External Evaluation and Review Report

Alphacrucis International College Limited trading as Alphacrucis International College

Date of report: 20 June 2019

About Alphacrucis International College Limited (trading as Alphacrucis International College)

Alphacrucis International College operates under the same governance, management, and faculty as its parent company, Alphacrucis Limited. The organisation focuses on delivering Christian studies programme, and in the last year ventured into Youth Guarantee programmes.

Type of organisation:	Private training establishment (PTE)
Location:	60 Rockfield Road, Penrose, Auckland
Code of Practice signatory:	Yes
Number of students:	Domestic: 251 (17 per cent Māori, 14 per cent Pasifika); international: one
Number of staff:	10 full-time and 18 part-time (joint with Alphacrucis Limited)
TEO profile:	See [Alphacrucis International College](#)
Last EER outcome:	September 2015: • Highly Confident in educational performance • Confident in capability in self-assessment
Scope of evaluation:	Diploma level 5 programmes (Diploma in Chaplaincy, Diploma in Christian Leadership, Diploma in Theological Studies) Youth Guarantee programmes (Certificate in Foundation Skills (Level 2); Certificate in Retail (Level 2)) International Student Support and Wellbeing
MoE number:	8573
NZQA reference:	C33336
Dates of EER visit:	26-28 February 2019

Final report

Summary of Results

Alphacrucis International College (AIC) is well connected in the industry and has provided Christian ministries and Christian studies programmes for a number of years. The value and relevance of the programmes is well accepted by the stakeholders. Alphacrucis could be more reflective in its operations and performance by purposefully collecting and analysing data and embedding self-assessment practices, to guide management and staff in their decision-making.

Not Yet Confident in educational performance

- Achievement data provided was not complete. Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) data shows that AIC is below the overall national qualification completion rate for levels 4-7 (non-degree) from 2015 to 2017.

- Students gain valuable life and employment skills and purportedly gain confidence and understanding of themselves. Their personal growth benefits their local communities.

Not Yet Confident in capability in self-assessment

- The organisation has a strong presence in Pentecostal Christian communities, particularly the Assemblies of God. Their connections enable them to network and provide training for their target market. The organisation has recently developed partnerships with local community trusts to deliver Youth Guarantee programmes.

- Anecdotal evidence was provided about individual needs being met. Individual positive relationships with various organisations and communities indicate, in the main, the relevance and appropriateness of the programmes.

- There is limited evidence that self-assessment happens intrinsically and on a regular basis. Achievement data is not analysed or explained.

- AIC was non-compliant in the delivery and assessment of unit standards, and there were inconsistencies in programme learning hours.

Final report

Key evaluation question findings[1]

1.1   How well do students achieve?

Performance:	**Marginal**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**
Findings and supporting evidence:	It has been a challenge obtaining consistent and final educational performance figures for AIC. The final document submitted to NZQA did not provide any data on achievement for the three level 5 diplomas. The document was incomplete, with the sections on benchmarking and analysis left blank, and a heavy reliance on the TEC for data. Comparing the TEC's data on cohort-based qualification completion rates for levels 4-7 (non-degree) for the organisation and all registered PTEs, the organisation's performance from 2015-2017 is below the overall PTE performance.[2]

Similarly, there was no clear evidence of meaningful benchmarks for the Youth Guarantee programmes, therefore it is unclear how the organisation is placed in terms of achievement.[3]

Students gain life skills, employment skills, literacy and numeracy skills, and computer literacy in the Youth Guarantee programmes. More importantly, they gain confidence and understanding of themselves, their values, and their motivation. Their outlook in life is shifted positively. For the diploma programmes, students' personal growth gives them a deeper understanding of the community services that they participate in. Personal growth in both programmes is evidenced anecdotally by students, staff and community partners.

Raw data was mostly presented without accompanying analysis. There is no evidence that self-assessment practices |

---

[1] The findings in this report are derived using a standard process and are based on a targeted sample of the organisation's activities.

[2] See Table 1, Appendix 1

[3] See Table 2, Appendix 1

Final report

	are embedded into the organisation's daily operations.
Conclusion:	Achievement data provided by the organisation was incomplete, and the absence of a benchmark makes it a challenge to know how well placed the organisation is. TEC data is used in this instance, which confirms that the organisation is below the overall PTE achievement rate for levels 4-7 non-degree programmes.

1.2 What is the value of the outcomes for key stakeholders, including students?

Performance:	**Marginal**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**
Findings and supporting evidence:	For the Youth Guarantee programmes, there was anecdotal evidence of individual achievement, indicating the value of the programmes, particularly in creating positive change in the student. Students were provided with new options in their learning which they did not experience in mainstream schooling. They also value the opportunity to obtain credits for the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA).
	The diploma level 5 programmes have varying information and contributing factors on the valued outcomes. The programmes are said to be relevant and create service direction and opportunities to students. The knowledge they obtain in the programme is highly applicable and helps them gain structure and order for the community work they do. They grow their personal values and attributes which are considered important to the churches. However, it is noted from the graduate survey that two out of three graduates of the chaplaincy programme could not obtain relevant employment, and nine out of 15 graduates of the Christian ministries (internship) programme did not link employment with the qualification.
	The self-assessment practices to understand the value of the outcomes could be improved. There is raw graduate destination data (2018), but with no accompanying analysis or explanation. The survey used mostly focused on the programme and on teaching and not on graduate destinations or the achievement of the graduate profile outcomes, and it is unclear whether the respondents were graduates or students. The submitted stakeholder survey presented generally positive feedback; however, the date it was conducted and the number and nature of

	respondents were not known.
Conclusion:	There are varying factors with regards to the value of the outcomes for key stakeholders, including students. The quality of the self-assessment practices to understand value is limited and could be improved.

1.3 How well do programme design and delivery, including learning and assessment activities, match the needs of students and other relevant stakeholders?

Performance:	**Marginal**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**
Findings and supporting evidence:	The Youth Guarantee programmes provide flexibility to enable individual needs to be catered for. They are contextualised and involve active and applied learning which suits the target learners (for example, the retail programme students set up a café and created a pop-up shop). The programmes are embedded within a social services provider and therefore integrated with other support initiatives. The needs of students and other stakeholders are addressed as the programmes are designed to develop direction among learners and build on their strengths.
	Internal moderation for the Youth Guarantee programmes includes peer marking and observation. Tutors closely liaise with each other to ensure consistency in programme delivery.
	A concern was expressed by teaching staff and management that the retail-focused programme may not meet students' needs. As a consequence, AIC is currently seeking a better alternative to this programme to meet a wider range of career aspirations. It is unclear whether a needs analysis was conducted at the development stage for this programme, or how subsequent evidence was gathered to support the notion that the retail programme is not meeting needs.
	A student engagement survey was conducted for the Youth Guarantee programmes, but was not analysed. The result does not appear to have been provided to staff, as evidenced by their lack of knowledge about this survey report. It is also unclear whether concerns identified in the survey were addressed.
	There were varying perspectives on how well the design and delivery of the level 5 diploma programmes match the needs of

	stakeholders. Both students and tutors interviewed said that some components of the programme are taught and assessed at a much higher level than they should be. Some assessment questions were repeatedly identified as ambiguous, but this has not yet been addressed.
	External moderation was conducted, but there is no clear indication of actions taken in response to the identified concerns.
	Tutors are knowledgeable, helpful and, in general, provide timely and comprehensive feedback to the students.
Conclusion:	This evaluation identified concerns around programme design and delivery in both the Youth Guarantee and diploma level 5 programmes. Some of these concerns need to be urgently addressed as they affect student learning and stakeholder needs being met.

1.4 How effectively are students supported and involved in their learning?

Performance:	**Good**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**
Findings and supporting evidence:	Students are generally well supported, although there is varying support from tutors. For the diploma level 5, tutors are available to assist the students, with some providing individual tutorials and some conducting question and answer sessions online. Students are encouraged to contact the tutors for questions and clarification. It is unclear whether there are opportunities for tutors to share best practice. Students are also heavily dependent on their supervisor/mentors or supporting church or organisation to provide support when they need extra tuition or guidance.
	With Youth Guarantee, considerable attention is given to encouraging and supporting students to successfully complete the programme. A significant amount of the support is nested in the local churches. In the case of Youth Guarantee programme, support such as from social workers, counsellors and youth workers is built into the partner community trust.
	A newly appointed Māori liaison officer, to support both Māori and Pasifika students, visits the campus and/or contacts students once a week. This is a new initiative and therefore it is

	too soon to evaluate its effectiveness.
	For international students, AIC provides a comprehensive orientation which includes a marae visit, familiarisation with the local community, learning support (library assistance and support for online learning) and other organised activities (chapel services and fellowship).
	There was no evidence of support and involvement being analysed or any data captured to substantiate assumptions.
Conclusion:	Students are supported in their learning, with a significant amount of support nested in the relevant local churches and the partner community trust. There was no evidence of support and involvement being analysed or any data captured to substantiate assumptions.

1.5 How effective are governance and management in supporting educational achievement?

Performance:	**Good**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**
Findings and supporting evidence:	AIC's mission of providing Christ-centred education is embodied throughout its programme offerings and community relationships. The introduction of Youth Guarantee programmes also showed the organisation's commitment to engage closely with communities.
	The organisation's strategic direction is aligned with its Australian parent company, and its business sustainability is supported by the parent company's financial backing.
	The organisation has a strong target-industry presence and connection in terms of provision of training, as evidenced by the number of Pentecostal churches using AIC to provide training. With the Youth Guarantee programme, stakeholders confirmed that the institution is supportive and very keen to work with them to achieve the best outcomes for students.
	The governing Council and management are very supportive of the programmes in terms of provision of learning and teaching resources. They were, however, unable to provide data to substantiate the institution's performance, which would have an impact on effective decision-making in terms of effectiveness,

	sustainability and growth.
	The Council's satisfaction with AIC and its effectiveness did not appear to be based on performance outcomes, but in a general confidence in the principal to highlight any issues and keep them informed. Submitted sample reports and documents showed that where data is provided this was not explained and/or analysed.
	The quality management system is in draft form which does not provide confidence that it reflects the actual policies and processes of the organisation.
	Despite being requested more than once by the EER team, management did not provide evidence of the extent to which they had addressed previous EER recommendations.
Conclusion:	The governance and management team supports educational achievement by maintaining its wide connections and its good reputation as a training provider for its particular stakeholder communities. Self-assessment in this area is not evident.

1.6 How effectively are important compliance accountabilities managed?

Performance:	**Marginal**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**
Findings and supporting evidence:	AIC has not met some important compliance accountabilities.
	The Youth Guarantee programmes include in their delivery and assessment a number of unit standards which AIC does not have consent to assess against, and are not part of the NZQA approval for these programmes. The inclusion of these unit standards in the delivery and assessment is a breach under Section 252(2) of the Education Act 1989, and Section 7.4 of the NZQF Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2018.
	There is a concern about the actual learning hours of the Youth Guarantee programmes, as conflicting information was provided, with student and tutor statements indicating under-delivery. Management appeared to be unaware of the learning hours' discrepancy, suggesting a lack of monitoring of this important compliance responsibility.
	Similarly, there was inconsistent information regarding the learning hours for the diploma level 5 programmes. This

	indicates that the organisation has no system to monitor whether the required learning hours are met by the students. There was no identified gap with the Code of Practice compliance responsibilities.
Conclusion:	The organisation is non-compliant with Section 252(2) of the Education Act 1989, and Section 7.4 of the NZQF Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2018. There was inconsistent information with regard to actual programme learning hours, indicating that the organisation has no systems in place to monitor that they are meeting the learning hour requirements.

Focus Areas

This section reports significant findings in each focus area, not already covered in Part 1.

2.1 Focus area: Diploma level 5 programmes (Diploma in Chaplaincy, Diploma in Christian Leadership, Diploma in Theological Studies)

Performance:	**Marginal**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**

2.2 Focus area: Youth Guarantee programmes (Certificate in Foundation Skills (Level 2), and Certificate in Retail (Level 2))

Performance:	**Marginal**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**

2.3 Focus area: International Student Support and Wellbeing

Performance:	**Good**
Self-assessment:	**Marginal**

Recommendations

Recommendations are not compulsory but their implementation may improve the quality and effectiveness of the training and education provided by the tertiary education organisation (TEO). They may be referred to in subsequent external evaluation and reviews (EERs) to gauge the effectiveness of the TEO's quality improvements over time.

NZQA recommends that Alphacrucis International College:

- Strengthen its self-assessment practices by purposefully collecting and analysing data and being more reflective regarding the effectiveness of data collection for the benefit of the students, stakeholders and the organisation.

- Regularly monitor and analyse achievement data, and set meaningful benchmarks and expectations.

- Communicate relevant information to staff in order to have a collective understanding of the organisation's operations, expectations and performance, to guide and support decision-making.

Requirements

Requirements relate to the TEO's statutory obligations under legislation that governs their operation. This include NZQA Rules and relevant regulations promulgated by other agencies.

NZQA requires Alphacrucis International College to:

- Apply for consent to assess against unit standards included in the Youth Guarantee programmes. (See Section 7.4 of the NZQF Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2018.)

- Ensure that the actual learning hours are aligned with what was approved by NZQA.

Appendix 1

Table 1. Cohort-based qualification and course completion rates – levels 4-7 (non-degree)

	2015		2016		2017	
	Qualification completion	Course completion	Qualification completion	Course completion	Qualification completion	Course completion
AIC	49%	83%	52%	73%	38%	78%
All PTEs	74%	83%	75%	83%	69%	87%

Source: Tertiary Education Commission, Performance of Tertiary Education Organisations, Educational Performance Indicators (new methodologies) 2015-2017

Table 2. Youth Guarantee programmes – educational performance data

Programmes	Enrolment			Course completion rate		
	Overall	Māori	Pasifika	Overall	Māori	Pasifika
Certificate in Foundation Skills (Level 2)	35	18 (51)%	1 (3%)	67%	41%	0
Certificate in Retail (Level 2)	29	9 (31%)	0	74%	47%	0

Source: Alphacrucis International College, 2018 Educational Performance Report (pages 22-23)

Appendix 2

Conduct of external evaluation and review

All external evaluation and reviews are conducted in accordance with NZQA's published rules. The methodology used is described in the web document https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/external-evaluation-and-review/. The TEO has an opportunity to comment on the accuracy of this report, and any submissions received are fully considered by NZQA before finalising the report.

Disclaimer

The findings in this report have been reached by means of a standard evaluative process. They are based on a representative selection of focus areas, and a sample of supporting information provided by the TEO under review or independently accessed by NZQA. As such, the report's findings offer a guide to the relative quality of the TEO at the time of the EER, in the light of the known evidence, and the likelihood that this level of quality will continue.

For the same reason, these findings are always limited in scope. They are derived from selections and samples evaluated at a point in time. The supporting methodology is not designed to:

- *Identify organisational fraud[4]*

- *Provide comprehensive coverage of all programmes within a TEO, or of all relevant evidence sources*

- *Predict the outcome of other reviews of the same TEO which, by posing different questions or examining different information, could reasonably arrive at different conclusions.*

---

[4] NZQA and the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) comprehensively monitor risk in the tertiary education sector through a range of other mechanisms. When fraud, or any other serious risk factor, has been confirmed, corrective action is taken as a matter of urgency.

Final report

Regulatory basis for external evaluation and review

External evaluation and review is conducted under the Quality Assurance (including External Evaluation and Review (EER)) Rules 2016, which are made by NZQA under section 253(1)(pa) of the Education Act 1989 and approved by the NZQA Board and the Minister authorised as responsible for Part 20 of the Education Act.

Self-assessment and participation and cooperation in external evaluation and review are requirements for:

- *maintaining accreditation to provide an approved programme for all TEOs other than universities, and*

- *maintaining consent to assess against standards on the Directory of Assessment Standards for all TEOs including ITOs but excluding universities, and*

- *maintaining training scheme approval for all TEOs other than universities.*

The requirements for participation and cooperation are set through the Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2018, the Consent to Assess Against Standards Rules 2011 and the Training Scheme Rules 2012 respectively. These rules were also made by NZQA under section 253 of the Education Act 1989 and approved by the NZQA Board and the Minister.

In addition, the Private Training Establishment Rules 2018 require registered private training establishments to undertake self-assessment and participate in external evaluation and review as a condition of maintaining registration. The Private Training Establishment Registration Rules 2018 are also made by NZQA under section 253 of the Education Act 1989 and approved by the NZQA Board and the Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills and Employment.

NZQA is responsible for ensuring non-university TEOs continue to comply with the rules after the initial granting of approval and accreditation of programmes, training schemes and consents to assess and registration. The New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC) has statutory responsibility for compliance by universities.

This report reflects the findings and conclusions of the external evaluation and review process, conducted according to the Quality Assurance (including External Evaluation and Review (EER)) Rules 2016. The report identifies strengths and areas for improvement in terms of the organisation's educational performance and capability in self-assessment.

External evaluation and review reports are one contributing piece of information in determining future funding decisions where the organisation is a funded TEO subject to an investment plan agreed with the Tertiary Education Commission.

External evaluation and review reports are public information and are available from the NZQA website (www.nzqa.govt.nz). All rules cited above are available at https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/about-us/our-role/legislation/nzqa-rules/, while information about the conduct and methodology for external evaluation and review can be found at https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/external-evaluation-and-review/.

Final report

NZQA

Ph 0800 697 296

E qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz

www.nzqa.govt.nz