

# AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF NZQA'S EVALUATIVE QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

## Report of the Panel

---

October 2012

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>FOREWORD</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>PROCESS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
EVALUATIVE QUESTION ONE.....	8
EVALUATIVE QUESTION TWO .....	11
EVALUATIVE QUESTION THREE.....	14
EVALUATIVE QUESTION FOUR .....	15
EVALUATIVE QUESTION FIVE .....	16
EVALUATIVE QUESTION SIX.....	17
EVALUATIVE QUESTION SEVEN .....	18
<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>19</b>
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS .....	19
<b>APPENDIX ONE: REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>APPENDIX TWO: SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>APPENDIX THREE: NZQA DOCUMENTS REVIEWED</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX FOUR: CONSULTATION MEETINGS</b> .....	<b>27</b>

## Foreword

### Comments from the Panel Chair

At its inception under the Education Amendment Act 1990, NZQA was empowered to quality assure the performance of tertiary educational organisations with the exception of universities. The authority was also empowered to accredit programme proposals from TEOs up to degree level on the qualifications framework.

During the 1990s and early 2000s, the accreditation of programmes and degree proposals and the progressive introduction of quality audit from 2000 was a stressful time for organisations such as polytechnics, wānanga, and private training establishments. A considerable amount of educational staff time was diverted from teaching to preparing for the audit or accreditation visit of an NZQA panel. Underlying the stress was the fear of failure, or a programme proposal being sent back to the drawing board.

As an alternative chairman of NZQA panels, I tried to alleviate stress on organisations by conducting an audit or accreditation visit in a collegial manner. In the whaikōrero, the speech in reply to a pōwhiri (welcome), I took the liberty to indicate that the function of the panel was to look at both the strengths and weaknesses of an organisation and its programme proposals. The objective was to strengthen an organisation and its pedagogy in areas where improvements could be made. This informal emphasis on quality performance was complemented by the dissemination of best practice.

NZQA is to be highly commended for moving away from the inspectorial approach to quality by introducing the system of self-assessment and external evaluation and review. Self-assessment commits an institution to be the best that it can be. This is the first step in an educational journey to “te paetawhiti,” the distant horizon of unknown power in quality assurance.

No reira, ka nui te mihi ki ngā rangatira o te Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa. Na rātou i wānanga te kaupapa EQAF hei hiki i nga kura tini o te motu ki te toi o ngā rangi, kia taea ngā kete o te matauranga.

Dr Ranginui Walker

## Introduction

This is the report of the panel commissioned to conduct an independent evaluation of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority's (NZQA) Evaluative Quality Assurance Framework (EQAF). The panel consisted of:

- Dr Ranginui Walker (New Zealand) - Chair
- Dr Ross Finnie (Canada)
- Dr Jennifer Greene (United States)
- Dr Neil Barns (New Zealand)

The findings and recommendations of the panel are contained in the body of the report. In overall summary, the panel found that:

1. The use of an evaluative quality assurance framework to underpin New Zealand's system of non-university tertiary education quality assurance is visionary and ground-breaking.
2. The underlying logic that the institutions should assume responsibility for quality is well supported by the tertiary education sector.
3. NZQA has shown professionalism and leadership in the design and implementation of the EQAF.
4. There is widespread support for the use of the EQAF from Tertiary Education Organisations.
5. There is an inherent tension between the developmental intentions of the EQAF and the consequential impact of EER ratings on providers.
6. There is not yet full confidence in EER procedures, judgments and reporting amongst all stakeholders.
7. There is a continuing need for capability-building in self-assessment.
8. Opportunities exist to identify and share good practice and research findings to further improve outcomes from the EQAF.

The introduction of the EQAF for the non-university tertiary education sector is at the leading edge of quality assurance and quality improvement internationally. Anchoring a quality assurance system in strong, sector-wide evaluative thinking is a solid and defensible approach to improving meaningful learning outcomes for students *and* having the capacity to sustain such gains over the long term. NZQA is to be commended for the vision and leadership that it has shown in establishing this system in such a short time frame. The suggestions offered by panel to enhance the implementation of the EQAF are only to be expected at this early stage of this initiative.

## Acknowledgements

The panel thanks the staff of NZQA for providing documents back-grounding the organisation and the EQAF, the Ministry of Education (MOE), the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), and Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs) in the preparation and conduct of its work. The Chief Executive, Dr Karen Poutasi, and the Deputy Chief Executive Quality Assurance, Tim Fowler, provided significant access to themselves, their staff and to key documents required to inform this review. Michael Steer, Advisor to DCE Quality Assurance, and Tracey Carlin, Executive Assistant to DCE Quality Assurance, carried out all necessary administrative arrangements, including organising the external stakeholder meetings, compiling and arranging numerous documents, and providing on-going advice and support in an efficient and highly professional manner. Syd King, Principal Evaluation Advisor, produced numerous documents to support the panel, and was on-call throughout the process to provide extremely useful input and explanation as required. The effective leadership and passion demonstrated by each of these people were evident throughout the process.

Similarly all other NZQA staff who appeared before the panel did so with an openness and sincere commitment to improve what they do themselves and to achieving the quality education outcomes that the system is seeking.

The panel would also like to acknowledge a similar commitment to quality and the open sharing of information and ideas provided by all of the external stakeholders, including provider, TEC and MOE representatives. All of these groups made major contributions to the work of the panel.

A list of the people who appeared before the panel, the submissions received, and the documentation provided by NZQA are included in the appendices.

## Background

In 2006 Cabinet agreed to the development of a new quality assurance system for the non-university tertiary education sector that would include:

- a requirement for (non-university) Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs) to undertake self-assessment (SA); and
- a system of regular external evaluation and review (EER).

One of the core principles underpinning the new quality assurance system is that each TEO would take greater responsibility for quality in their organisation. They would do this through the development of TEO-specific self-assessment processes that focused on how major stakeholder and student needs were identified and met, how the organisation knew about how well identified needs were being met, and how the organisation acted on areas identified for improvement.

The new quality assurance system is referred to in this review as the Evaluative Quality Assurance Framework or EQAF. This refers to all parts of the evaluative quality assurance system, including regulations, policy, and the resources, systems and processes used in its implementation. The central parts of the EQAF implementation consist of the self-assessment and external evaluation and review components.

Self-assessment (SA) is critical to identifying and achieving on-going quality improvements at the provider level, which will collectively lead to improved educational outcomes at a system level. SA has been developed following the principles of high trust and high accountability, with which Government and its agencies seek to generally operate in the tertiary education sector.

In order to build confidence in the self-assessment outcomes amongst Government agencies and the public, an independent external process was also introduced in 2009 along with a set of incentives and sanctions associated with EER outcomes in 2011. The EER process is operated by NZQA and focuses on determining the level of confidence that a stakeholder can have in (a) a provider's future educational performance and (b) its self-assessment capability. The results of the EER are publicly reported in line with the Government's commitment to high accountability for the sector.

Self-assessment was introduced to the non-university tertiary education sector in February 2009, and the first external evaluation and review was undertaken in September 2009. Since that time EER has been progressively undertaken across both the public and private non-university tertiary education sub-sectors. Approximately three-quarters of the sector's institutions had been through an EER by mid-2012.

As this is a new quality assurance system, NZQA decided that it was important to undertake an evaluation of the EQAF in order to assess its early performance. This review stems from the commitment made in its Statement of Intent 2011-2014.

The terms of reference for this review are provided in Appendix One.

## Process

The panel was selected and commissioned by NZQA specifically for the purpose of conducting this independent review. To assist and to guide the work of the panel, NZQA offered seven evaluative questions in the terms of reference. The questions were:

1. To what extent does NZQA have the evaluative culture, the evaluative capability and the necessary resources to implement the quality assurance framework effectively with the sector for which it is responsible?
2. To what extent is the implementation of evaluative quality assurance in line with the framework's design and the policy intent?
3. To what extent is NZQA's focusing on "the right things" to influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?
4. To what extent is NZQA utilising the most effective range of policy levers to influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?
5. To what extent are the combined regulatory framework, policy framework, and the quality assurance framework and methodology likely to / actually do influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?
6. What evidence is there that the quality assurance framework is being effective in influencing improved valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?
7. To what extent does NZQA itself have a good understanding of the answers to these key evaluative questions, and acts appropriately to improve design and/or implementation based on that understanding?

These questions assisted in identifying the scope and nature of the review and have been used to shape the structure of the review report. The questions were also provided to the non-university tertiary sector peak bodies, which were invited to make submissions to the review panel. There were 11 written submissions received by the panel. A list of the submissions is provided in Appendix Two.

NZQA compiled and/or developed a number of documents to inform the work of the panel. A list of documents reviewed by the panel as a part of this process is provided in Appendix Three.

The panel met from 13-17 August in Wellington, New Zealand. During this week a number of consultation meetings were held with NZQA management and staff, and various stakeholder groups including sector representatives and Government agencies. A list of the people with whom the panel met is provided in Appendix Four.

Following a review of the documentation and the various meetings with NZQA, other government stakeholders, and sector representatives, the panel considered each of the seven evaluative questions in turn. This report presents the collective view of the panel for each of these questions and a small number of recommendations that it proposes to NZQA for its consideration. NZQA will provide feedback to this initial report, and following consideration by the panel, a final report will be submitted to NZQA not later than 15 October 2012.

## Evaluative Questions

The seven evaluative questions provided in the terms of reference outlined the scope of the review. Although the panel's discussion and investigation were not necessarily limited by these questions, the panel determined that the questions provided an appropriate and meaningful framework for summarizing the feedback received and comments heard and its own sense of what should be addressed in the review. In doing so, it was clear that there would be areas of overlap in addressing the different evaluative questions. The panel has, in this context, attempted not to repeat information or findings unnecessarily.

### Evaluative Question One

**To what extent does NZQA have the evaluative culture, the evaluative capability and the necessary resources to implement the quality assurance framework effectively with the sector for which it is responsible?**

From the material reviewed, and interviews with staff and stakeholders the panel concluded, in summary, that:

- a. NZQA does have an evaluative culture in the Quality Assurance Division.<sup>1</sup>
- b. NZQA is still developing the evaluative capability required.

These are explained more fully in this section.

#### An Evaluative Culture at NZQA

All of the NZQA management and staff that the panel met with were able to express a sound understanding of and commitment to evaluative quality assurance. What was additionally encouraging was that NZQA has also been able to infuse the tertiary education sector with enthusiasm for this approach. There is a remarkably high level of institutional buy-in to the concepts of self-assessment and external evaluation and review across the diversity of the sector.

NZQA is committed to ensuring that the EQAF is appropriate for all types of providers and stakeholder needs. It has also shown that it is prepared to be adaptable where this is required. For example, the development of a Maori-specific framework, *Mātauranga Māori Evaluative Quality Assurance (MMEQA)*, is to be highly commended. This model was developed in partnership with Māori educationalists from across the tertiary sector and was blessed in a formal ceremony at Waiwhetu Marae, Lower Hutt on 4 May 2012. Te Hono o te Kahurangi allows for the kaupapa Māori and evaluative quality assurance principles to sit along side each other without either being compromised. Developments such as this indicate NZQA's willingness to adapt the Evaluative Quality Assurance Framework where doing so will enhance its use in specific situations.

It is likely that there will be further developments of the framework over time as specific issues such as this are identified. However, NZQA's willingness to make this change is a sign that NZQA itself does reflect an evaluative culture.

---

<sup>1</sup> Apart from the Chief Executive, the panel did not consult with NZQA staff outside of the Quality Assurance Division.

### NZQA's Evaluative Capability

It was clear to the panel that NZQA has staff that provides leadership, expertise and a passion for evaluative quality assurance. However, there were also indications from stakeholders that there is inconsistency at NZQA in terms of evaluative capability and approach, which was mainly evident in the EER process. The panel was not in a position and did not attempt to assess the evaluative capability of the specific individuals that make up the Quality Assurance Division or of the external contractors used in the EER process. The panel found, however, that there is a gap between NZQA and its stakeholders in the perceived level of capability and consistency of approach of evaluators, which is concerning. Even if this is a gap in perception only, it creates an issue for NZQA in building sector confidence in the implementation of the system itself and therefore needs to be acknowledged and plans put in place to address it.

Stakeholders were clear in stating that their experience with NZQA in the EER process was one of differing levels of skill and differing approaches used by evaluators during the EER process. Some stakeholders reported that they believed that this resulted in cross-site inconsistency, which flowed through to the judgments made by evaluators and to the EER reports. Although the panel could not substantiate the validity of comments made, parallel comments were received from all sub-sectors. Comments such as 'it depends who you get,' and 'we couldn't believe the rating (confidence level) that they got' were shared with the panel, who again believe that this is an important issue for NZQA to address.

The panel also heard specific recommendations from the sector. (a) Hire an external moderator to review and possibly attend some of the EERs to create greater consistency. (b) Allow designated representatives to operate their own EER process within their subsector<sup>2</sup>. (c) Institute an appeal process on EER outcomes, using an independent authority (such as an ombudsman). What is consistent about these suggestions is that someone or some authority needs to be set up to provide consistency and to handle appeals regarding outcomes. The current process of internal moderation of the reports has not yet found favour with the sector in terms of their experience of the system.

One of the contributing factors to these sector comments about inconsistency may be the heterogeneous nature of the sector (both within and across sub-sectors). The panel understands that NZQA does attempt to put together EER panels that will understand the nuances of the provider undergoing the EER, although this is not always possible. Including evaluator expertise and experience with the type of institution being visited may be especially challenging when there are only two members of an EER panel visiting a small TEO. In these cases, institutions going through an EER may feel that the panel members do not truly understand the 'business' of the organisation and that they sometimes bring a particular perception or bias about the sub-sector into the EER process. Although the panel could not substantiate these concerns, numerous comments were made in this respect, and NZQA did indicate that it was challenging to assemble evaluator teams with sector experience and knowledge at a consistent level for each EER panel. However, although this in itself is a challenge for NZQA to manage, it is unlikely to be the cause of all of the comments related to consistency in EER teams that were shared with the panel. That is, while issues of consistency may be partly addressed by the expertise of the actual teams, the issues seem to go beyond this.

NZQA's response to this is that they are aware of the perceptions and are attempting to mitigate the issue by using highly skilled lead evaluators, conducting ongoing training for all evaluators, and implementing a system of peer review of EER reports. NZQA currently uses a mix of internal (NZQA

---

<sup>2</sup> This suggestion was made by from one subsector representative.

staff) evaluators and external evaluators (contractors). The pool of external evaluators is significant in size and ensuring consistency of skill and approach across this group appears to be especially challenging. NZQA has enacted a significant level of ongoing training particularly for lead evaluators. NZQA is also peer moderating all EER reports in efforts to improve cross-site consistency, and as an additional means to enhance the overall capability of the lead evaluator group.

The panel applauds the actions taken by NZQA and acknowledges that the recent introduction of a peer review process in particular is likely to have already improved consistency. However, it is too early to judge the success of these actions and it is important to note that the standard and consistency in EER processes is a critical element in maintaining the long-term acceptability of the EQAF. The experience that providers have through the EER will impact on their view of the validity of the EER process and their confidence in the judgments made. Similarly the standard and consistency of the EER is key to building and maintaining confidence in the EQAF with other Government agencies. Therefore ongoing efforts to improve the selection and training of evaluators (lead and panel members), the make-up of each panel and the EER reports remain critical to the credibility of the system.

**It is therefore recommended that**

1. NZQA further develop its tools and processes for identifying and selecting EER panel members and EER lead evaluators and attempt to make sure that each team's expertise corresponds to the specific needs and distinctive contribution of the sector and the institution being evaluated.
2. NZQA review and strengthen the on-going training provided to EER panel members.
3. NZQA give consideration to designing an external moderation process appropriate to the different parts of the sector for EER.
4. NZQA give further thought to the appeals process relating to EER outcomes and reports.

These four recommendations are intended to raise the level of confidence in the EER outcomes across the various parts of the sector. The panel understands that they are likely to increase the cost of the EER and has therefore not made these recommendations lightly.

Another challenge for NZQA is to ensure that there is a system in place to ensure that the necessary capability at the higher leadership level is maintained and enhanced over time in the Quality Assurance Division.

NZQA is fortunate to have the services of some very skilled and experienced staff, each of whom are developing experience in the implementation of the EQAF. This team of people is committed and working very hard to ensure that this system delivers the intended outcomes. However, despite the good work to build capability across the team, at this stage the EQAF has a primary leader, designer, and 'guru', and this person is Syd King. The panel was very impressed by Mr. King's intricate knowledge, expertise and passion for the evaluative quality assurance system. This has worked well for NZQA to date. However, in order to reduce risk to the long term development of NZQA capability and leadership of the EQAF:

**It is recommended that**

5. NZQA develop a succession plan for future development and operation of the EQAF in terms of the related senior leadership.

Although this may be in hand, it was not evident to the panel and it is suggested that NZQA seek to develop more leaders in EQAF to continue its work, and continual improvement, into the future.. How this happens is over to NZQA but could include specific project leadership (and training), EQAF research leadership, international experience, and the creation of an offshore peer network of support.

Further comments relating to NZQA's resources are picked up under Evaluative Question Two.

## Evaluative Question Two

### **To what extent is the implementation of evaluative quality assurance in line with the framework's design and the policy intent?**

The implementation of the evaluative quality assurance framework is progressing within the overall design and policy intent. The panel believes, however, that further emphasis is required on:

- building the sector's capability for self-assessment,
- improving the timeliness of communications to providers from EER, and
- acknowledging the inherent tensions within the system

in order for the system to reach its potential.

### **Building Sector Capability**

An evaluative quality assurance system is designed to achieve on-going improvement. To make this happen at a system level, continual improvement needs to occur at the provider level. To some extent this will occur naturally by providers being given (and taking) responsibility for their own quality. However, providers need to develop a high level of evaluative capability across their institutions to be able to effectively self-assess in order to know where and how to improve. In the main, providers welcome that approach, however, many also indicated that they need more help to build SA capability.

Among providers, the most salient aspect of the EQAF system appears to be the EER. From a system perspective, although EER is needed to ensure accountability, the cornerstone of the EQAF system is actually contextually meaningful and appropriate institutional self-assessment.

NZQA may have underestimated the time and support needed for the sector to develop strong self-assessment capacity. Most providers will need more time and probably more support to develop whole-of-institution capability in self-assessment. This is reflected in some of comments made to the panel:

- The process and outcome indicators are thoughtful, but also quite ambitious.
- Our members are unsure how to embed this approach across their institutions.
- Who at the TEO should appropriately be in charge of self-assessment?
- What resource allocation would be expected for high quality self-assessment?

The panel acknowledges that NZQA has already provided support to institutions to build self-assessment capability, particularly early in the implementation of SA-EER. The self assessment workshops that NZQA organized were well received and have made a difference, particularly for

larger TEOs that have been able to involve significant numbers of staff. The panel understands that the role of building sector capability in self-assessment now rests with the sector relationship managers (SRM) and noted that these roles were commented on favourably by the sector. However the panel believes that sector capability building will be an on-going process that is likely to require additional input and expertise from NZQA.

**Therefore, it is recommended that:**

6. NZQA develop a 5-year plan and budget to build sector capability in self-assessment

In making this recommendation the panel acknowledges that there is already some very good work happening to build a nationwide evaluative quality assurance community by involving NZQA staff in TEO staff development activities, evaluation conferences, and targeted research activity. The panel is suggesting that NZQA could take a further lead in building a comprehensive plan that not only lifts sector capability but builds stronger sector-NZQA partnerships. The panel sees a partnership approach to capability building as the way forward even though there will always be some tension between NZQA and providers due to its registration, accreditation, and QA roles.

**Timeliness and Nature of EER Reporting**

NZQA has set itself the target of providing 95% of EER reports to providers within 20 working days from the completion of the EER panel visit. This target has been consistently met by NZQA since the EQAF was introduced. However, feedback from providers indicated that in the cases where the 20 day guideline was not able to be met, there were serious concerns for those affected. Providers understand delays, but in one example cited by a provider, NZQA indicated that the report would be available 60 days after the visit. Although the provider had received communications from NZQA about the delay, they did not consider the length of time acceptable. Although a short turn-around is desirable, where it is not possible providers need to be informed in writing, with reasons for the delay and an expected report date. NZQA is clearly committed to meeting its target of 95% of EER reports within the 20-day deadline however it should aim to do this in every case. The EER outcomes are very significant for providers and they want to know these as soon as possible.

The panel was informed that in the early EER panel visits, the lead evaluator would give interim feedback to the institution. This included the main findings of the panel and its recommendations on confidence levels. This practice was valued by providers but has been changed with lead evaluators no longer disclosing emergent statements of confidence. They are, however, expected to discuss the emergent findings, strengths and weakness found in the course of the site visit at the closing meeting.

The panel holds the view that providing some immediate feedback to providers at the time of the EER is important. Providers indicated that their staff are eager and receptive to EER feedback at this time but that their enthusiasm diminishes over time as 'business as usual' takes over. Although the panel acknowledges that NZQA may not wish to have the EER panel provide indicative confidence ratings to the provider it is important that some feedback is provided immediately.

**Therefore it is recommended that:**

7. Lead evaluators continue to provide substantive and constructive feedback to providers at the end of the EER panel visit.

Although providers would like to also hear the interim confidence level ratings at the time of the EER, the panel has not recommended this to NZQA. Because the confidence ratings are

consequential, the NZQA's internal peer review process needs to occur before the ratings are finalized. The main purpose of the initial feedback should be to help the institution improve.

The panel was impressed with the sample EER reports provided. The structure and content of the reports were good, and they were suitable to be in the public domain. However, some providers commented that they were surprised at the content of their own EER report, which did not match their EER experience or the initial feedback they had received from evaluators. Other providers reported that information they were shown at the time of the EER was not necessarily available to them with or after the EER report was received, for example, the full matrix of ratings by focus area. This made it hard for the provider to reconcile the final EER report with the evidence and the formative evaluations made by the panel. This feedback concerned the panel and did not meet NZQA's own aspirations to have 'no surprises' and to be transparent about the process. The providers did not know why this had occurred.

The panel is aware that the EER reports have multiple audiences, including other Government agencies, students, the general public, as well as the institution itself. Such a diverse range of readers, who have differing reasons for reading and interpreting the reports, means that the reports need to be very carefully and clearly written. The outcome of this is that the reports risk losing value to the institutions themselves as a resource in their own continued improvement. The focus tends to be on the confidence ratings rather than the other content in the report.

The panel therefore discussed whether there could be two reports, one with greater detail to assist the provider, and the other for all other readers. The more detailed report may contain specific material that was not appropriate for publication as it may lead, for example, to the identification of individuals, particularly in small institutions. Two reports would obviously create a tension between full transparency and meeting the need to provide detailed actionable feedback to providers that can be used to assist in quality improvement. The fundamental difference between the reports would be the level of specific detail provided.

Having two EER reports would increase the EER cost, however it may be necessary in order to meet two quite different purposes of the report: a resource to assist in quality improvement of the provider; and, a source of information to support decision-making by central agencies and students. The panel acknowledges the tension that this would cause however it believes that it is worthy of consideration by NZQA.

**Therefore it is recommended that:**

8. NZQA consider a system of two EER reports.
  - a. A provider report with sufficient detail to be useful to the TEO for quality improvement purposes, and
  - b. A summary form for publication and external purposes.

The current report format would be appropriate for the second of these. The provider report could contain more explicit recommendations to providers for improvement. Both reports would need to be consistent in terms of key messages and confidence ratings.

**Tension Inherent in the System**

In seeking to determine whether the implementation of the EQAF was meeting its design and policy intent, the panel considered the impact on EQAF outcomes of having a high trust and high accountability environment. Although the sector and the panel support this principle, the reality is that it results in a tension inherent in the EQAF implementation. To be effective, an evaluative

quality assurance system requires providers to be open, honest and transparent about strengths and weaknesses in their self-assessment. Providers expressed concern that openness in a high trust environment could penalize them if it negatively affected either of the confidence ratings that they received in the EER. The real issue is that, in keeping with high accountability, there are incentives and sanctions related to the confidence ratings. This is a dilemma for the system as there is a risk that providers will attempt to 'game' the EER rather than use it for quality improvement. Some providers believed that this was already happening and gave plausible examples of how this may be possible. Whether it is actually possible or not, one outcome is that the EQAF loses at least some of its impact as a mechanism for continuous improvement at the provider level if providers' main concern is the confidence rating that they get.

The panel also considered whether reducing the EER outcomes to two confidence ratings was, in itself, undermining the quality improvement intent of the EQAF. There are usually examples of good (and poor) practice that can be found particularly in large complex TEOs. The summary confidence ratings tend to hide the real story going on inside an organisation yet the EER process itself has the ability to highlight these. The panel is also aware that using a summary of two confidence measures is useful for external agencies and the public looking for guidance about overall quality in a provider (in order to apply their own incentives or sanctions). The solution may lie in two reports as already suggested to meet these different purposes.

In regards to the use of incentives and sanctions, providers also had some feedback. The general view was that the current policy really only contained sanctions. The only incentive for Category 1 providers seemed to be that there were no sanctions. This may need to be addressed with more thought on potential incentives in the future, for example, additional resources for initiatives aimed at 'educational excellence.'

The reality is that the EQAF must exist with the inherent tension just described. Yet, it is important that NZQA continue to recognize this as it further develops the system and its incentives and sanctions policies.

### **Evaluative Question Three**

#### **To what extent is NZQA focusing on "the right things" to influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?**

It is the panel's view that NZQA is focusing on the right things overall. Most comments offered above for Evaluative Questions One and Two support this overall assessment, most prominently, the core emphasis on 'evaluative thinking.'

The Key Evaluative Questions (KEQs) are critical to the EQAF implementation and, in the panel's view, these are well designed and are helping to focus attention on 'the right things'. The split of process and outcome KEQs is clear and helps to create a workable framework for an institution to develop its own approach to self-assessment. Most provider respondents were very knowledgeable about the KEQs; one noted that she had them posted on her office wall. There was a comment from some stakeholders that the EER should be more focused on the financial aspects of the TEO and on risk in particular. However, in the panel's view, the KEQs can be applied to all aspects of quality. The panel also noted that an assessment of provider financial viability is already part of the PTE registration and reporting process and that TEC undertakes and reports on the financial risk associated with TEIs. An assessment of future educational performance risk is clearly a part of the EER process already.

The panel also sought to determine how adaptable the EQAF was to differences across the sector and to specific issues, such as differential provider commitment to and engagement with educational equity. In responding to questions about equity, NZQA staff stated that equity issues appropriate to each TEO and its stakeholders are considered, and that respectful attention is given to educational institutions that serve minority and increasingly diverse populations. This implies, but was not supported by evidence, that institutions that aggressively seek to serve populations of learners not currently well served will not be penalized for doing so by the EQAF. NZQA further stated that equity is fundamentally built into the system, because the system is anchored in stakeholder needs assessment and it uses contextualized or 'dynamic' definitions of quality. The question remains: 'Can a TEO that intentionally serves a population that is not well served by the sector receive high confidence ratings for educational performance?' NZQA acknowledged that an external evaluation of equity issues is likely to be challenging in large mainstream institutions where variability in how these are handled is harder to determine. NZQA is currently working to strengthen the EQAF's ability to do this effectively and defensibly, an endeavor this panel would strongly support.

Again, the panel further believes that priority emphasis should be given to building the self-assessment capability of providers, as this is the fundamental centre of the EQAF in design and in ultimate success.

#### Evaluative Question Four

##### **To what extent is NZQA utilising the most effective range of policy levers to influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?**

The EQAF requirements and the incentives and sanctions policy are primary policy levers in this evaluative quality assurance system.

In terms of the EQAF the panel refers the reader back to evaluative questions 1 and 2 of this report rather than repeat these comments here. This section is therefore focused on the use of incentives and sanctions as a policy lever in achieving valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders.

The panel considered the current policy on incentives and sanctions attached to category 1-4 providers. The providers interviewed were also asked about the effectiveness of the incentives and sanctions approach. The general view of providers was that although most agreed with the concept of incentives and sanctions, at the moment, the use of EER judgments as the basis for determining them was problematic. The reason given for this was the perception of variability and unreliability in the judgments made to date, as referred to earlier. In principle the panel believes that a quality assurance system needs some teeth both to ensure provider compliance and to encourage meaningful provider investment in the system. Providers are likely to invest in their own capability in order to access incentives, although the desire to avoid sanctions is also a powerful driver.

Providers understand sanctions and incentives, but are not sure that the right mix is in place yet, particularly in terms of incentives. For example one suggestion was that the system could be used to identify and award National Centres of Excellence as an incentive for outstanding quality in a particular area. Another example (which has already been identified as a potential incentive) is for Category 1 providers to have a streamlined process for international student visa approvals from Immigration New Zealand. For this to happen, Immigration New Zealand must both understand and have confidence in the system. Whether they do, is not yet clear.

There is strong support across the sector for sanctions against low quality and high-risk providers. NZQA is already taking action on this although many in the sector would like this to happen more quickly.

What did come through strongly from stakeholders was the need for stronger connections between the EQAF administered by NZQA and policy levers of other Government agencies. In particular TEC, MOE and Immigration New Zealand were identified. Although this statement reflects stakeholder views, NZQA noted that several quality assurance teams within NZQA already work on a close, weekly basis with the TEC and Immigration NZ, in terms of gathering, interpreting and sharing information on TEO performance. This is especially true for all EERs as contact with these two agencies is routinely made for any review of a TEO receiving funding and/or enrolling international students. There is also potential for Education NZ to use the EER confidence ratings when determining where its support should be for providers involved in international education.

To maximize the potential value of the EQAF across Government each relevant agency needs to have confidence and a sound understanding of the system. As many of the potential policy levers are outside of NZQA's direct control, there is a critical leadership role for NZQA to play in ensuring that these agencies understand both the intention and limitations of EER outcomes. There is also a risk that the outcomes from the EER are used inappropriately. NZQA's relationships with each of these agencies are therefore critical to ensure that New Zealand gets the best possible outcomes from the EQAF. Although all of the Government agency representatives indicated that there was a positive working relationship between them all, other stakeholders were not convinced of this. NZQA should not take for granted that each agency has the same understanding of what EQAF results can or should be used for as it does.

As stated earlier in this report tension does exist in the implementation of the EQAF. There are different needs and purposes between use of the EER report by NZQA for quality improvement and assurance and how TEC, for example, needs to use it to make funding decisions. This tension will never go away. Ensuring that there is clear and sustained communication among NZQA, TEC, and the Ministry of Education about the EQAF is important, and NZQA should take a leadership role around the use of its EER reports in particular.

**Therefore it is recommended that:**

9. NZQA develop a relationship and communications plan for its work with other Government agencies in relation to the Evaluative Quality Assurance Framework and its results.

This plan would need to include on-going information exchange, continued building of understanding of the system, and also specific agreements on potential policy levers related to EER outcomes. Although it is clear that the agencies talk, a more systematic approach to managing these relationships, with clear expectations and *agreed-upon uses* of the EER confidence ratings would further strengthen and legitimize the EQAF in New Zealand's educational decision making contexts. New Zealand needs to leverage this system to gain the maximum benefit across agencies and to provide a wider range of incentives (and sanctions) to motivate providers to enact the main promise of evaluative thinking, which is stronger learning attainment for New Zealand's students.

**Evaluative Question Five**

**To what extent are the combined regulatory framework, policy framework, and the quality assurance framework and methodology likely to / actually do influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?**

The panel believes that NZQA has the regulatory power and policy framework needed to implement the EQAF effectively and that this has promise to bring longer-term benefits for learners.

Despite this belief the panel acknowledges that there is insufficient information available on the outcomes from the system to be certain of its benefits at this time. What it did note also is the widespread level of support that there is for the EQAF – this provides a good basis to achieve the continuous quality improvement that is being sought, particularly when combined with the right incentives and sanctions. Further time and evidence will be needed before judgment can really be made about the level of impact the system will have on achieving improved valued outcomes for learners and other key stakeholders.

### **Evaluative Question Six**

#### **What evidence is there that the quality assurance framework is being effective in influencing improved valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?**

As stated in the last section, the EQAF is too new to be able to determine its effectiveness in bringing about improved valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders. There is also the challenge that it will be difficult to be definitive about how much improvement in any measurable outcomes is due to the QA system and how much is the result of other variables, such as funding levers and the general state of the employment market. Despite this, the panel applauds the work that is currently underway to gain evidence that will assist in making such judgments in the future.

The EQAF is just one part of a set of regulatory and policy tools that collectively aim to lift the social and economic outcomes for the country. Achieving and externally confirming continuous improvement in the quality of tertiary education will lead to improved capability across the population and an improved ability to support economic growth and improve social outcomes. Although the EQAF is conceptually sound, there needs to be a way to measure improvement in educational outcomes over time that can be at least used as a proxy measure to determine the gains made from the system itself.

The Government agencies that have a direct responsibility for improving learner and other stakeholder outcomes are working together in an attempt to measure the effectiveness of this and other policy levers by tracking learners and graduates over a long-term period. NZQA is also working on describing the type of system-change that can be expected from the EQAF and is designing measures and mechanisms to track and judge such change. One current plan is the idea of “thematic reports,” which would be developed by reviewing evidence across the system for longitudinal changes in particular domains or sectors. The use of thematic reports has been used elsewhere as was a major strength of the Sweden higher education quality review system. NZQA indicated that it is very supportive of this proposal.

There are a few measurable outcomes already such as an increase in the number of provider de-registrations, although not all of these are the result of the EER process.

Alongside ‘hard data’ there is a need for more qualitative information to support developments in quality improvement at the provider level, and to showcase institutions with exemplary EQA systems. The sharing of good practice examples can itself enhance sector collaboration. There is also an obligation for NZQA to continue to research evaluative quality assurance here and abroad to ensure that is able to further refine and disseminate the system. There is a real opportunity for NZQA to partner with the sector and also with other Government agencies in evaluating the longer-

term outcomes of the EQAF principles and system. Such partnerships should help further increase buy-in to and understanding of the evaluative quality assurance principles and values.

#### The panel therefore recommends that

10. NZQA commission in-depth case studies of good practice examples identified through any part of the self assessment or external evaluation and review process that can be shared with the sector.
11. NZQA develop an on-going research programme in evaluative quality assurance to increase national levels of expertise, to disseminate lessons learned to international audiences, and to inform future design and implementation improvements.

The case studies and research programme may be commissioned in a partnership with individual providers and/or with agencies such as Ako Aotearoa, the Ministry of Education, and/or the TEC.

Beyond all of this, the panel recognizes that providing some concrete evidence of the 'value-added' to learners by the tertiary system is critical for sustaining the long-term confidence in evaluative quality assurance as the system default. Providers, as well as the education system as a whole, need to understand more about learner cohorts and identify as far as possible what value has been added through their engagement in tertiary education. This evidence is likely to come from the longitudinal tracking of learner and graduate income and employment outcomes, and thus is not a responsibility centered in the NZQA. Yet, NZQA could assist in making such tracking data available to individual providers. The panel has not made recommendations around how this should happen but is generally aware of the data tracking work currently underway, led by the Ministry of Education. The panel applauds this work and hopes that the data generated will be used to inform and assist providers, as well as funders, in improving quality outcomes. The panel also hopes that these data sets will not be used in isolation, but rather used in tandem with multiple other sources of information to support evaluative discussions toward better understanding the contextual meanings and individual stories of educational success in New Zealand.

### Evaluative Question Seven

**To what extent does NZQA itself have a good understanding of the answers to these key evaluative questions, and acts appropriately to improve design and/or implementation based on that understanding?**

The panel was impressed with NZQA's expertise and commitment to an evaluative quality assurance system.

It was also clear to the panel that NZQA is actively seeking to improve the system and is open to advice on how to do so. The panel understands that it is difficult to step back and reflect on how things can be improved when this involves critical reflection of your own actions and beliefs. However to be objectively self-reflective is a core principle of the evaluative approach and the panel hopes that this report will form a part of the process used by NZQA to continue to improve the design and implementation of the system.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

The panel entered this process with limited knowledge of the New Zealand EQAF or its implementation. NZQA provided substantial documentation about the system, the context in which it operates, and how it is being implemented. Through this review the panel has concluded that the evaluative quality assurance system (the framework and its implementation) is the right approach for the New Zealand tertiary education system and that NZQA has made a successful start in its implementation. Although it is too early to have evidence that valued learner outcomes are being improved, there is sufficient research evidence and literature for the review panel to give a strong vote of confidence in this approach.

NZQA has embraced evaluative quality assurance – noting that it too is still learning and seeking to improve its own performance. The sector for which NZQA is responsible for quality assurance has also, in the main, embraced this approach. Other government agencies further support this approach, even though they have slightly different expectations and needs from it than has NZQA. To maintain this level of support it is critical that NZQA continues to work to improve the EER process to ensure as much consistency and fairness as possible. It is equally important to do further work to build and maintain the sector’s capability and understanding of evaluative quality assurance and of self-assessment in particular. Thoughtful self-assessment is the anchor for the whole system, therefore improvements in this capability will lead to overall system level quality improvement.

Finally, the panel offers its thanks NZQA for the opportunity to undertake this evaluative review and for the open and transparent way that it organized stakeholders and material to assist the panel to do its work.

## List of Recommendations

The following recommendations are contained in the body of the report but are listed here for ease of reference.

1. NZQA further develop its tools and processes for identifying and selecting EER panel members and EER lead evaluators and attempt to make sure that each team’s expertise corresponds to the specific needs and distinctive contribution of the sector and the institution being evaluated.
2. NZQA review and strengthen the on-going training provided to EER panel members.
3. NZQA give consideration to designing an external moderation process appropriate to the different parts of the sector for EER.
4. NZQA give further thought to the appeals process relating to EER outcomes and reports.
5. NZQA develop a succession plan for future development and operation of the EQAF in terms of the related senior leadership.
6. NZQA develop a 5-year plan and budget to build sector capability in self-assessment
7. Lead evaluators continue to provide substantive and constructive feedback to providers at the end of the EER panel visit.
8. NZQA consider a system of two EER reports.
  - a. A provider report with sufficient detail to be useful to the TEO for quality improvement purposes, and
  - b. A summary form for publication and external purposes.

9. NZQA develop a relationship and communications plan for its work with other Government agencies in relation to the Evaluative Quality Assurance Framework and its results.
10. NZQA commission in-depth case studies of good practice examples identified through any part of the self assessment or external evaluation and review process that can be shared with the sector.
11. NZQA develop an on-going research programme in evaluative quality assurance to increase national levels of expertise, to disseminate lessons learned to international audiences, and to inform future design and implementation improvements.

## Appendix One: Review Terms of Reference

### INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF NZQA'S EVALUATIVE QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK:

In 2012, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) is seeking:

an independent evaluation of NZQA's quality assurance framework for the tertiary education sector (non-university), which includes TEO [tertiary education organisation] self-assessment and independent external evaluation and review to determine the effectiveness of the new framework for improving educational outcomes for learners. (NZQA *Statement of Intent 2011-14*)

### NZQA's quality assurance framework

The overall intent for tertiary education in New Zealand is to operate an integrated system that encompasses tertiary education policy, funding and quality assurance. The system incorporates the Ministry of Education (policy), the Tertiary Education Commission (funding), Immigration New Zealand (immigration policy and operations such as work rights and visas), Education New Zealand (a new agency with a focus on international education) and the Ministry of Social Development (tertiary students' loans and allowances) in their various funding and policy roles.

A key component of New Zealand's tertiary education quality assurance system is the *Gazetted criteria for programme approval and accreditation*. The criteria apply to the entire tertiary education sector, including the universities. In terms of the Education Act 1989, NZQA is required to consult the sector when changes to the gazetted criteria are proposed.

Within the system, NZQA has the role as the independent evaluator of non-university tertiary education organisation (TEO) performance and is increasingly developing the capability and expertise to report on broader sector and policy issues relevant to system performance.

NZQA's quality assurance framework applies to New Zealand's institutes of technology and polytechnics (ITPs), wānanga<sup>3</sup>, private training establishments (PTEs), government training establishments (GTEs) and industry training organisations (ITOs). The framework has been progressively implemented from January 2009 and works as an integrated whole comprising four components: initial front-end or entry quality assurance processes, self-assessment by tertiary education organisations (TEOs), external evaluation and review by NZQA, and compliance and risk monitoring.

Thus, EQA is designed to be an integral and influential part of the broader set of government policies.

The prime focus of the independent evaluation is on TEO self-assessment and external evaluation and review by NZQA.

---

<sup>3</sup> Wānanga are institutions which maintain, advance and disseminate knowledge, develop intellectual independence and assist the application of knowledge (mātauranga Māori) regarding āhuatanga Māori (Māori tradition) according to tikanga Māori (Māori custom). They are Crown entities which receive government funding and are identified in the Education Act 1989.

## **Evaluative quality assurance**

NZQA has adopted an evaluative approach to the framework. Evaluative quality assurance (EQA) is a substantial and innovative policy position requiring considerable initiative, resourcing and skill on both NZQA's and the non-university tertiary education sector's part. It is potentially one of the most significant developments internationally in the quality assurance of tertiary education in the last few years.

The approach was developed following careful consideration of the international literature on quality assurance and is purpose-designed for the New Zealand tertiary education and training context.

It seeks an innovative and effective means of answering the big questions about how well the tertiary education system is performing, and how it might be improved.

The evaluation methodologies have a direct and practical focus on short and longer term outcomes for learners and stakeholders, and the key processes that most directly influence these outcomes. The intention is to influence and motivate TEOs to take greater responsibility and accountability for improving the quality and value of the tertiary education they provide.

The size of the implementation challenge is such that a developmental approach has been adopted with a broad five year timeframe for fully integrated performance. This independent evaluation is occurring at approximately the mid-point of that timeframe.

Thus far, the evaluative approach has been implemented for TEO self-assessment and external evaluation and review. It has also very recently been implemented for Mātauranga Māori evaluative quality assurance (MMEQA)<sup>4</sup> which encompasses self-assessment, external evaluation and review and front-end quality assurance of programme approval and accreditation. The evaluative approach has not been implemented for compliance and risk monitoring.

### **Independent evaluation**

The independent evaluation of NZQA's quality assurance framework provides an opportunity to formatively assess the effectiveness of the framework mid-way through a five-year developmental process of implementation.

A panel, comprising individuals with significant capability and experience in evaluation and quality assurance in the tertiary education sector, will determine how effective the new evaluative approach to quality assurance is for improving the educational outcomes for learners.

The focus of the independent evaluation will be primarily on those parts of the system that have been implemented for a significant period of time (i.e. 2+ years), namely:

- Tertiary education organisation self-assessment
- External evaluation and review.

---

<sup>4</sup> Mātauranga Māori evaluative quality assurance (MM EQA) acknowledges that a distinctive approach is required in order to quality assure mātauranga Māori qualifications, programmes and organisations credibly. MM EQA is based on the principle that what is of value to Māori should be central, with mātauranga Māori outcomes, processes, philosophies and practices recognised on their merits.

Front-end quality assurance (listing qualifications, approving programmes, accrediting TEOs to deliver, consent to assess etc) - although still in developmental or early implementation phase - should be included in evaluating the **design** intent of the evaluative approach.

Similarly, mātauranga Māori evaluative quality assurance has just commenced, but the design aspects should be included.

NZQA conducted a targeted review of the New Zealand qualifications system in 2008 and 2009. This targeted review found that changes needed to be made to the qualifications system at levels 1-6 of the New Zealand Qualifications Framework to ensure that the qualifications system provides learners with clear pathways to their goals, and employers and industry with a skilled workforce. The Targeted Review of Qualifications will be the subject of a separate independent evaluation (*NZQA Statement of Intent 2011/12 - 2013 /14*).

The panel will be provided with documentation to inform the review.

During the week-long site visit, the panel will have the opportunity to discuss the quality assurance framework and the evaluative approach within it, its intent and implementation with the NZQA Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive Quality Assurance and NZQA staff, and representatives of other agencies and tertiary sector organisations. These arrangements will be discussed with the Panel Chair.

## **Key evaluative questions**

Key evaluative questions provide:

- an overall framework to guide the work of the independent panel
  - some sense of scope to the panel's work
  - a parallel focus for the panel as that for the quality assurance framework itself i.e. a practical focus on valued outcomes and key contributing processes
1. To what extent does NZQA have the evaluative culture, the evaluative capability and the necessary resources to implement the quality assurance framework effectively with the sector for which it is responsible?
  2. To what extent is the implementation of evaluative quality assurance in line with the framework's design and the policy intent?
  3. To what extent is NZQA's focusing on "the right things" to influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?
  4. To what extent is NZQA utilising the most effective range of policy levers to influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?
  5. To what extent are the combined regulatory framework, policy framework, and the quality assurance framework and methodology likely to / actually do influence and improve valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?
  6. What evidence is there that the quality assurance framework is being effective in influencing improved valued outcomes for learners and stakeholders?

7. To what extent does NZQA itself have a good understanding of the answers to these key evaluative questions, and acts appropriately to improve design and/or implementation based on that understanding?

### Key milestones

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Panelists confirmed	1 June
Terms of reference	15 June
Project timeline confirmed	Early June, following confirmation of panelists
Support work	Ongoing. June: Travel arrangements made From early July: Documentation progressively provided to panelists July: On site arrangements, interviewees, focus groups confirmed
Independent evaluation conducted	13-17 August
Draft report received for NZQA comment	30 September
Final report received	15 October
NZQA Strategic Management Team review report	5 November
NZQA Board receives report	29 November

## Appendix Two: Submissions Received

Written submissions were received from the following sector representative organisations:

1. Association of Emergency Care Training Providers (AECTP)
2. English New Zealand
3. Independent Tertiary Institutes (ITI)
4. Industry Training Federation (ITF)
5. ITP Advisory Group to NZQA
6. New Zealand Association of Private Education Providers (NZAPEP)
7. Pacific Island Tertiary Providers of New Zealand (PITPONZ)

One submission was received from an individual ITP

8. UCOL, Palmerston North

One submission was received from an individual

9. John Fiso (NZAPEP Chairman of the Board)

Written input was also provided by:

10. Ministry of Education
11. Tertiary Education Commission

## Appendix Three: NZQA Documents Reviewed

The series of documents were provided to the panel by NZQA in advance, some of which were written specifically for the review. Each document was titled and numbered as follows:

1. Independent Evaluation of NZQA's Evaluative Quality Assurance Framework: Terms of Reference
2. The New Zealand Tertiary Education System
3. NZQA's Functions and Structure
4. Roles of the Education Agencies
5. The Development of the Quality Assurance Framework
6. Evaluative Quality Assurance
7. Evaluative Approach to Quality Assurance Policy Framework
8. Evaluation for Self-assessment
9. Policy and Guidelines for the Conduct of External Evaluation and Review
10. Tertiary Evaluation Indicators
11. The Targeted Review of Qualifications (TROQ)
12. a) NZQA and Mātauranga Māori
12. b) MMEQA Te Hono o te Kahurangi
13. Consequences of External Evaluation and Review and Risk Management
14. Education Amendment Act 2011
15. NZQA and Communications with the Tertiary Education Sector
16. External Evaluation and Review: The First Year
17. EER Two Years On
18. External Evaluation and Review: Pasifika PTEs
19. Evaluative Quality Assurance –Capability Building
20. EER Enhancements and NZQA's Uses of EER Results
21. NZQA International Quality Assurance Contacts and Offshore Quality Assurance Arrangements
22. NZQA-TEC Alignment
23. NZQA Commentary on the INQAAHE Guidelines of Good Practice in Quality Assurance
24. Information and Statistics on the New Zealand Tertiary Education Sector
25. Institutional Ownership of Quality through Self-Assessment (APQN paper)
26. Sample External Evaluation and Review Reports (4)
27. Gazetted Criteria for Programme Approval and Accreditation
28. Tertiary Education Strategy 2010-2015
29. NZQA Statement of Intent 2012-2015
30. NZQA Values
31. NZQA Client Charter
32. External Evaluator Personal Profile
33. eQuate –Sample Copies
34. QA News – Sample Copies
35. Quality Reassurance: An Analysis of Private Training Establishment External Evaluation and Review reports – draft (MOE)

## **Appendix Four: Consultation Meetings**

Consultation meetings were arranged by NZQA for the panel over the period 13 to 17 August 2012. The list below identifies those people that the panel met with in person to discuss the EQAF:

### **NZQA**

1. Dr Karen Poutasi, Chief Executive
2. Tim Fowler, Deputy Chief Executive Quality Assurance
3. Syd King, Principal Evaluation Advisor
4. Paul Stone, Manager Evaluation
5. Pani Bird, Lead Evaluator
6. Alex McKegg, External Lead Evaluator
7. Fleur Chauvel, External Lead Evaluator
8. Natalie Bourke, Senior Policy Analyst
9. Penny Hoy-Mack, Senior Policy Analyst
10. Tui Marsh, Strategic Relationship Manager-Māori
11. David More, Senior Policy Analyst
12. Eve McMahon, Advisor
13. Kathy Maclaren, Manager Service Delivery

### **Industry Training Federation**

1. Mark Oldershaw, Chief Executive, Industry Training Federation
2. Shaun Twaddle, Manager – Policy Development
3. Martin MacLean, EMQUAL Quality Manager / National Moderator

### **ITP Sector Representatives**

1. Rick Ede, Unitec Institute of Technology
2. Shirley Wilson, Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology
3. Tony Gray, Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology

### **Ministry of Education**

1. Sandy Brown, Chief Advisor
2. Colleen Slagter, Senior Policy Advisor
3. Roger Smyth, Senior Manager, Tertiary Sector Performance Analysis

### **NZQA Expert Advisory Group (2007-2008)**

1. Professor Gary Hawke, Director – Institute of Policy Studies
2. Dr Jane Davidson, Consultant

### **PTE Sector Representatives**

1. Yvonne Gray, Association for Emergency Care Training Providers
2. Feroz Ali, Pacific Islands Tertiary Education Providers of New Zealand
3. John Fiso, NZ Association of Private Education Providers
4. Paul Chalmers, The Indian Group
5. Neil Miller, Independent Tertiary Institutions
6. Darren Conway, English New Zealand

**Tertiary Education Commission**

1. Murray Johnson, Group Manager - ITP & Wānanga Investment Group
2. Graeme Cahalane, Manager – Tertiary Performance Group

**Wānanga Representatives**

1. Wiremu Doherty (Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi)
2. Kieran Hewitson (Te Wānanga o Aotearoa)

**Weltec (Institutional Visit)**

1. Alan Cadwallader, Academic Director