

Quality Assuring Mātauranga Māori Qualifications and Courses

Consultation Summary Report

Mātauranga Māori Quality Assurance Model: Analysis of Feedback

Consultation

In March-May 2010, NZQA consulted with non-university tertiary education organisations (TEOs), government agencies, key Māori groups and organisations, and NZQA management and staff on a proposed model for quality assuring mātauranga Māori courses and qualifications.

The model proposes that any TEO would be able to “opt in” and follow the mātauranga Māori quality assurance model. Key features include that the model would:

- be available for all TEOs – not just for wānanga or self identified Māori providers. Similarly TEOs offering courses that have specifically Māori content, such as te reo, would not be compelled to seek approval through the mātauranga Māori process.
- strengthen the existing quality assurance framework by providing new processes for mātauranga Māori courses, qualifications and providers.

Overall, while a clear majority of comments and feedback supported the concept, a need for further work on the model was indicated. In response, NZQA will undertake further policy design work and trial the model with selected TEOs in 2010/11.

Summary of Findings

A consultation document including details of the model was accompanied by a consultation questionnaire. A total of ten responses via the questionnaire form were received and largely reflected:

- strong support for the notion of Early Engagement and a principles-based approach to implementation
- support for the concepts of Outcome and Process Indicators, Performance Criteria and that the model provided assurances in terms of the quality and value of mātauranga Māori
- the importance of aligning the model to key initiatives and activities such as the Targeted Review of Qualifications (TRoQ) and self-assessment and external evaluation and review (SA / EER)
- the need for further development of the Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) and the “Māori Qual” mark.

An analysis of written comments received via the questionnaire, 11 individual submissions, and notes recorded at the eight public hui and meetings with a number of key audiences was also undertaken. In summary, comments emphasised the need for:

- a stronger focus on a quality assurance approach firmly anchored in the mores of Te Ao Māori (Māori worldview)
- further work on the model to ensure its successful implementation across the various development, approval and delivery contexts
- clearer alignment to key initiatives and activities such as TRoQ and SA /EER
- further sector engagement / dialogue on mātauranga Māori through:
 - continued participation in model development
 - trialling the model prior to implementation.

Detailed Summary of Feedback Received via the Questionnaire Form

Question 1 sought comment regarding the notion of *Early Engagement* contributing to a better understanding of what quality in mātauranga Māori courses and qualifications might look like. A total of ten responses were recorded with six strongly agreeing, two agreeing and two neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

Question 2 suggested two options for implementing the proposed model:

- a. amend the NZQA *Criteria and Guidelines for Course Approvals and Accreditation*; or
- b. establish principles for ensuring the model is reflected in the quality of mātauranga Māori courses, qualifications and/or their provision.

A total of nine responses were recorded for this question with four selecting Option A and five indicating a preference for Option B. One response did not indicate a preferred option.

Questions 3-5 sought comment on the *Key Evaluation Questions* (KEQs). For Question 3, comment was sought on the extent to which respondents believed the key questions provided guidance on what evidence of quality learner/community and process outcomes for mātauranga Māori might look like. A total of nine responses were recorded with two strongly agreeing, four agreeing, and three neither agreeing nor disagreeing. One submission did not indicate a preference.

Question 4 asked to what extent respondents agreed or disagreed that the KEQs were broad enough to include the different focuses of Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs). Nine responses were recorded with two strongly agreeing, three agreeing, two neither agreeing nor disagreeing, one disagreeing, and one strongly disagreeing. One submission did not indicate a preference for this question.

Question 5 sought suggestions for identifying alternatives or improvements to the KEQs, which would clarify what quality outcomes for mātauranga Māori might look like. Six written responses were recorded, ranging from comments on the relevance to Standard Setting Bodies (SSBs), to suggested changes to both outcome and process KEQs.¹

Questions 6 sought comment on the model's *Outcome and Process Indicators*. Question 6 looked at the extent respondents agreed or disagreed that proposed indicators reflected learner / community and process outcomes sought through a mātauranga Māori course or qualification. Of the nine responses recorded, four strongly agreed, two agreed, and three neither agreed nor disagreed. One response indicated no preference.

Questions 7-8 sought comment on the model's *Performance Criteria*. Question 7 asked whether the criteria provided a measure of the likelihood a mātauranga Māori course or qualification would meet the needs and aspirations of learners and other relevant groups? A total of ten responses were recorded with three strongly agreeing, five agreeing, and two disagreeing.

Question 8 invited comment on what improvements or other performance criteria would characterise the quality and value of a mātauranga Māori course or qualification. Eight submissions provided comments ranging from the implications in relation to the *Māori Qual Mark*, their apparent provider-focus, suggested improvements, the need for the criteria to provide more guidance and direction, and further criteria for consideration.²

¹ See *Quality Assuring Mātauranga Māori Courses and Qualifications: Record of Feedback March-May 2010*: p. 5.

² Ibid: pp. 5-6.

Questions 9-10 focused on the concept of a “Māori Qual” mark. Question 9 asked to what extent respondents supported the use of such a mark. Out of the ten responses received, three strongly supported the concept, four supported, one neither agreed nor disagreed, one somewhat supported and one did not support.

Question 10 proposed the following two options for awarding a “Māori Qual” mark to a TEO *delivering* a mātauranga Māori course or qualification: have achieved a rating of *Highly Evident* under the mātauranga Māori performance criteria, and/or achieved as part of external evaluation and review:

- a.** an educational performance focus area rating of *Excellent*, and
- b.** organisational level judgements of *Confident* or *Highly Confident*.

Of the nine responses received, one submission strongly supported the criteria, with another supporting them. Three responses indicated a preference for **b.** organisational level judgements of *Confident* or *Highly Confident*, but it is unclear whether these included the *Highly Evident* rating under the mātauranga Māori Performance Criteria. It is assumed that this stems largely from **a.** and **b.** being interpreted as options, rather than being part of the overall criteria for the awarding of a “Māori Qual” mark.

Four further submissions, while neither agreeing nor disagreeing, did provide further suggestions/comment. They included: the implications of aligning the mark to the external evaluation and review (EER) process; of “self-awarding” the mark; the risk of creating a culture of elitism / competition; agreement with the need for quality systems and processes for quality assuring mātauranga Māori; and questions regarding the maintenance of systems and processes to ensure quality standards for the mark.

Finally, **Question 11** sought further comment on the proposed model, including the extent to which respondents believed the proposed model would provide greater assurances around the quality and value of mātauranga Māori courses and qualifications. Of the ten responses received, three strongly agreed, four agreed, two neither agreed nor disagreed and one strongly disagreed.

Six submissions also provided additional comments ranging from risks regarding the “opt-in” nature of the model, the need for the model to consider qualifications developed by SSBs, and the importance of the model to clearly articulate a Māori world view.³

³ Ibid: pp. 7-8.

Detailed Summary of Written Feedback Received and Comments Recorded

The Model

The key findings under this theme are as follows:

- *Opt-in*: no clear rationale for opting-in; risk of mātauranga Māori qualifications and courses opting-out of the process; all mātauranga Māori qualifications and courses ought to go through this process; and additional incentives required to make opt-in more attractive.
- *Early engagement*: support for the concept; further details regarding what early engagement looks like across the different TEOs required; and further discussion needed on the extent to which early engagement contributes/constitutes part of the formal approval process.
- *Key Evaluative Questions*: the questions need to be more relevant for those who design, develop and approve qualifications; exemplars of good practice should perhaps be incorporated into the proposal to clarify what the questions only imply; and there is a need to integrate/align the model more closely to self-assessment/external evaluation and review.
- *Indicators*: would be crucial for ensuring providers do not simply take what they want without an in-depth understanding of mātauranga Māori; indicators important in providing guidance for evaluators on what good looks like; and they appear to reflect current government priorities which may or may not be what drives the development of courses and qualifications based in mātauranga Māori.
- *Performance criteria*: importance of a participatory approach not evident at the decision-end of the model; criteria more relevant to providers than qualification developers / approving bodies; criteria could, where appropriate, include examples to clarify expectations at each judgement level; and a TEO could receive excellence rating in a focus area and still not receive a confident or above whole of organisation rating.
- *General*: to assess the model's conceptual integrity, a consideration of what it means to quality assure mātauranga Māori courses and qualifications from a Te Ao Māori perspective / world view is necessary; and a relatively simple solution would be to test NZQA's quality assurance system against a kaupapa Māori framework to determine its effectiveness in quality assuring mātauranga Māori.

“Māori Qual” Mark

The key points under this theme are as follows:

- *Excellence and quality*: that a qual mark should represent nothing less than the highest level of excellence; it adds significant quality and value to the quality assurance process, and for learners, employers and institutions; important that appropriate systems and processes for assessing/evaluating/awarding a qual mark are in place; need to carefully consider the implications with respect to current NZQA criteria and guidelines and EER; and a “Te Ao Māori” based approach within NZQA across all of its qualifications systems, which recognises the special nature of mātauranga and kaupapa Māori is preferred.
- *Developers and providers*: the processes underpinning the awarding of a qual mark; “excellence” should be defined from a Māori world view and considered achieved when a provider can show their course(s) and qualification(s) have met all the criteria; and the awarding of a qual mark at an organisational or programme level, and to currently accredited providers and existing qualifications and courses.

- *Qualifications and courses / programmes*: whether a qual mark should be awarded to a qualification, course/programme, or components thereof; implications of a qualification or programme awarded a qual mark from a Māori perspective; review of qualifications or programmes awarded a qual mark; and implications for qualifications developers.
- *Whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori*: the extent of whānau, hapū, iwi, Kaumātua or an external body in endorsing a qual mark; and importance of the mark in recognising and validating mātauranga Māori.
- *Qual Mark*: what is it/its purpose; what will it look like; and important to consider/align to other quality marks/systems.
- *Learner/student outcomes*: qual mark is clearly linked to the likelihood/achievement of quality learner/student outcomes.
- *Funding*: ensuring the relevance of outcomes not currently recognised and the quality and value of mātauranga Māori, over and above opportunities to access additional funding.

Mātauranga Māori

The key points under this theme are as follows:

- *Mātauranga Māori/Māori world view*: there is a need for the model to reflect a Māori world view; other than the aspects of Early Engagement and the “Māori Qual” mark, the model simply reflects the current quality assurance process; and important to maintain the dialogue on the nature - traditionally and contemporary - of mātauranga Māori.
- *Roles and responsibilities*: need to ensure the ownership of mātauranga Māori sits with the knowledge holders while NZQA establishes the conditions for its quality assurance; that it is entirely appropriate for NZQA to define what mātauranga Māori is; and that mātauranga Māori needs be recognised across all of NZQA’s systems and processes.

Other Comments

The key points under this theme are as follows:

- *Model principles*: an appropriate model for assuring mātauranga Māori courses and qualifications must be Kaupapa Māori based. However, the proposed model has been shown to be insufficient when evaluated against a Kaupapa Māori framework.
- *Mātauranga Māori/Māori world view*: the need for the model to reflect a Māori world view; and the importance of continuing the dialogue on the nature - traditionally and contemporary - of mātauranga Māori.
- *Roles and responsibilities*: ownership of mātauranga Māori sits with the knowledge holders while NZQA establishes the conditions for its quality assurance;
- *Capacity and capability*: the proposed system will provide challenges in terms of capability (resourcing) for Quality Assurance Bodies - ITP Quality and NZQA will need to consider these as the system is rolled out, to ensure staff have the right set of skills and competencies to engage.
- *Implementation: criteria vs. principles-based approach*: with the implementation of TRoQ, a principles-based approach is preferred, otherwise further work will be required to clarify which criteria apply to qualifications, courses (teaching programmes) and the delivery of courses; and a criteria-based approach would ensure more rigorous and robust approval and accreditation processes, which met the needs / requirements for all new Māori programmes, rather than only those identified as mātauranga Māori courses or qualifications.
- *Wānanga*: the distinctiveness of each wānanga needs to be acknowledged - there are commonalities but the answers for each are not the same - each interprets its statutory responsibilities in its own way.

- *Trialling*: offer extended to trial model on Raukawa and Awanuiārangi Bachelors in Mātauranga Māori; and suggestion that an ITP course be included in the trial, perhaps a mainstream course as well as a course where the mātauranga Māori aspect is more obvious.

NZQA's Response

As a result of the feedback received, NZQA will consider further what it means to quality assure mātauranga Māori courses and qualifications from a Te Ao Māori perspective/world view. It also proposes to further develop the following aspects of the model:

- the Early Engagement stage, including principles of engagement and operational implications, and its link to formal approval processes;
- the model tools (KEQs, Indicators and Performance Criteria) including guidelines and exemplars to support their use; and
- the “Māori Qual” mark, including design, development and registration, processes for awarding a mark, and implications with respect to the *Māori Content Indicator*.⁴

Given its cross-sectoral implications, a trial and evaluation of the model with selected providers and standard-setters, and affected business units will also be critical. A similar approach was adopted during the tertiary reforms work, and was found to be an effective way of socialising the changes and testing the validity and integrity of an evaluative approach to quality assurance.

⁴ The *Māori Content Indicator* shows that a unit standard or national qualification has Māori content.

APPENDIX 1

Mātauranga Māori Quality Assurance Model Consultation Schedule

Date	Location	Time	Venue
14 April	Wellington	9am-9.30am	TEC Inter-Wānanga Hui
-	Wellington	3.30pm-5pm	Inter-Agency TEC. TPK, TEU, Careers
15 April	Christchurch	10.30am-12pm	Public Hui - Sudima Hotel
-	Dunedin	3.30pm-5pm	Public Hui - Kingsgate Hotel
22 April 17 May	Wellington	9am-10.30am 11am-12pm	Te Kohanga Reo National Trust
22 April	Wellington	1.30pm-3pm	Ako Aotearoa
23 April	Wellington	2pm-3pm	NZ Vice Chancellors Council - Kahui
28 April	Wellington	11am-12pm	Tertiary Educators Union (Māori)
29 April	Wellington	2.30pm-4pm	Public Hui - Terrace Conf Centre
30 April	Te Awamutu	10am-12pm	Te Wānanga o Aotearoa
3 May	Auckland	3.30pm-5pm	Public Hui - Hotel Grand Chancellor
4 May	Auckland	10.30am-12pm	Public Hui - Kingsgate Hotel, Parnell
-	Auckland	2.30pm-4pm	Public Hui - Lincoln Green Hotel
5 May	Wellington	12pm-1pm	Te Tauihu O Ngā Wānanga
6 May	Wellington	9am-11am	Whakaruruhau Matua
-	Wellington	12pm-1pm	ITF Māori Caucus
-	Wellington	1.30pm-2.30pm	Ministry of Education
7 May	Hamilton	10.30am-12pm	Public Hui - Hotel Novotel Tainui
-	Rotorua	3.30pm-5pm	Public Hui - Rydges Rotorua
10 May	Otaki	1.30-4pm	Te Wānanga o Raukawa
11 May	Whakatane	1pm-3pm	Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiarangi