

Appendix One: The survey results and NZQA's response

List of abbreviations:

New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)
Tertiary Education Organisations (TEO)
The New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF)
NZQF Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2013 (Approval & Accreditation Rules)
NZQF Offshore Programme Delivery Rules 2012 (Offshore Rules)
NZQF Offshore Delivery Guidelines (Offshore Guidelines)
NZQF Qualification Listing and Operational Rules 2016 (Listing Rules)
The Education Act 1989 (the Act)

PART ONE – CURRENT OFFSHORE PROGRAMME DELIVERY SETTINGS

a) What do you consider to be the distinctive benefit/value for an offshore student to gain a qualification listed on the NZQF?

Feedback from 20 responses included:

- high quality reputation, credibility, and international recognition of New Zealand qualifications (x17 submissions)
- NZQA quality assurance (x6)
- enhanced employability domestically and internationally (x5)
- reduced costs due to no need to relocate and pay international student fees (x4)
- supporting applications to work or migrate to New Zealand or Australia (x4)
- portability of the qualification from one country to another (x3)
- pathway to undertake further study in New Zealand and other countries (x2)
- access to NZQF industry qualifications that are unique to New Zealand (x2)
- delivery in English
- exposure to Western teaching approaches with all the associated outcomes, such as creative problem solving and critical thinking skills.

Additional comments:

- the benefits of offshore delivery are not only to students, but also to offshore institutions, such as increased capability, knowledge, and innovation
- the above are also benefits to New Zealand institutions
- offshore delivery allows New Zealand to remain competitive in the global market.

b) What are your views on the risks and benefits of offshore delivery of programmes in languages other than the official languages of New Zealand?

Out of 21 responses, three specifically viewed the benefits of offshore delivery of programmes in other languages outweigh the risks. One viewed that it should be the exception rather than the norm, and one TEO stated it should not occur. The remaining submissions outlined the following benefits and risks:

Benefits:

- students gain unique knowledge and skills in the context of their own language (x2)
- being exposed to New Zealand education may encourage students to study English in New Zealand
- students may have more cultural empathy in their home language and environment
- increased access for New Zealand TEOs to additional markets, from
 - i. students who want to progress their career domestically (x2)

- ii. students who do not speak English (x3)
 - increased revenue
 - relationship building with offshore education institutions
 - aligning New Zealand with Australia and England in allowing delivery in other languages.

Additional comments on benefits:

- the knowledge and skills to work with students in a culturally appropriate manner are more important than the language of instruction
- programmes can be delivered in meaningful and consistent ways in local languages.

Risks:

- difficult (for NZQA and TEOs) to ensure the quality assurance of the programmes (x8)
- difficult to recruiting people who are fluent in the local language, have the appropriate qualifications and experience, and share the values of the institution (x3)
- translation may compromise programme content, context, and intent (x3)
- damage to the reputation and credibility of New Zealand qualifications (x3)
- employers may expect a graduate of a New Zealand qualification to have:
 - a reasonable level of English language proficiency (x2)
 - the capability to work in the discipline area under New Zealand conditions
- general commercial risks (x2).

Additional comments on risks:

- provided the organisation has the capacity to ensure that quality assurance processes are followed, the risks should be nil or minimal (x5)
- English language education is a key factor for admission, academic success and graduate outcomes (x2)
- Risk may be mitigated by allowing only Category 1 providers to deliver in other languages.

NZQA's response:

The Offshore Rules allow for delivery in languages other than the official languages of New Zealand. In NZQA's experience to date, the vast majority of applications have included English as the medium of instruction.

However, countries such as China and India have demand for high quality education and training for people who do not speak English and intend to study and progress their careers domestically. Australia and England have already capitalised on this opportunity.

The global framework of transnational education is expected to continue to grow and a key priority of the Tertiary Education Strategy and International Education Strategy is supporting TEOs in the development of international linkages.

Although the demand for delivery in English remains strong, the demand for delivery in languages other than English is likely to increase. NZQA's objective is to enable TEOs to deliver offshore, while preserving the high-quality reputation of New Zealand qualifications.

The fact employers may expect a graduate of a New Zealand qualification to be fluent in English and have the capability to work in the discipline area under New Zealand conditions is a valid point. When a New Zealand qualification is delivered in another language, this must be made clear in the qualification title (Listing Rule 5.2(b)), so that employers are not misled. For example, NZQF Certificate in Cookery (Mandarin) (Level 5).

c) What quality assurance arrangements would you expect to be in place to protect the reputation of New Zealand's qualifications provided offshore? (For example, if a qualification is delivered in a language other than English).

Out of 20 responses, TEOs' expectations included:

- the same quality assurance arrangements as they would be for a qualification delivered offshore in English or delivered in New Zealand, including evidence of moderation, monitoring, self-assessment processes, and qualified teaching staff (x6)
- reliable translation of programme content and quality assurance evidence (x5)
- external evaluation and review (EER) (x2)
- the New Zealand TEO should be responsible for the quality assurance of the offshore programme
- a model that avoids duplication of requirements for TEOs that have already been approved by NZQA
- an effective approach that recognises the commercial responsiveness and quality imperatives through an overall approval of the institution for offshore delivery
- the New Zealand TEO to have high level expertise and competence in the language of delivery
- if fully delivered in another language, this should be stated on the academic transcript.

Additional comments:

- it should be recognised that host countries will have their own regulatory requirements that will demand compliance from TEOs (x2)
- for programmes delivered in languages other than English, NZQA would have to decide if TEOs must translate all materials and/or provide a translator for visits, or if NZQA would utilise bilingual staff.

NZQA response:

The Offshore Rules were developed based on a high-trust approach. Hence, only Category 1 and 2 TEOs can apply for offshore delivery.

NZQA's quality assurance expectations for offshore delivery include the TEO ensuring there is a permanent and accurate record kept of student enrolment and achievement. As part of the institution's participation in self-assessment and External Evaluation Review (EER), the TEO must ensure there are regular reviews of the programme and its delivery offshore, including reviews of any delivery by an offshore partner organisation (Offshore Rule 9).

The TEO must ensure that special considerations for offshore programme delivery are incorporated within its quality assurance and management systems, and that all applicable quality assurance requirements in the host country are identified and met (Offshore Rule 6 Criterion 10). For example, for offshore delivery in languages other than English, NZQA expects TEOs to provide translated materials and interpreters where necessary throughout the approval and accreditation and quality assurance processes.

Where a TEO is using an offshore partner organisation, the TEO remains responsible under these rules for the actions and performance of the offshore partner organisation in relation to the offshore programme delivery (Offshore Rule 4.4).

d) Are there any parts of the current Approval & Accreditation Rule requirements that you feel may not apply to offshore delivery? (For example, providing proof of consultation for acceptability of the programme). If so, please explain which parts and why.

Out of 15 responses, the majority (11) stated that requirements related to (Approvals and Accreditation Rule 4.1 – Criterion 4) acceptability of programme and consultation should not apply to offshore delivery, while two responded that it should.

Reasons for the latter included:

- establishing a partnership with an offshore TEO should suffice to demonstrate there is demand for the programme
- partnerships with offshore governments and/or TEOs request delivery of specific programmes
- it makes the application process more time effective since the entry into new markets requires rapid responses from the TEO and NZQA.

Additional TEOs' suggestions and comments:

- the approval to deliver a programme in New Zealand should automatically carry the approval to deliver the same programme offshore
- if the programme is to be hosted by a reputable offshore TEO, it should be trusted it will be delivered with appropriate resources
- NZQA has applied the current Approval & Accreditations Rules consistently and with an understanding of the offshore environment.

NZQA's response:

If a TEO has a programme already approved for domestic delivery and wishes to also deliver it offshore, Rule 4.1 Criterion 2 has already been met. The TEO only needs to comply with the offshore programme delivery rules and part 5 of the Approval and Accreditation Rules (Maintaining Programme Approval) to enable that programme to be delivered offshore.

If a TEO wishes to gain approval and accreditation for a programme to be delivered offshore, which has not previously been approved for delivery in New Zealand, Rule 4.1 Criterion 4 is not applicable.

However, programme approval in this instance would be on the basis or condition that the programme is only approved for delivery offshore. If the TEO later decided to deliver the programme in New Zealand, it would need to make a new programme approval and accreditation application.

e) Please outline any other matters you have identified concerning the Offshore Rules.

Submissions included various suggestions and comments.

- A TEO suggested the creation of a student type called 'offshore student' (in addition to domestic student and international student), to allow for better monitoring and easier access of NZQA and other government organisations to measure enrollment numbers in offshore programmes.

NZQA's response:

The Act (section 159) offers a definition of international and domestic student. An international student is defined as a person who is not a domestic student; and a domestic student is a New Zealand citizen or resident.

NZQA has forwarded this feedback to the Ministry of Education. While there is no student type called 'offshore student', it is possible to identify, measure and report on offshore

enrolments using other existing fields such as the location of the enrolment and attendance status for the programme.

- A submission suggested Category 1 TEOs to be allowed to self-evaluate offshore training in the same way they would local training, in order to reduce costs.

NZQA's response:

This is the current model for all providers delivering offshore (ie. Categories 1 and 2).

- A TEO noted the Offshore Rules and Programme Approval & Accreditation Rules should be sector neutral. The example used was inconsistency in terms of English language competency requirements (Approval & Accreditation Rule 18) between university and non-university sector.

NZQA's response:

While NZQA sets the requirements for programme approval and accreditation across the tertiary education sector, it does not hold legislative responsibility for the quality assurance of universities. Universities New Zealand holds this responsibility, and information about the English language entry requirements for studying at a New Zealand university can be found on the [Admission Requirements for International Students page of the Universities New Zealand website](#).

- A TEO perceived NZQA, Education New Zealand and the Ministry of Education to have different ideas in terms of identifying a good (high potential, low risk) offshore market.

NZQA's response:

Different government organisations play different roles in offshore delivery. Education New Zealand's role is to provide TEOs with advice on opportunities in emerging offshore markets. NZQA's role is to ensure the quality assurance of qualifications listed on the NZQF being delivered offshore, thus protecting New Zealand's education reputation.

The aforementioned agencies are working together on the development of a new International Education Strategy, which will set out the Government's goals and priorities for international education delivered in New Zealand and offshore.

PART TWO: THE OFFSHORE GUIDELINES UPDATE

Based on the current Offshore Guidelines (published in 2012), TEOs were invited to answer the following questions:

a) What have you found useful?

The nine responses found the current Offshore Guidelines' structure, particularly its use of examples, to be helpful and provide a clear idea of the information that is required in an application seeking approval for offshore delivery.

b) What would you like changed in the updated version?

The nine responses requested the updated Offshore Guidelines to provide examples featuring PTEs and offshore arrangements with TEOs from Australia and the Middle East. Additionally, clarification about:

- delivery in languages other than English

- NZQA's requirement for an offshore delivery site visit
- Student fee protection arrangements for offshore delivery
- NZQA's expectations for offshore quality management systems.

NZQA's response:

NZQA will provide the requested examples in the updated Offshore Guidelines. In cases where a submission query does not fit into an example, NZQA has contacted TEOs directly to provide clarification.

QUALITY ASSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS

The general matters outlined below are the result of NZQA working with key offshore delivery TEOs and government agencies. NZQA invited comments, offered guidance, and proposed to add an example or clarification regarding each topic in the updated Offshore Guidelines.

Please refer to the survey in Appendix Two for context.

c) Comparability versus Equivalence

Out of 11 responses, the majority (7) agreed that the term 'comparable' as opposed to 'equivalent' acknowledges the differences between the domestic and international environment and its context.

Two submissions made unrelated comments, and two stated they have applied the 'equivalent', not the 'comparable' approach.

NZQA's response:

The current Offshore Rules use the term 'comparable' as opposed to 'equivalent', acknowledging the differences between the domestic and international contexts. Qualifications are evaluated on the basis of a strategic purpose statement and an outcome statement, and the approved programme must meet the learning outcomes in the offshore context.

In regard to governance and quality assurance processes, NZQA has set expectations to ensure the quality and reputation of New Zealand education is protected, as per previous responses to questions (b) and (c) in Part One of this document.

d) Providing proof of demand for the programme

NZQA received 13 responses to this question. The feedback reflected what has already been addressed under question (d) of Part One of this document.

e) Programmes that do not lead to an NZQF qualification

All 10 responses agreed it is fair and reasonable that NZQA's jurisdiction is limited to NZQA approved offshore programmes.

One submission requested a clear statement in the Offshore Guidelines that NZQA has no role in the quality assurance of programmes delivered offshore that have not been NZQA approved and do not lead to a qualification on the NZQF.

f) Programme title

Out of 13 responses, three TEOs agreed that including the country of delivery in the qualification title is important, while two stated that it adds no value, and three stated that it diminishes its perceived value.

Reasons for the latter included:

- the delivery site is indicated on the transcript and qualification certificate
- the quality of the qualification should be consistent, whether it is delivered onshore or offshore.

Additional suggestion:

- rather than the country being included in the qualification title, the language of instruction could be included in the brackets instead.

NZQA's response:

Listing Rule 5.2 allows for flexibility when it comes to the qualification title. The title may include the country where it is going to be delivered, part of the main discipline or subject, optional discipline and focus qualifiers, or strands that recognise achievement or specialties.

That means it is up to the qualification developer to choose to include the country name or language of instruction in the qualification title. It will then be at NZQA's discretion to approve the title. If fully delivered in a language other than English, the other language must be listed in the title.

g) Requirements for English language proficiency

Out of 13 responses, six asked for examples to clarify when the exemption to Rule 18 would be applied. Three submissions concluded the exemption would obviously apply to delivery in languages other than English, and two stated that programmes delivered in English should not be exempt.

The remaining two responses were unrelated to the questions and were addressed directly with the TEO.

NZQA's response:

NZQA will apply the exemption to Rule 18 to all offshore qualifications fully delivered in languages other than English.

TEOs do not need to prepare an application seeking exemption, but just make a note in the application for approval and accreditation. The exemption is by way of condition and the condition is placed on the programme at the time of granting the programme approval and accreditation.

Note that any other entry requirements specific to the programme, which may include language proficiency, still apply.

h) Visits to evaluate offshore delivery

Out of 13 responses, feedback included:

- it is important that NZQA retains the right to visit offshore delivery sites at its own discretion (x3)
- utilising videos and photo files should suffice, as opposed to an in-person visit
- costs of a potential visit are of concern (x2)
- offshore delivery is an investment; this cost should be budgeted by the TEOs at the time of entering.

NZQA's response:

Under the current Offshore Rule 7.2 the right to visit and evaluate offshore delivery sites and the costs would be recovered from the TEO.

However, these visits would only take place in exceptional circumstances. For example, if NZQA becomes concerned with the quality of offshore delivery. Typically, the TEO provides enough evidence to give NZQA confidence of its (or its offshore partner) resources and capabilities.

As stated in the feedback document, this factor should not discourage TEOs from pursuing offshore delivery opportunities.

i) Are there any further issues you would like to bring to NZQA's attention?

Out of 6 responses, four highlighted the important role of NZQA in ensuring quality but enabling TEOs to respond to offshore market demand and competition, by:

- approving applications in a timely manner
- proactively recognising different delivery models
- considering the Government's goals to increase offshore enrolments
- following Productivity Commission recommendations to improve efficiency of processes.

A TEO suggested NZQA to consider options for student fee protection for offshore delivery. A submission about Free Trade rules was directly addressed with the TEO.

NZQA's response:

The PTE Student Fee Protection (SFP) Rules 2013 require all student fees to be protected, regardless of the delivery location. The SFP Rules already allow for different payment arrangements: standard trust or static trust, company or parent body guarantee, deferred payment, or bank bond.

The static trust and the bank bond options may be favoured by TEOs wanting to avoid international bank transfers. If the PTE wants to avoid using its own funds to cover student fee protection, then it needs to transfer the offshore student fees to New Zealand.

j) NZQA is considering adding the updated Offshore Guidelines to the back of the Approval & Accreditation Guidelines and the Degree and Related Qualifications Guidelines, in order to have the information in one place.

NZQA received 14 responses to this question. Twelve submissions agreed to this proposal, one was neutral and one disagreed, stating the specialised nature of offshore delivery requires a separate document is preferable.

NZQA's response:

NZQA will add the updated Offshore Guidelines to the back of the Approval & Accreditation Guidelines. This will make it clear to TEOs that the criteria set from the first must be met before moving on to the next. Except for meeting Rule 4.1 Criterion 4 when the TEO is only wishes to deliver the programme in question offshore (see question (d) on page 5 for further details).