Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board (QAB)

Date of Meeting: 2021-11-07

Title	2021 End-of-year Programme Evaluation and Planning
Provided by:	Eric Stone
For:	**APPROVAL**

Recommendation

That Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board (QAB):

1. Approve the undertaking of a 2021 end-of-year Programme[1] Evaluation and Planning (PEP) process as detailed in this memorandum. Key points are:

   - Focus is on Key Evaluative Questions (KEQs) 1, 2 and 6
   - Embedment of the annual statutory declaration into KEQ6
   - Staggered completion dates, aligned to the availability of data
   - Recognises confidence in the system and capability of staff

2. Approve that in 2022 a mid-year (interim) PEP will not be required

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to provide QAB with an update on 2021 mid-year (interim) Programme Evaluation and Planning (2021 iPEP), provide background environmental scan for the 2021 end-of-year Programme Evaluation and Planning (2021 EoY PEP) and make a recommendation on the process for the 2021 EoY PEP. The environmental scan will be useful for further planning in 2022.

Information/Background

2021 iPEP

On 2 June the QAB approved that all programmes (with the exception of some expiring/suspended programmes, contracted delivery and short courses) undertake a "light" interim PEP focusing on KEQ 1 and 2.

On 14 July the QAB (Item 3.1.) reconsidered the previous approval at the request of HoS to prioritise mahi based on re-accreditation, CEP and School actions. The QAB resolved:

> *That Te Poari Whai Kounga endorse a reduced, targeted, interim PEP process for a limited range of programmes for 2021.*

An accompanying action item with the resolution was that the:

> *Manager Te Korowai Kahurangi outline the criteria and approach to be used to HoSs and kōrero with HoSs on which programmes should be selected to undergo an Interim PEP.*

---

[1] Programme in the context of this memorandum is defined as an academic provision that may include programmes, training schemes, micro-credentials, contracted delivery and short courses. Academic provision is commonly referred to as "programmes".

This action item was completed and is attached as Appendix 1.

As a result of this resolution and action item fourteen (14) programmes were selected for a 2021 iPEP.

On 1 September the Chair of the QAB wrote to the Heads of Schools expressing concern about the impact of the lockdown due to Covid-19:

> *Acknowledging the increased pressure, the extension of the level 4 lockdown is putting on teaching teams, I would like to offer this opportunity to <u>not</u> undertake the interim programme evaluation and planning (PEP) for those programmes previously selected (i.e., the one or two programmes selected in most schools)*

As a result of this email only four (4) programmes were selected to complete a 2021 iPEP.

Subsequently one programme has been taken from the list. As at the date of this memorandum only one programme has completed the iPEP and the other two are in progress.

2021 EoY PEP

On 14 July the QAB (Item 4.1.) resolved to appoint a working group to develop proposed improvements to programme self-assessment and bring suggestions back to the following hui.

The working group met once kanohi-ki-te-kanohi to summarise concerns. Sub-groups and individuals were involved in firming up a **Programme self-assessment review - Environmental scan** (Appendix 2) that generated a range of **2021 Programme self-assessment approaches** (Appendix 3).

Since formation of the working group Senior leadership has confirmed there is no longer a requirement for mid-year (interim) PEPs from 2022. This shows confidence in the Unitec programme self-assessment system and programme teams' capability development.

Approach 3 has been recommended by various stakeholder representatives including HoS and TKK Leadership.

Summary: Approach 3 - 2021 EoY PEP

- Focuses on outcomes (KEQ 1 and 2) and compliance management (KEQ 6)
- Is data driven with staggered completion dates, aligned with the availability of data
- Efficient in that duplication in the system is removed particularly with the statutory declaration
- Reduces content requirements due to confidence in the system and staff capability developed over previous iterations of the process
- Focuses on where improvements need to be made, especially CEP completion and KEQ 2 evidence collection
- Flexible to allow for lock-down and programme evaluation requirements

Proposed scope

It is proposed that all programmes (with the exception of some expiring/suspended programmes, contracted delivery, short courses and micro-credentials*) undertake a 2021 EoY PEP.

*Micro-credentials are required to have a review after 12 months of delivery.

Proposed focus

The following are proposed as the focus of the 2021 EoY PEP:

Proposed focus of EoY PEP	Rationale	Existing template prompts

KEQ 1 Successful Course Completion	To consider how well students achieved in the first semester for the overall programme, priority groups, and courses reported against Unitec targets and benchmarks	1.1 to 1.6 Additional prompts to support flexibility in approach and acknowledgement of impact of lockdown
KEQ 2 Graduate Institute Survey	Graduate outcomes are a key performance measure for Unitec. The results will be available from the new graduate survey. Data from all 2021 graduates will be available.	2.1 Same
KEQ 2 Stakeholder engagement including graduates and next-users	A key focus of the PEP is to continue to address evidence collection from graduates and next users on capability of graduates with the GPO and also the relevance of the GPOs.	2.2 Refinement of the prompts and rubric
KEQ 6 Compliance management		Changed prompts to accommodate the embedment of the Statutory Declaration.
Progress against SMART goals (and setting of any new goals)	Action planning, and the evaluation of actions, not only better supports the implementation of those actions but also provide an additional option to demonstrate Unitec's capability in self-assessment	

Proposed capability development

Capability development for PAQCs, PEP Lead writers, Āta Kōrero facilitators, PowerBI, SMART goal creation use will be prioritised dependent on capacity. Where possible group wise interventions will supersede individual requests. When back on campus it is proposed to continue with weekly drop-in sessions to cover off individual requests about PEP, CEP and PowerBI use. Capability development for Administrators, Academic Quality (AAQs) will target processing improvements.

Proposed timeframes

Indicative Dates except where noted as a deadline	Process
28-Nov-21	Semester 2 2021 (general) ends
29-Nov-21 to 17-Dec-21	Grade processing and CEP completion
17-Dec-21	CEP Dashboard available
8-Feb-22	"January" SDR Dashboard available
28-Feb-22	KEQ 1 Due
18-Apr-22	KEQ 6 Due
27-Jun-22 (may be earlier)	**KEQ2 and completed PEP due**
TBC (dependent on QAB 2022 dates)	PEP Review
TBC (dependent on QAB 2022 dates)	Evaluation of process and outcomes of PEP cycle
TBC (dependent on QAB 2022 dates)	PEP process report to QAB

2022 programme self-assessment processes

Interim PEPs were implemented to increase capability and confidence in programme self-assessment. An indicator being Unitec's Category 2 status. Senior Leadership therefore have relaxed the requirement for iPEPs and these can be lapsed in 2022. The EoY PEP process for 2022 will be determined after evaluation of the 2021 PEP process.

Next steps

Confirm with relevant stakeholders the programmes and dates for EoY PEPs.

Update or develop relevant templates and resources.

Contributors

- Simon Tries, Manager, Te Korowai Kahurangi

Appendix 1 – Amending iPEP original approach (email)

From: Simon Tries <stries@unitec.ac.nz>
Date: Friday, 16 July 2021 at 16:23
To: DG - Heads of Schools, DG - Academic Programme Managers
Cc: Quality Alignment Board, TKK Insights, DG - Te Korowai Kahurangi, Martin Carroll, Simon Nash, 2021 Interim PEP - Te Korowai Kahurangi
Subject: Interim PEP - Semester 1, 2021

Kia ora koutou

At the hui of Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board on Wednesday *[14 July]* the Committee considered the concerns raised by the Heads of School regarding the impact on workload in undertaking the Interim PEP. The Committee has now agreed to amend the original approach as follows:

- Heads of School and Te Korowai Kahurangi mahi tahi to:
    o identify two or so programmes in each school for evaluation
    o determine the focus of the evaluation

- In discussing the criteria to apply in determining the programmes, it was agreed that programmes meeting the following criteria should be prioritised:
    o Programmes with High EFTS/Low SCC based 2020 TEC data
    o Programmes with EFTS/Low SCC based on 2021 semester one live data
    o Programmes with Hapai Ō courses
    o Poor performance of a priority group over time
    o Programme teams which would benefit from support in self-assessment

The focus of each evaluation (for each programme) will be targeted, with each evaluation looking at KEQ 1 (i.e., SCC) and any other negotiated focus area(s).
Each evaluation will be a facilitated Āta-Kōrero, with the facilitation undertaken by Te Korowai Kahurangi. Capacity within Te Korowai Kahurangi will also inform the number of programmes to be evaluated. The overall focus will be on gaining a full understanding of the outcomes achieved through the evidence available and building evaluative capability amongst identified programme teams.

Notwithstanding this revised approach, we encourage all teams to undertake their own āta-kōrero as a means of reflecting on semester one delivery and collectively identifying areas of good practice which could be shared and areas for possible improvement.
As usual, PAQCs will continue to monitor the success of students.

Next steps:
- Te Korowai Kahurangi will identify and provided to Heads of School a selection of programmes in each school which meet the above criteria
- The selection of individual programmes and focus areas will then be negotiated with each Head of School kanohi ki te kanohi.

Ngā mihi
Simon Tries
Chair, Te Poari Whai Kounga | Quality Alignment Board

Appendix 2: Programme self-assessment review - Environmental scan, analysis and recommendations

Prepared October 2021

Environment Type	Environmental Factor	What we know	Issue	Continue	Avoid
External	NZQA: Self-assessment system	NZQA does not prescribe how TEOs do self-assessment. However, they provide a common evaluative quality assurance framework (EQAF) using Key Evaluative Questions (KEQs) and Tertiary Evaluation Indicators (TEIs) to reach consistent judgements with Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs). Unitec's programme documents include various statements committing to Programme Evaluation and Planning (PEP).	Maintaining the investment in programme self-assessment. The investment is closely aligned with the NZQA EQAF. The system is mature having been through several iterations. Full End-of-year Programme Evaluation and Planning Reports (EoY PEPs) covering six KEQs and mid-year (interim) PEPs (iPEPs) focusing on selected KEQs have been undertaken 2018 to 2020. This has been a substantial investment in the system and staff capability.	Continue alignment of the system to NZQA EQAF.	
	Te Pūkenga: Self-assessment system	Te Pūkenga are committed to an EQAF. Initial indicators will be mid-year 2022. More than likely local-based course-based evaluation and rohe based graduate evaluation will feature.	Uncertainty about Te Pūkenga EQAF.	Continue alignment to NZQA EQAF and prioritise course-based evaluation.	Avoid major change.
	Tāmaki Makaurau approach to self-assessment	MIT are committed to an EQAF. The MIT system is aligned with the NZQA EQAF however Unitec and MIT systems are not aligned.	Uncertainty about future Tāmaki Makaurau approach to self-assessment.	Continue alignment to NZQA EQAF.	Avoid major change as Tāmaki Makaurau EQAF will follow Te Pūkenga EQAF.
	Covid-19: Tāmaki Makaurau lock downs	Changes to course delivery will impact on programme self-assessment processes. **Changes to delivery requirements** There are four options: 1 Course completed in 2021 (may require extensions in December)	Uncertainty of how Covid-19 will pan out affecting: a) availability of completion data to make a sensible evaluation b) Capacity of staff to engage with self-assessment due to increase in current	Ensure system is flexible to: a) accommodate changes to completion dates and CEP requirements b) considerate of staff workload c) maintains a consistent approach	Avoid major change where staff will have to undertake capability development to adopt to changes.

Environment Type	Environmental Factor	What we know	Issue	Continue	Avoid
		2 Teaching Completion 2021, Assessment Completion 11 February, 2022 3 Course Completion 11 Feb 2022 4 Course Closure **Staff capacity** The health, safety, and wellbeing of staff to complete programme self-assessment processes.	workload and additional workloads into next year.		
Internal Indirect (Indirectly impacts on self-assessment)	Cost savings	In October 2021 the CE of Unitec/MIT announced cost savings of 2.5 million dollars are required for 2022. Two-thirds of the cost savings are to come from support areas and one-third from Schools. The Covid-19 lockdown has impacted on the timing of the consultation on cost-savings. This looks unlikely for 2021 however is still on the books for 2022.	Certainty that cost savings will diminish capacity in programme teams and support teams to support programme self-assessment. Impact on enthusiasm and appetite for programme self-assessment.	Where possible: a) Simplify systems b) Reduce ad hoc data requirements c) Continue with template improvements to "paint by numbers" d) Consider reduction on KEQs and TEIs to be reported against.	
Internal Direct (Directly related to self-assessment)	Easing of requirement for 2022 Interim or mid-year PEP (iPEP)	Interim PEPs were implemented to increase capability and confidence in programme self-assessment. Senior Leadership recognise this has been achieved, an indicator being Unitec's Category 2 status. The requirement for iPEPs have fulfilled its purpose and can now lapse.	No issue however the use of full EoY PEPs and partial iPEPs has provided a background capability that allows a confidence of the relaxation of capacity in time of a crisis such as Covid-19.	Accept this koha from leadership. Consider further reduction in programme self-assessment requirements.	
	Changes to the Institute Graduate Survey	The QAB approved cancelling the 2021 Wave 1 (August) graduate survey in preparation for once per year graduate surveys. Therefore, in April 2022 all 2021 graduates will be surveyed. The survey focuses on GESC and value. Learning experience and capability of graduates with GPOs questions have been removed. GPO	Capability and capacity of programme teams to collect sufficient evidence on graduate's performance against the GPOs. The QAB over the past year has identified this as an area requiring improvement.	Reporting against the results of the institute graduate survey in KEQ2. Ensuring this area of improvement is reflected in EoY PEPs. Support programme areas on collecting evidence of the capability of graduates with	

Environment Type	Environmental Factor	What we know	Issue	Continue	Avoid
		questions will be the responsibility of Schools/Programme teams. Institute graduate survey data will be available late May 2022.		GPOs and relevance of the GPOs.	
	What's in it for the programme team? - Do the PEPs go into a big black hole - What is the value?	Self-assessment focuses on: • identifying, responding to and meeting learner and stakeholder needs • evaluating the effectiveness of the organisation's processes and practices • using the understanding you gain to make real, worthwhile improvements to outcomes and learner achievement. Programme self-assessment is for different audiences: - Programme staff - PAQC - HoS - ELT - Monitor - Professional bodies - NZQA The current system achieves this however communication of intent, purpose and value need work.	Uncertainty in value of self-assessment. Is this just busy work for administrators?	Reframe purpose of self-assessment in training, workshops and template design. Consider cost/benefit and make changes if necessary.	
	Compliance fatigue and link - CEP - PEPs	This is a common theme across CEP and PEP. Prompting for evidence collection aligned to the TEIs may be misconstrued as compliance. Alignment to the TEIs supports consistent self- assessment practices. Likewise, the link between CEP and PEP is confusing. This may be	Uncertainty of the value of programme self-assessment and the link to CEPs.	Reframe purpose of self-assessment in training, workshops and template design, including reframing of CEP questions and the link between CEP and PEP. Consider cost/benefit and make changes if necessary.	

Environment Type	Environmental Factor	What we know	Issue	Continue	Avoid
		because only 70% of CEPs were completed in 2020. The current prompts in CEP and PEP are aligned to key aspects of the TEIs however the language used and the communication of intent, purpose and value need work.			
	Change fatigue		Impact on change of self-assessment process and templates.	Keep same process, template and rubrics and PAQC process unless there is an improvement in effectiveness or efficiency.	Avoid major change where staff will have to undertake capability development to adopt to changes.

	NZQA 2020 External Evaluation and Review (EER) Recommendation EER 6a	Unitec's draft plan to address EER 6a states:
		
		Ensure there are 'two-way' feedback loops to industry advisory groups.
		
		The draft action was:
		
		Evaluate through the 2021 Interim PEP process:
		• *the extent to which programme teams are engaged:*
		  o *with their IACs*
		  o *With stakeholders in general*
		• *The extent to which feedback to IACs and stakeholders occurs*
		• *The extent to which stakeholder engagement informs ongoing programme improvements*
		
		This draft action changed due to Covid-19. The action now is:
		
		A memo has been written to each IAC to report on the extent of "two-way feedback"
		
		However, that only goes so far as there are underpinning issues of gathering sufficient evidence to
			Capability and capacity of programme teams to collect sufficient evidence on graduate's performance against the GPOs.
			
			The QAB over the past year has identified this as an area requiring improvement.
			
			See NZQA September Newsletter sections **NZQA processes** and **Reminders**
			
			"When preparing for an Assuring Consistency review, it is important to have information about graduates from all the reporting years. To achieve this, gather this information after each cohort rather than just before the review meeting."
				If not already included in KEQ 2 bolster the requirement for evidence collection from graduated cohorts on a regular basis. Note: This is independent on the institute graduate survey.	

Environment Type	Environmental Factor	What we know	Issue	Continue	Avoid
		inform that graduates are capable with the GPOs. Consistency reviews undertaken in 2020 (7) and the 2021 (6) show issues involving the adoption of regular evidence collection from graduated cohorts.			
	Self-assessment evaluative capability	Evaluative capability has matured with each iteration of programme self-assessment. Currently, highly scaffolded "paint-by-numbers" templates and exemplars support evaluative capability.	supporting self-assessment capability due to potential cost saving.	Continue to improve existing processes and templates i.e. require text boxes for each prompt thus focusing users. This may be part of the road-map to automation of the programme self-assessment process.	
	Timing of programme self-assessment - Data driven - Memory	Timing of programme self-assessment to some degree is dependent on evidence availability such as Student Course Survey data, CEPs and completion/EPI results. It also is problematic undertaking an evaluative conversation months after an event. Due to the broad context of Unitec programmes and impacts on course delivery due to Covid-19 a one size fits all approach is difficult.	Timing of reflection.	System design to look at timing of report writing. Ensure system is flexible to: a) accommodate changes to completion dates and CEP requirements b) however, maintaining a consistent approach.	
	Duplication in the system	Duplication in the system includes: • Statutory declaration has overlaps with KEQ5/6 • PAQC Chair Reports	Duplication corresponds to extra workload	Consider way of removing duplication especially the two listed bullet point items. Embed Statutory Declaration in KEQ6.	

Appendix 3: 2021 Programme self-assessment approaches and indicative dates

2021 Programme self-assessment approaches and indicative dates

Date columns: 22-Nov, 29-Nov, 6-Dec, 13-Dec, 20-Dec, 27-Dec, 3-Jan, 10-Jan, 17-Jan, 24-Jan, 31-Jan, 7-Feb, 14-Feb, 21-Feb, 28-Feb, 7-Mar, 14-Mar, 21-Mar, 28-Mar, 4-Apr, 11-Apr, 18-Apr, 25-Apr, 2-May, 9-May, 16-May, 23-May, 30-May, 6-Jun, 13-Jun, 20-Jun, 27-Jun, 4-Jul

All approaches:
- Flexibility to extend mainstream dates due to the impact of Covid-19
- Flexibility for programmes teams to evaluate what is of value to their programme
- Continue with strong approach to KEQ2 and collecting sufficent evidence to evaluate graduate capability with GPOs
- Minimal changes to rubrics and question prompts
- Programme area to decide if Āta kōrero approach to be used
Note: No mid-year (interim PEP) 2022

Approach 1:
All KEQs - Same as 2020 EoY PEP
Long flexible timeline
Separate Statutory Declaration
— Timeline: All KEQs (blue, from 22-Nov through 25-Apr); + Stat Dec (yellow, 4-Apr)

Approach 2:
All KEQs
Staggered timeline aligned with data events
Embedded statutory declaration for KEQ 6
— Timeline: KEQ 1,3,4 (13-Dec); KEQ 1,3,4 (31-Jan–14-Feb); KEQ 5,6 includes Statutory Declaration (yellow, 21-Mar–28-Mar); KEQ 2 (6-Jun–20-Jun)

Appoach 3:
Outcomes and compliance KEQs (1, 2 and 6)
Staggered timeline aligned with data events
Embedded statutory declaration for KEQ 6
— Timeline: KEQ 1 (13-Dec); KEQ 1 (31-Jan–14-Feb); KEQ 6 includes Statutory Declaration (yellow, 21-Mar); KEQ 2 (6-Jun–20-Jun)