

2021 Interim Programme Evaluation and Planning (PEP) Report

| PeopleSoft Code: | Title of Programme: |
|------------------|--|
| e.g. NZCME | e.g. New Zealand Certificate in Mechanical Engineering (Level 3) |

Leading to the:

| NZQA Qualification No.: | NZQA Qualification Title: |
|-------------------------|--|
| e.g. 2715 | e.g. New Zealand Certificate in Mechanical Engineering (Level 3) |

| School Name: | PAQC Chair Name: |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| e.g. School of Trades and Services | e.g. Aaaaaaaa Bbbbbbbbbb |
| Head of School Name: | PEP Report Lead Writer name: |
| e.g. Aaaaa Bbbbbbbb | e.g. Aaaaa Bbbbbbbb |

Purpose of 2021 Interim Programme Evaluation and Planning

The 2021 Interim PEP (iPEP) reflects on **educational performance** and **self-assessment capability** of programmes, for specified [Key Evaluation Questions](#) and related [Tertiary Evaluation Indicators](#).

Unitec does this to:

- Monitor and improve our performance in delivering positive outcomes for our students and other stakeholders
- Monitor and improve our ability to reflect on the effectiveness of our actions in doing the above.
- Increase consistency in performance and self-assessment across the organisation
- Report on our performance to our key external stakeholder NZQA

The iPEP takes a targeted approach. Programmes were identified and selected in agreement with the HoS by looking at key metrics such as High EFTS/Low SCC, performance of priority groups and capability in self-assessment.

Scope of the 2021 Interim PEP:

1. KEQ 1 How well do students achieve? (required)
2. Update on SMART goal progress (optional)
3. Checklist before submission to PAQC (required)
4. Capability in self-assessment demonstrated in this report (required)
Determined by the Programme Academic Quality Committee (PAQC)
(see *Appendix A - Capability in Self-Assessment Rubric*)

Please remove the prompts in *red italics* throughout the report as you finalise your responses.

KEQ 1: How well did students achieve in 2021 Semester 1?

Key indicative evidence sources

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Live Data Dashboard (TKK) | Course Evaluation Reports |
| Student Course Survey Dashboard | CEP Online Dashboard Sem1 2021 |
| Course Survey Reports | Assessment data * Where SCC is less relevant |
| Student EPI TEC Dashboard | |

External Benchmarks

From current TEC, ITP Ngā Kete

Educational Performance Rubric Guidance

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Overall | <p>Please check <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the criteria that supports your rating decision.</p> <p>The final rating shall be determined by the weighting of, range of, and predominance of criteria met. E.g. mostly Good criteria checked indicates an overall “Good” rating.</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of students that contribute to gaps or weaknesses, including within priority groups trends in the data in your analysis <p>Where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> predicted SCC is used there should be a strong evidence base e.g. previous performance and assessment data to support predictions PowerBI data is not appropriate such as due large numbers of DEF or blank grades other data should be sourced that allows the KEQ to be answered. |
| Excellent | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Overall SCC% (or predicted SCC%) are at or above Programme SCC target 2022 <input type="checkbox"/> Priority groups’ SCC% (or predicted SCC%) are at or above priority group targets 2021 <input type="checkbox"/> SMART goals and/or actions taken to improve SCC are identified and show a positive impact <input type="checkbox"/> Further actions to maintain/improve SCC and expected impacts are identified <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking SCC against Unitec targets and available current TEC, ITP benchmarks are equal or above in all applicable metrics |
| Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Overall SCC% (or predicted SCC%) are at or above Programme SCC target 2022 <input type="checkbox"/> Priority groups’ SCC% (or predicted SCC%) are no greater than 5% under respective priority group targets 2021 <input type="checkbox"/> SMART goals and/or actions taken to improve SCC are identified; and their impact on SCC is mostly positive <input type="checkbox"/> Further actions to maintain/improve SCC are all identified <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking SCC against Unitec targets and available current TEC, ITP benchmarks are comparable in all applicable metrics |
| Marginal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Overall SCC% (or predicted SCC%) are no greater than 10% under Programme SCC target 2022 <input type="checkbox"/> Priority groups’ SCC% (or predicted SCC%) are no greater than 10% under their respective priority group target 2021 <input type="checkbox"/> SMART goals and actions taken to improve SCC, over the last year, are mostly identified and impact may not be reported on. <input type="checkbox"/> Further actions to maintain/improve SCC are mostly identified <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmarking SCC against Unitec targets and available current TEC, ITP benchmarks are comparable in 50% of applicable metrics |
| Poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Overall SCC% (or predicted SCC%) are more than 10% under Programme SCC target 2022 <input type="checkbox"/> Priority groups’ SCC% (or predicted SCC%) are more than 10% under their respective priority group target 2021 <input type="checkbox"/> SMART goals and actions to improve SCC are not identified or are well behind schedule <input type="checkbox"/> Gaps are evident from the narrative and these are not addressed |

☐ Benchmarking SCC against Unitec targets and available current TEC, ITP benchmarks are below in most applicable metrics

Example ONLY

SUMMARY

[Guidance Note: If the PEP is combined for two or more programmes, provide a separate KEQ1 rating summary for each programme and report separately on each section 1.1 to 1.6]

The rating of **Excellent / Good / Marginal / Poor** *[Choose one delete others]* is made due to, [Enter summary reason from Section 1.1], [Enter summary reason from priority group Sections 1.1 to 1.4], [Enter summary reason from course Section 1.5] and [another phrase as applicable].

The screen shots in KEQ1 below was published on ddd mmmm yyyy.

[Place holder for screen shot]

1.1 How well did all students achieve in 2021 Semester 1 (SCC overall)?

What is the data telling us? What is going up? Down? Staying the same? By how much? Are we above, on, near or far from targets and TEC benchmarks?

Why do we think this is?

What did we say we were going to do about overall SCC? Did we do it and did it work? (SMART and other actions)

What are our gaps/challenges to achieve overall SCC targets?

What are we planning to do about it? (SMART Goals)

1.2 How well did Māori students achieve in 2021 Semester 1?

What is the data telling us? Is Māori SCC going up or down or staying the same? By how much? Are we above, on, near or far from targets and TEC benchmarks?

Why do we think this is?

What did we say we were going to do about Māori SCC? Did we do it and did it work? (SMART and other actions)

What are our gaps/challenges to achieve Māori SCC targets?

What are we planning to do about it? (SMART Goals)

1.3 How well did Pacific students achieve in 2021 Semester 1?

What is the data telling us? Is Pacific SCC going up or down or staying the same? By how much? Are we above, on, near or far from targets and TEC benchmarks?

Why do we think this is?

What did we say we were going to do about Pacific SCC? Did we do it and did it work? (SMART and other actions)

What are our gaps/challenges to achieve Pacific SCC targets?

What are we planning to do about it? (SMART Goals)

1.4 How well did Under 25 students achieve in 2021 Semester 1?

What is the data telling us? Is Under 25s SCC going up or down or staying the same? By how much? Are we above, on, near or far from targets and TEC benchmarks

Why do we think this is?

What did we say we were going to do about Under 25 SCC? Did we do it and did it work? (SMART and other actions)

What are our gaps/challenges to achieve Under 25 SCC targets?

What are we planning to do about it? (SMART Goals)

1.5 How well did international students achieve in 2021 Semester 1?

What is the data telling us? Is international SCC going up or down or staying the same? By how much? Are we above, on, near or far from targets and TEC benchmarks?

Why do we think this is?

What did we say we were going to do about International SCC? Did we do it and did it work? (SMART and other actions)

What are our gaps/challenges to achieve International SCC targets?

What are we planning to do about it? (SMART Goals)

1.6 How well did all students achieve in courses in 2021 Semester 1?

What is the data telling us (trends for courses over time, which courses are successful, which courses have challenges)?

Why do we think this is? (team actions, factors inside and outside of the team)?

What did we say we were going to do about course SCC? Did we do it and did it work? (SMART and other actions)

What are our gaps in course SCC? If appropriate, can we use our learnings of what is happening in successful courses and apply these to other courses?

What are we planning to do about it? (SMART Goals)






Example ONLY

Table 1: SMART goals current and new (only if required)

The table below is to be pre-populated with your programme PAQC SMART goal summary (PAQC workplan) in collaboration with your PAQC secretary. If a new SMART goal is required add the new SMART goal using the numbering format Int2021 - 1, Int2021 – 2, etc. If previous goals are not SMART, now is the time to update them.

Resources for writing SMART goals: <https://www.atlassian.com/blog/productivity/how-to-write-smart-goals>.

Process versus outcome goals: <https://www.developgoodhabits.com/process-goals/>

| | Issue  | Tasks  | Measurement  | Responsibility  | Timeline  | Progress |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Year Action number | <p>A goal should be linked to one issue or gap in the consistency review report.</p> <p>What problem/issue needs addressing?</p> <p>TIP – Suggest three to five highest priority issues</p> | <p>There should be clear tasks or actions you can take to make progress toward a goal.</p> <p>What specific actions and specific steps need to be accomplished in order to achieve goal resolution? Is each step achievable and relevant?</p> <p>TIP – highly recommended to use process goals of maximum duration of 6 months</p> | <p>A goal should be something you can track and measure progress toward.</p> <p>The action will be considered successful when... What measurable outcomes are you expecting to result from your proposed actions at each step?</p> | <p>A goal should be clearly assigned to a person and role.</p> <p>Who specifically will be the individual responsible for monitoring and reporting progress? Who will also be working on these actions?</p> | <p>A goal should have an end date. (ongoing is not an end-date, usually within 6-months)</p> <p>When will steps in progress be reported?</p> <p>TIPs - ongoing is not an end-date Consider 6-month completion dates</p> | <p>What specific actions and steps have been achieved against the goal at the reporting date?</p> |
| EoY 2020 - 1 | <p>KEQ 1 Low SCC% for some courses.</p> <p>KEQ 3 Student (course surveys) and lecturers have recurring issues with difficult assessments late in some courses.</p> | <p>Implement low-stakes assessment for AB1002, 1009 and AB 1110</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to moderation plan • Write assessments • Pre-moderate assessments • Implement assessments | <p>Moderation plan updated</p> <p>Pre-moderation approved</p> <p>New assessments Implemented</p> <p>Post-moderation approved</p> <p>Moderation plan updated</p> | <p>Lead A Jones – APM</p> <p>Assessment designer M Smith –Lecturer</p> <p>Moderator J Ducati -ASM</p> | <p>Design complete 20/03/21</p> <p>Moderation complete 20/04/21</p> <p>Implemented Semester 2</p> <p>Post moderation 20/08/21</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Example ONLY





Checklist before submission to PAQC




The PEP has:

- ☐ A SUMMARY statement and rating (Excellent, Good, Marginal, Poor) for KEQ 1.
- ☐ No ratings are fence sitting i.e. Good/Marginal
- ☐ SMART goals (optional) follow the guidelines provided
- ☐ Red italics have been removed
- ☐ Spelling and grammar have been checked
- ☐ Rubrics have not been deleted or they are moved to an appendix
- ☐ Track changes are accepted
- ☐ Comments in the document, usually in the right-hand margin are deleted

PAQC review of the PEP report

The PAQC reviews the PEP and completes the following discussion prompts, decisions, summary of comments or agreements.

| | |
|---|--|
| PAQC Chair name: | |
| Date of PAQC Meeting: | |
|  | <p>ACHIEVEMENT</p> <p>Discussion prompts: <i>(These questions do not require a written response on this form)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the ratings given reflect a degree of reasonableness for the programme? 2. Does the PAQC know of further evidence, not cited in the report, that supports or contradicts the rating? 3. What area(s) does the programme need to focus on to improve educational performance of student achievement in 2021 Semester 2? |
|  | <p>Decide: The PAQC has confidence through its analysis of the PEP that the rating and the narrative given for each KEQ are (select <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> one of the following):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> accurate with no changes to rating and narrative <input type="checkbox"/> accurate with no changes to the rating and only minor changes to the narrative as agreed by the PAQC in the <i>Summary of agreements made section below</i>. These minor changes will be undertaken before submission of the QAB. <input type="checkbox"/> required to be reviewed with more analysis, research and/or rework before resubmission to the PAQC <input type="checkbox"/> not applicable due to [Add reason] <p>Summary of agreements made:</p> |
|  | <p>SMART GOALS</p> <p>Discussion prompts: <i>(These questions do not require a written response on this form)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What progress does this PEP evidence toward the completion of SMART goals set previously? 2. What reasons are known for any delays? 3. Are there any suggested refinements to the SMART goals for the next period going forward? |
|  | <p>Progress on previous goals (optional)</p> <p>Decide: The PAQC can confirm the current SMART goals have had activity toward completion and/or delays have been explained and the achievement to date is (select <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> one of the following):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> accurate with no changes required <input type="checkbox"/> accurate with minor changes to the SMART goal/s as agreed by the PAQC and recorded in the <i>Summary of agreements made</i>. These minor changes will be undertaken before submission of the QAB. <input type="checkbox"/> required to be reviewed, with research or rework and then resubmitted to the PAQC <input type="checkbox"/> not applicable due to [Add reason] |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Summary of agreements made: |
|  | <p>New goals set (optional)</p> <p>Decide: That the PAQC has reviewed the new SMART goals for this PEP and confirms that they are (select <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> of the following):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> valid SMART goals with no changes required <input type="checkbox"/> valid SMART goals with minor changes as agreed by the PAQC and recorded in the <i>Summary of agreements made</i>. These minor changes will be undertaken before submission of the QAB. <input type="checkbox"/> required to be reviewed with further research or rework and then resubmitted to the PAQC <input type="checkbox"/> not applicable due to [Add reason] |
| | Summary of agreements made: |
|  | <p>SELF-ASSESSMENT CAPABILITY</p> <p>Discussion prompts: <i>(These questions do not require a written response on this form)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How well has the programme team demonstrated its capability in self-assessment in determining educational performance? Use the attached criteria in <i>Appendix A - Capability in Self-Assessment Rubric</i> to provide a rating. |
|  | <p>Decide: The rating of Excellent/Good/Marginal/Poor [Choose one] is made due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Reason 1 from the criteria list] • [Reason 2 from the criteria list] • [Reason 3 from the criteria list] • [Reason 4 from the criteria list] <p><i>(At least 4 reasons should be provided here)</i></p> <p>Other narrative as applicable in support of the rating awarded.</p> <p><i>e.g. The PEP has one criterion from Appendix A that is excellent, four criteria (List) that are good and one criterion that is Marginal. Therefore, a rating of Good has been given.</i></p> |

QAB Submission: Submission of the PAQC approved PEP shall be done by the PAQC secretary to QAB@unitec.ac.nz. Please check all items in the Checklist Page have been actioned.

Syntax for the filename is:

2021_PEPInt_[School Code]_[Programme Code]_[Date of uploading using the format ddmmmyyyy]_final.docx
e.g. 2021_PEPInt_TandS_NZCME_20Aug2021_final.docx

Appendix A - Capability in Self-Assessment Rubric

(Note please use the applicable parts of this rubric for the 2021 interim PEP)

| Rating | NZQA criteria | Unitec criteria for self-assessing PEPs |
|---|--|---|
| Please check <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the criteria that supports your rating decision. | | |
| Excellent | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-assessment is exceptional and comprehensive Strong evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities Very few gaps or weaknesses Any gaps and weaknesses have no significant impact and are managed very effectively | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All sections of the PEP are completed with very few spelling, grammar, formatting and punctuation errors <input type="checkbox"/> Ratings are made for each KEQ with justification well supported by the rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Where applicable analysis has been made against the recommended benchmarks provided, with reasons <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient evidence is provided for each KEQ <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of feedback from stakeholders being used to inform Programme improvements <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of feedback loop with stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Shortcoming in evidence have been explained <input type="checkbox"/> Te Noho Kotahitanga Principles underpin all KEQ discussions and these are explicit in the narrative <input type="checkbox"/> Trends are analysed in KEQ 1 and 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Margin of error in KEQ 2 is identified and discussed in depth <input type="checkbox"/> Actions previously taken clearly link to outcomes or processes for each KEQ and have shown a positive impact <input type="checkbox"/> Reference to I See Me is included in KEQ1 if relevant <input type="checkbox"/> Identified gaps in outcomes or process clearly link to the KEQ and are minor <input type="checkbox"/> All SMART goals related to the KEQ have been actioned or addressed throughout the year with outcomes or changes recorded <input type="checkbox"/> Goals that are not SMART are rewritten <input type="checkbox"/> New SMART goals are identified that are clearly linked to the KEQ performance or process |
| Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-assessment is generally strong and comprehensive Evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities Few gaps or weaknesses Gaps or weaknesses have some impact but are mostly managed effectively | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All sections of the PEP have been completed with some spelling, grammar, formatting and punctuation errors <input type="checkbox"/> Ratings are made for each KEQ with justification supported by the rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Where applicable, analysis has been made against the recommended benchmarks provided, with some reasons. <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient evidence is provided for most KEQs <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of feedback from stakeholders being used to inform Programme improvements or appropriate SMART goals created to ensure this happens in future <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of feedback loop with stakeholders or appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> SMART goals created to ensure feedback loop is created <input type="checkbox"/> Shortcomings in evidence have been identified with some explanation <input type="checkbox"/> Te Noho Kotahitanga principles underpin most KEQ discussions and these are explicit in the narrative <input type="checkbox"/> Trends are identified with some analysis in KEQ 1 and 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Margin of error in KEQ 2 is identified and with some discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Actions previously taken generally link to outcomes or processes for each KEQ and have shown some positive impact <input type="checkbox"/> Reference to I See Me is included in KEQ1 if relevant <input type="checkbox"/> Identified gaps in outcomes are process generally link to the KEQ <input type="checkbox"/> SMART goals related to the KEQ have mostly been actioned throughout the year with outcomes recorded <input type="checkbox"/> New SMART goals are identified that link to the KEQ |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| Marginal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-assessment is inconsistent in quality and coverage Limited evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities Some gaps and weaknesses have some impact, and are not managed effectively | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> PEP sections generally completed, with some information missing <input type="checkbox"/> Ratings are made for each KEQ, but may be inconsistent, for example the reasons for the rating is not clear or the rating given does not match the evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Not all applicable areas are analysed against the recommended benchmarks, or reasons for analysis may not be given, or be inaccurate <input type="checkbox"/> One of the KEQs may lack evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of feedback from stakeholders being used to inform Programme improvements but SMART goals created to ensure this happens in future <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of feedback loop with stakeholders but SMART goals created to ensure this happens in future <input type="checkbox"/> Shortcomings in evidence may not be explained or addressed <input type="checkbox"/> Te Noho Kotahitanga principles are referred to inconsistently and may underpin some discussions but not others. Not explicit in the narrative <input type="checkbox"/> Trends may be identified in KEQ 1 or 2, with limited analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Margin of error in KEQ 2 is identified <input type="checkbox"/> Actions previously taken may be described but not always clearly linked to outcomes or processes for each KEQ or may not show a positive impact <input type="checkbox"/> Limited references to I See Me in KEQ 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Gaps in outcomes or process may not be consistently identified or consistently linked to KEQs and have clear impact on outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> SMART goals related to the KEQ may be inconsistently referred to and/or inconsistently actioned (e.g. some actioned, some not) <input type="checkbox"/> Some new SMART goals missing, or goals not consistently linked to the KEQ performance or process |
| Poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-assessment is generally ineffective or weak No or minimal evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities Significant gaps or weaknesses have significant impact, and are not managed effectively Does not meet minimum expectations or requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> PEP sections have large gaps and missing information <input type="checkbox"/> Ratings are not made for each KEQ or have minimal relationship to their rubric <input type="checkbox"/> No analysis made against the recommended benchmarks <input type="checkbox"/> No or very limited evidence provided <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of feedback from stakeholders being used to inform Programme improvements/no SMART goals to ensure this happens in future <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of feedback loop with stakeholders/no SMART goals created to ensure this happens in future <input type="checkbox"/> No explanation or analysis of shortcomings of information including margin of error in KEQ2 <input type="checkbox"/> No reference to Te Noho Kotahitanga Principles in discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Actions previously taken are not clearly described, or assessed against outcomes or processes for each KEQ, or have not shown positive impact <input type="checkbox"/> No reference to I See Me <input type="checkbox"/> Gaps in outcomes or process not identified or not linked to the KEQ and have clearly impacted outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Previous SMART goals related to the KEQ missing, or consistently not actioned, or outcomes not recorded <input type="checkbox"/> New goals not identified, or not linked to KEQs performance or process |