Information/Background

Each semester Unitec asks students to provide feedback on course structure, content, assessment, teaching and practical components (if applicable) via an online survey. Reporting is delivered at three levels:

1. Institutional Summary Report
2. Student Survey Course Dashboard
3. Course / Class Reports

This institutional summary report, appended here, provides a summary and analysis of the overall results for the past six semesters and an evaluation of the survey process. It was reviewed in detail by Te Puna Ako and Te Korowai Kahurangi who presented a joint paper to Ako Ahimura with a number of recommendations. Following robust discussion at the Ako Ahimura meeting of 03 March 2021, proposed recommendations were tweaked and approved.

Key Points

- Key finding: The overall performance of Unitec courses continues to track strongly averaging at 8.0 out of 10. This is slightly higher than the Semester 2, 2019 average of 7.9. All teachers and programme teams were commended for very impressive results overall, especially

considering the difficult circumstances of campus closure due to COVID-19 Lockdowns.

- A summary of more detailed findings and trends, especially those leading to the recommendations below, are provided in the appendix.
- Key discussion points at the Committee include:
 - How Lockdowns impacted the results: It was noted that this report simply presents the findings. It is the role of the committee to highlight significant trends and to request action where needed. The Committee recommended that specific Schools/programmes conduct their own further investigation into the reasons for the results.
 - Statistical reliability in the case of low response rates: It was confirmed that response rates do impact the validity of the ratings students give which is why the process relies heavily on teaching staff to encourage students to engage. Sample sizes are robust when reporting at an institute/ school level but become more of an issue when reporting at a programme and course level. Individual course reports are only produced for courses that receive 3 or more responses (to ensure student confidentiality); it is made clear that results are indicative only if a course response rate is below 25%.
 - How Student Council and Student Representatives could be involved in analysis and action planning from the results

Recommendations approved (Ako Ahimura additions indicated in italics)

1. For any course achieving a score of 6 or less (overall) *or averaging less than 6.5 over the last three iterations of the survey for that course*, that the Chair of Ako Ahimura write to Heads of School requiring that programme leadership (APM, PC or DL) work in partnership with the Course Co-Ordinator, seeking input from *relevant* support services as appropriate, *and involving Student Representatives where possible*, to carry out a supported and supportive inquiry process to help identify challenges and to develop action plans for improvement. These plans should be approved by PAQC before 04 July 2021, and a summary of actions and outcomes to be incorporated in the subsequent three rounds of PAQC Chair Reports, as well as in relevant CEPs and in the PEP.
2. The Chair of Ako Ahimura write to Heads of those Schools showing a decline in performance of key areas requesting an inquiry into the possible causes and the development of action plans where appropriate; oversight to be maintained by PAQC and a summary (of analysis, interpretation and actions) to be included in the PAQC Chair's reports as well as in PEPs (and CEP where appropriate). These Schools include:
 - a. Bridgepoint: course content & teaching performance
 - b. Architecture: course content and feedback on assessments (see additional recommendation below)
 - c. Computing, Electrical & Applied Technology: course content, assessment
3. The School of Architecture be required to undertake a more targeted small group instructional diagnostic (SGID) for any course achieving a score of 6 or less (overall), *or averaging less than 6.5 over the last three iterations of the survey for that course*, as well as an analysis of the range of data available (including previous SGIDs, PEP, CEP, NPS, SCC, course evaluation) and structured discussions with library, LOP, Academic Adviser, teachers, APM, DLs *and Student Representatives (where possible)* on their perception of the issues and possible solutions. This should be completed prior to 04 July 2021, with appropriate action plans developed and approved by PAQC and a summary (of actions and outcomes) to be included in the subsequent three

rounds of PAQC Chair's reports, as well as in relevant CEPs and in the PEP.

4. The School of Building & Construction is encouraged to continue to work closely with Te Puna Ako to build on positive trends already in progress (in course structure, assessment and teacher preparedness).
5. Te Korowai Kahurangi to continue to strive for process improvements, including the responses to stakeholder feedback set out in Slide 28 of the accompanying PPT file.

Next Steps

- Recommendation/s to be implemented with oversight by PAQCs and PAQC Chairs;
- Regular updates to be included in PAQC Chair's reports, submitted to Te Poari Whai Kouna | Quality Alignment as well as in relevant CEPs and in the PEP.

Contributors

- Maureen Perkins (Academic Advisor, Te Puna Ako)
- Jeff Honey (Insights Business Partner, Te Korowai Kahurangi)
- Maura Kempin (Manager, Te Puna Ako)

Attachments

The full report is appended here. Below is a summary of key finding.

Appendix 1: Summary of Key Findings

- The overall performance of Unitec courses continues to track strongly averaging at 8.0 out of 10. This is on par with the institutional target, being slightly lower than the Semester 1, 2020 average of 8.1 and slightly higher than the Semester 2, 2019 average of 7.9.
- At 7.4 out of 10, the overall rating for the statement "I felt that Māori beliefs, language and practices were embedded throughout my course" is relatively low compared to other content statements (avg 8.4). Note: the wording for this statement was updated one year ago, hence data included for two cycles only. The previous wording (*I believe this course valued Māori beliefs, language and practices*) achieved an average rating of 6.5 from Semester 1, 2018 to Semester 1, 2019.
- Driver modelling (see slide 8 for details) shows that well-structured courses & teachers clearly explaining key ideas & difficult material have the largest impact on overall course performance.
- Performance has improved significantly for Maia and for Trades & Services, both achieving the highest overall student evaluations for semester 2/2020. The most significant improvements in

Trades and Services over the past 12 months have been in the areas that are most important to students, i.e., course structure & relevance, teacher's preparation and ability to explain things clearly. Note that the response rate for Trades & Services increased significantly from 4.9% in Semester 1, 2020 to 25.0% in Semester 2, 2020.

- In addition to the significant improvements noted above in Trades & Services, Unitec's overall improvement in course performance over the past 12 months is driven by significant gains in:
 - Building & Construction: course structure and teacher preparedness
 - Creative Industries: course structure, relevance and teaching performance
 - Community Studies: teaching performance
- Schools that have shown a decline in performance of key areas include:
 - Bridgepoint: course content & teaching performance
 - Architecture: course content and feedback on assessments
 - Computing, Electrical & Applied Technology: course content, assessment
- Average ratings for Architecture at 7.1 are significantly lower than institutional average (8.0) and have declined significantly from Semester 1, 2020 (7.6) and Semester 2, 2019 (7.5). The most recent rating of 7.1 is the lowest in the six semester iterations of this survey. The key issues identified by driver modelling include course content and feedback on assessments.
- Overall ratings from Applied Business, Community Studies and Health Care & Social Practice, decreased from Semester 1, 2020 but remain at or above Semester 1, 2019 levels.
- At 7.6, the overall rating for Building & Construction is lower than average. However, this is higher than the Semester 2, 2019 rating of 7.4; and ratings for this School are generally trending in a positive direction. Significant improvements have been identified over the past 12 months in course structure and teacher preparedness.
(Additional information: in partnership with Te Puna Ako, a pilot programme is in progress to improve assessment and moderation practices, focusing initially on first year first semester courses).
- Given the large number of students in Building & Construction compared to other schools, any improvements in this school will have the greatest impact on Unitec's overall result.
- Priority group students' rating are generally above average:

	Average Score	Comment
All	8.0	In line with targets, down from 8.1 in Semester 1, 2020 but up from 7.9 in Semester 2, 2019
Māori	8.3	Highest score to date. Trending consistently upward from 7.8 in Semester 2, 2018
Pacific	8.4	Down from 8.6 in Semester 1, 2020; 1 but up from 8.0 in Semester 2, 2019
Under 25s	8.0	Broadly consistent rating since Semester 2, 2018
International	8.2	Broadly consistent rating since Semester 2, 2018