DEGREE MONITORING

Section	Quality		
Approval Date	27.09.2012	**Approved by**	Academic Board
Next Review	13.06 2018	**Responsibility**	Director of Academic and Quality
Last Reviewed	13.06.2016	**Key Evaluation Question**	3, 4

PURPOSE

To ensure that following initial approval, NMIT degrees continue to meet academic standards.

DEFINITIONS

APER (Annual Programme Evaluation Report) **Monitoring**	Commonly referred to as 'self-monitoring'or 'self-assessment' Replaces NZQA monitoring following application from the provider to NZQA and once NZQA considers that the programme is stable and all conditions for changing the monitoring status are met. Occurs annually. NZQA require an APER for all NMIT degree programmes. Refer: http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/approval-accreditation-and-registration/degree-approval-accreditation-and-monitoring/degree-monitoring/
DAQ	Director of Academic and Quality
DLT	Director of Learning and Teaching
NZQA Monitoring	Annual monitoring following approval to deliver a degree. Includes a visit to NMIT and a report by a Monitor appointed by NZQA.
SAR	Self-Assessment Report. The report produced following the annual review procedure required for all NMIT programmes. Refer: *Self-Assessment Policy and Self-Assessment Procedure*. For degrees, the SAR fulfils all the requirements set by NZQA for the APER. In this policy, the APER will be referred to as the SAR.

SCOPE AND POLICY

All NMIT degree programmes are monitored and reported annually to the NMIT Academic Board and to NZQA.

There are two processes for degree monitoring:

Degrees currently Monitored by NZQA	Degrees currently Monitored by APER
Bachelor of Aquaculture and Marine Conservation	Bachelor of Information Technology
Postgraduate Diploma in Sustainable Aquaculture	Bachelor of Commerce
Bachelor of Viticulture and Winemaking	Bachelor of Arts and Media
Bachelor of Social Work	Bachelor of Nursing
Bachelor of Counselling	
Postgraduate Certificate in Professional Supervision	
Postgraduate Diploma in International Business	
Postgraduate Diploma in Business Enterprise	

A collaborative arrangement is in place for the delivery of:
- AUT's Bachelor of Sport and Recreation.

For this degree, arrangement of monitoring visits, NMIT staff involvement during monitoring visits and checking of / feedback on the Monitor's Reports will follow similar Procedures as outlined below, in consultation with the respective tertiary institution.

QUALITY COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

The Quality Committee is required to recommend to the Academic Board renewal of Academic Approval, or not, according to whether the degree meets agreed NMIT and external academic standards.

The Quality Committee may request any documentation associated with the degree including previous Monitor's reports, reports from professional bodies, external and internal audit reports, approval and accreditation reports and programme evaluations.

The Quality Committee should evaluate the effectiveness of the review process undertaken by the Programme Area for the degree; refer: *Self-Assessment Policy*

The Quality Committee may wish to validate the conclusions reached by the Programme Area by seeking additional documentation and meeting with students, staff and other stakeholders.

The Quality Committee's recommendation to the Academic Board may include "recommendations" and "requirements".

The Academic Board may request the Quality Committee to follow up the implementation of recommendations and requirements as set by the Board.

Standards are:

- Monitoring of NZQA Approved Degrees and Related Qualifications.
- Standards set by other external bodies for particular programmes.

- Standards embodied in the NMIT Quality Management System and approved by the NMIT Council, Academic Board, Chief Executive (CE) or Directorate.
- Requirements set by professional bodies such as the Nursing Council, Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand (CAANZ).

PROCEDURE FOR NZQA MONITORING

The following procedure is for year 2 of degree delivery onwards, and assumes that an NZQA Advisor is not involved (refer Note 1 below). However, NMIT may request from NZQA the ongoing participation of the NZQA Independent Evaluator.

Note 1:   For the first year of delivery following approval of a new degree, a different procedure to that below applies – the NZQA-appointed Monitor is accompanied by an NZQA Advisor for the first year's visit. Please refer to *NZQA Guidelines for Monitoring programmes leading to Diplomas, Degrees and Related Qualifications*.

Note 2:   The procedure below incorporates the annual curriculum area self-assessment procedure undertaken for all NMIT programmes. The light-grey shading indicates steps involving external parties (degree Monitor, NZQA).

STEP	RESPONSIBILITY	EVIDENCE	TIME	NOTES
1. Arrange Contract between NZQA and Monitor.	NZQA	Contract	Jan/Feb	
2. Prepare annual Self-Assessment Report (SAR)	HoD in conjunction with degree staff	SAR	February – March of the year following review.	Refer *Self-Assessment Policy and Self-Assessment Procedure* Note: the NMIT SAR is equivalent to the APER for degrees.
3. Arrange monitoring visit	HoD in liaison with Monitor	Letter	February	Visit typically during May / June
4. Advise CE and Directorate of date of Monitor's visit	HoD		April	Visit must include briefing by Monitor to CE (or delegate) on the scope of the visit before work is undertaken
5. Clarify scope and structure of Monitoring Report	DLT in conjunction with HoD			Visit must include briefing by Monitor to CE (or delegate) on the scope of the visit before work is undertaken
6. Advise NZQA of monitoring visit date	Monitor		March - April	

STEP	RESPONSIBILITY	EVIDENCE	TIME	NOTES
7. Evaluate effectiveness of the institute review process. Recommend action to Academic Board. Actions may include "recommendations" and "requirements".	Quality Committee	SAR, QC meeting minutes with recommended action to Academic Board	May	Quality Committee may request any documentation associated with the degree including: Monitor's reports, internal review reports, approval and accreditation reports and programme evaluations.
8. Approve SAR to be sent to NZQA. Request Quality Committee to follow up on implementation of recommendations and requirements if necessary.	Academic Board	SAR & Academic Board minutes	June AB Meeting	
9. Send SAR to NZQA	DAQ	SAR & letter	June	Refer to *NZQA Guidelines for Monitoring programmes leading to Diplomas, Degrees and Related Qualifications*
10. Send SAR to Monitor for comment on any specific issue.	NZQA	SAR with comments	June / July	
11. Confirm monitoring visit and advise NZQA.	Monitor in liaison with HoD	Letter	May	
12. Advise Directorate of confirmed monitoring visit date	HoD			
13. Conduct annual monitoring visit. Key outcomes of the visit, with recommendations, to be reported by the Monitor to the CE before conclusion of the visit	Monitor		From June	Monitor to meet with CE; Director of Learning; and DAQ at commencement and conclusion of visit.
14. Send draft report to CE	Monitor	Draft Report	July	
15. Confirm factual accuracy of draft report to Monitor	DAQ in consultation with HoD			

Degree Monitoring
Printed 16/06/2016 4:35 PM

STEP	RESPONSIBILITY	EVIDENCE	TIME	NOTES
16. Finalise Monitor's report	Monitor		August	
17. Send Monitor's report to NZQA	Monitor	Finalised Report	August	
18. Send Monitor's report to CE with invitation to comment	NZQA	Report Letter from NZQA	August	
19. Send response to Monitor's report to NZQA	CE in consultation with HoD and DAQ	Letter to NZQA	September	
20. Provide Monitor's report and response to Quality Committee	DAQ	Minutes of Quality Committee meeting	September	
21. Send response to Monitor (and Academic Advisor if necessary) for comment	NZQA	Letter from NZQA	September	

PROCEDURE FOR MONITORING BY APER

Two procedures run concurrently:

- **Procedure A** - produces the NMIT Self-Assessment Report (SAR) (for further details refer to: *Self-Assessment Policy* and *Self-Assessment Procedure*) which, for degrees, is equivalent to the APER required by NZQA.
- **Procedure B** - shows the steps involved in a Monitor's visit.

Notes: Step six of procedure A involves sending the most recent Monitor's report with the APER to NZQA. The reason for not waiting for the next Monitor's report is due to the irregular timing of Monitor's visits, which could delay the process unduly.

The light grey shading indicates steps involving external parties (degree Monitor, NZQA).

PROCEDURE A – ANNUAL PROGRAMME EVALUATION REPORT (APER)

STEP	RESPONSIBILITY	EVIDENCE	TIME	NOTES
1. Prepare annual Self-Assessment Report (SAR)	HoD in conjunction with degree staff	SAR	February - March of the year following review.	Refer *Self-Assessment Policy* and *Self-Assessment Procedure* Note: the NMIT SAR is equivalent to the APER for degrees.
2. Evaluate effectiveness of the institute review process. Recommend action to Academic Board. Actions may include "recommendations" and "requirements".	Quality Committee	SAR, meeting minutes with recommended action to Academic Board.	May	Quality Committee may request any documentation and evidence associated with the degree including: Monitor's reports, internal review reports, approval and accreditation reports and programme evaluations.
3. Approve SAR to be sent to NZQA. Request Quality Committee to follow up on implementation of recommendations and requirements if necessary.	Academic Board	SAR & Academic Board minutes.	June AB meeting.	
4. Send SAR to NZQA, with most recent Monitor's report and/or most recent quality review as it relates to the degree programme.	DAQ	Letter to NZQA with SAR, Academic Board minutes, reports from	June	Refer to *NZQA Guidelines for Monitoring programmes leading to Diplomas, Degrees and Related Qualifications*

STEP	RESPONSIBILITY	EVIDENCE	TIME	NOTES
		Monitor, and other reports if necessary.		
5. Evaluate Report and send response to DAQ	NZQA	NZQA report		

PROCEDURE B – MONITOR'S VISIT & REPORT

STEP	RESPONSIBILITY	EVIDENCE	TIME	NOTES
1. Receive approval for monitoring by SAR, from NZQA	DAQ	Letter of approval	Once NZQA considers that the programme is stable and all conditions for changing monitoring status are met	Follows application from NMIT to NZQA. Approval to be supported by the Monitor
2. Arrange appointment of Monitor	HoD in consultation with DLT and DAQ	Letter	A new Monitor should be appointed after three years	Monitors to be nominated by HoDs; and confirmed by the AB
3. Approve contract between Monitor and NMIT	Academic Board	Academic Board minutes & Contract		Monitors to be appointed on a 3 year contract. (Refer to *Appendix* and Contract template available from the POD Team)
4. Negotiate Monitoring Plan and any additional criteria	DAQ and HoD Confirmed by Academic Board	Monitoring Plan AB minutes	3 yearly & reviewed annually	NZQA require annual, independent external input
5. Send Monitoring Plan to NZQA	DAQ	Letter & File note	Annually	
6. Advise CE and Directorate of date of Monitor's visit	HoD			Visit must include briefing by Monitor to CE (or delegate) on the scope of the visit

STEP	RESPONSIBILITY	EVIDENCE	TIME	NOTES
				before work is undertaken
7. Clarify scope and structure of Monitoring Report	DLT in conjunction with HoD			Visit must include briefing by Monitor to CE (or delegate) on the scope of the visit before work is undertaken
8. Conduct annual monitoring visit Key outcomes of the visit, with recommendations, to be reported by the Monitor to the CE before conclusion of the visit	Monitor		As arranged in steps 4 & 5	Monitor to meet with CE, DLT and DAQ at commencement and conclusion of visit.
9. Send draft report to CE	Monitor	Draft Report		
10. Confirm factual accuracy of draft report	DAQ in consultation with HoD			
11. Send response (if required) to Monitor	CE in consultation with HoD and DAQ	Letter		
12. Finalise Monitor's report	Monitor			
13. Provide Monitor's Report to Quality Committee	DAQ	Minutes of Quality Committee meeting		
14. Send Monitor's Report to NZQA	Monitor	Finalised Report		
15. Implement solutions to issues raised	HoD	Academic Committee minutes		
16. Follow up recommendations and requirements	Quality Committee	Quality Committee minutes		
17. Confirm Academic Approval	Academic Board	Academic Board minutes		

RECORDS

Degree Self-Assessment Reports
Contract for Services – Degree Monitoring
Degree Monitor Reports
Related correspondence

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Degree Monitor Guidelines
Appendix 2: Degree Monitoring Report – Template

REFERENCES

INTERNAL

Academic Board Terms of Reference
Academic Statute
Approval and Publication of Research
Assessment
Equal Education Opportunities
Ethical Considerations for Research
Ethical Approval of Student Research
Guidelines for Programme Design and Approval
Moderation of Assessment
Off-site Practical and Workplace Components
Programme Advisory Committees
Recognition of Academic Credit
Self-Assessment Policy
Self-Assessment Procedure
Student Academic Support and Progression
Student Academic Appeals
Student Surveys

EXTERNAL

Approval and Accreditation of Courses Leading to Degrees and Related Qualifications (NZQA)
Monitoring of NZQA/ITPQ Approved Degrees and Related Qualifications
Guidelines for ITPs (ITPQ)
ITPNZ Academic Quality Standards, 2006 Revision

APPENDIX 1: DEGREE MONITOR GUIDELINES

A Contract for Services must be in place for the Degree Monitor. A standard contract for Degree Monitors is available from the Human Resources Team.

DEGREE MONITOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES

The primary role of the degree Monitor is to evaluate the application and effectiveness of NMIT's quality management system as it relates to the Bachelor degree. The external Monitor has a twofold responsibility to NMIT:

- To assist Bachelor degree staff to maintain and enhance the quality of programme delivery
- To advise the CE (through NMIT's Academic Board) of any unresolved issues which may impact upon the standard or integrity of the programme

The external Monitor for a NMIT Bachelor degree agrees to discharge the following responsibilities:

1. In consultation with NMIT degree staff, to arrange a schedule for monitoring the Bachelor degree over a three year period.
2. Provide independent, external academic input to NMIT's degree review process and to peruse and evaluate all information relating to the structure, content and delivery of the Bachelor degree, on an annual basis.
3. It is expected that the Monitor will undertake an annual visit to NMIT and will consult, as appropriate, with representative staff, students, industry representatives and other stakeholders of the Bachelor degree.
4. To compile an annual monitoring report which sets out the perceived strengths, weaknesses and any and all other matters pertaining to the Bachelor degree, together with recommendations and a timeframe for further action. This Report is to be forwarded to the relevant Programme Area Leader from NMIT.
5. To monitor NMIT follow-up of any matters of concern identified in the annual report.
6. To notify NMIT Bachelor degree staff of any changes or developments within the profession which come to the external Monitor's notice, and which may affect the programme structure, content or delivery.

NMIT'S RESPONSIBILITIES

The primary responsibility of staff within the degree delivery programme area and the Academic and Quality Team is to ensure that quality management systems are effective and operational, and that the Bachelor programme continues to meet specified standards and requirements.

NMIT staff have a responsibility:

- To the external Monitor, by providing the degree Self-Assessment Report and any other necessary information relating to quality assurance within the programme;
- To NMIT, to act upon the external Monitor's recommendations, particularly if and where they relate to identified shortcomings within the programme.

Specific responsibilities of NMIT require the Managers for Bachelor degrees to:

1. Arrange an annual monitoring visit in consultation with the external Monitor.
2. Provide the external Monitor with access to all documentation relating to quality assurance within the Bachelor degree. It is anticipated that such documentation will include:
    - Student evaluations

- Assessment schedules
- Advisory Committee minutes and recommendations
- Notified curriculum changes
- Practical Work Components\Practicum evaluations (if appropriate)
- Examination results
- Report on staff research and professional development
- Moderation reports
- Employment outcomes for graduates
- Staff changes
- Details of resources and budgetary concerns
- Academic Committee minutes and recommendations
- Research Outputs

3. Take appropriate action to resolve and remedy any perceived programme deficiencies identified by the external Monitor, within an agreed timeframe.

4. Make such changes to quality systems and procedures as may be deemed desirable or necessary, as a result of the external Monitor's report.

5. Provide an Annual Programme Self-Assessment Report (SAR) on the Bachelor degree programme to the external monitor by 31st July of each year.

6. Provide an Annual Programme Self-Assessment Report (SAR) to the Quality Committee and the Academic Board setting out the processes, recommendations and actions taken, as a result of the external monitor's visit.

7. Arrange for payment to the external monitor, as specified in this contract.

Introduction

[Provide a short paragraph providing background to the report, e.g. the degree is in the fifth year of delivery/this is the first monitoring visit since the degree was approved/this is the second monitoring visit this year etc].

Current Operation

[Please comment as indicated under the following headings].

Previous recommendations
[Provide a brief account of the issues that were identified at the previous monitoring visit (or evaluation panel visit) and whether the ITP has addressed these issues.]

Summary of the visit
[Provide a brief summary of the monitoring visit e.g. individuals met, sites visited, the particular "focus" of the visit.]

Programme structure
[Comment on any changes the ITP has made to the programme structure in the last 12 months e.g. new courses developed, changes to electives.]

Learner achievement
[Comment on the effectiveness of programme delivery in terms of learner achievement. How well learners are guided and supported.]

Teaching effectiveness
[Comment on the effectiveness of the teaching/learning strategies. Have there been enhancements to the delivery methods (e.g. a move to online delivery, move to work-based learning), programme structure, or learning and assessment strategies, and how effective the changes have been for learners.]

Assessment
[Comment on the effectiveness and appropriateness of the assessment tools/methods. Have any issues arisen from internal or external moderation, and if so, how have these issues been addressed.]

Programme regulations
[Outline any changes that have been made to the programme regulations, the rationale for the changes, and the impact the changes will have on students and other stakeholders.]

Resources
[Comment on the current level of teaching, staffing (academic, support), facilities and physical resources available for the programme's delivery. It would be helpful if an indication of total staff (FTE) that contribute to the teaching of the programme could be identified.]

[In the case of programmes delivered at more than one site (e.g. at a remote campus, or in collaboration with another ITP), please comment on the effectiveness of the ITP's systems and resources to manage and quality assure the multi-site delivery.]

Self evaluation
[Comment on the effectiveness of the ITP's process for seeking feedback on the programme from students and stakeholders and how this feedback is utilised.]

Research
[Comment on the current level of research activity.]

Issues and challenges
[Comment on any significant risks or challenges to the programme that are likely to be encountered in the next 12 months (e.g. falling enrolments, need for major equipment or accommodation upgrades, changes to specific professional requirements, etc.). Comment on the processes the ITP has put in place to deal with these challenges.]

Commendations

[Outline specific areas of good practice that deserve special mention.]

Recommendations

[Please list the recommendations (if any) you wish to provide to the ITP to enhance the delivery of the programme. These may have already been identified in the preceding sections but a summary list is helpful. This section can also be used when monitors wish to recommend that the ITP apply for self-monitoring.]

This report was confirmed as factually accurate by:[Name of person at ITP, position] on [date].

_____   _____
Monitor's Signature   Date