

Consultation: The Targeted Review of the New Zealand Qualifications System

The following questionnaire contains questions regarding the seven proposed changes for the New Zealand qualifications system. We value your feedback on these changes.

Each proposed change has its own set of questions. You may either provide feedback on all the changes and complete the entire questionnaire, or you can fill out *just* the sections that are of interest to you.

Please ensure that you have read the consultation document before answering this questionnaire. Online responses are preferred, but hard-copy responses are also welcome. The due date for responses is **10 November 2009**.

Please fill out the form and send it via email to:

qualificationsreview@nzqa.govt.nz

Alternatively, you can print the questionnaire out and send it to:

Targeted Review Consultation
Policy Unit
NZQA
PO Box 160
WELLINGTON 6140

Before starting the questionnaire, could you please fill out the following information:

- i. Your name, role and organisation

- ii. Is there any other information by which you would like your organisation to be identified e.g. Māori PTE, Pacific provider? Please specify.

- iii. Is your response a personal view or the view of your organisation?

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this consultation.

Change One: Develop a unified New Zealand qualifications framework

1. To what extent do you support a unified outcomes-based qualifications framework for New Zealand? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Strongly support change one	Support change one	Neutral	Somewhat support change one	I do not support change one

2. Please provide reasons for your answer to the above:

--

3. How easy would it be for learners, employers and people from overseas to understand the proposed New Zealand Qualifications Framework, compared with the present New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications and National Qualifications Framework? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Very easy	Easy	No different	Difficult	Very difficult

4. To what extent would the proposed New Zealand Qualifications Framework make the relationships between qualifications clearer, compared with the current framework? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Very clear	Clear	No different	Unclear	Very unclear

5. What other alternatives or improvements to the proposed New Zealand Qualifications Framework do you think could improve the clarity and user-friendliness of the system?

--

6. Please provide any additional comments about change one in the space below.

--

Change 2: Require the use of existing quality-assured qualifications and change the design rules for national (standards-based) and New Zealand qualifications to allow for more inclusion of local components

7. To what extent do you support NZQA requiring the use of existing quality assured qualifications? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Strongly support change two	Support change two	Neutral	Somewhat support change two	I do not support change two

8. Please provide reasons for your answer to the above:

9. What impacts would this change have on qualification developers?

10. One option to increase the flexibility of National and New Zealand qualifications is to allow local components, by either:

- a. setting a percentage range within which local components could most usefully added (e.g. 30 per cent); or
- b. establishing principles for developers and standard setting bodies to determine the appropriateness of local components

Which option do you prefer and why?

11. What else should be taken into account when applying the requirement to use existing qualifications?

12. Please provide any additional comments about change two in the space below.

Change 3: Require mandatory periodic reviews of qualifications to determine whether they are still fit-for-purpose

13. To what extent do you support the introduction of mandatory periodic reviews of qualifications to determine whether they are still fit-for-purpose? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Strongly support change three	Support change three	Neutral	Somewhat support change three	I do not support change three

14. Please provide reasons for your answer to the above:

15. What impacts do you think this change will have on qualification developers?

16. How should timeframes for reviews be determined? (e.g. annual or every 3 to 5 years)

17. Do you have any other suggestions on how a qualification remains fit-for-purpose and how this could be shown?

18. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the idea that provider accreditation should be subject to mandatory periodic review? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree

19. Please provide any additional comments about change three in the space below.

Change 4: Strengthen and standardise qualification outcome statement requirements

20. To what extent do you support the change to strengthen and standardise qualification outcome statement requirements? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Strongly support change four	Support change four	Neutral	Somewhat support change four	I do not support change four

21. Please provide reasons for your answer to the above:

22. Should this change be undertaken for new qualifications only, or applied to all qualifications?

23. Is there any other content (additional skills and knowledge, and education and employment pathways) that you would like to see included in the outcome statements?

24. Please provide any additional comments about change four in the space below.

Change 5: Introduce a mandatory pre-development assessment stage for qualification developers

25. To what extent do you support the introduction of a mandatory pre-development assessment stage for qualification developers before development commences? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Strongly support change five	Support change five	Neutral	Somewhat support change five	I do not support change five

26. Please provide reasons for your answer to the above:

27. Do you have any other suggestions to reduce qualification duplication besides a pre-assessment stage?

28. Please provide any additional comments about change five in the space below.

Change 6: Strengthen recognised industry involvement in qualification development

29. To what extent do you support the change to strengthen recognised industry involvement in qualification development? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Strongly support change six	Support change six	Neutral	Somewhat support change six	I do not support change six

30. Please provide reasons for your answer to the above:

31. How much involvement would be considered adequate and how would you expect this involvement to be evidenced?

32. Do you have any suggested alternatives to improve the relevance of qualifications?

33. Please provide any additional comments about change six in the space below.

Change 7: Provide the public with clear information about whether a qualification is active, inactive or closed

34. To what extent do you support the change to provide the public with clear information about whether a qualification is “active” or “inactive” or “closed”? (please place a tick (✓) in one box)

Strongly support change seven	Support change seven	Neutral	Somewhat support change seven	I do not support change seven

35. Please provide reasons for your answer to the above:

36. Are there other categories for the status of qualifications that should be available for the public?

37. Please provide any additional comments about change seven in the space below.