

Report of External Evaluation and Review

Bridge International College NZ
Limited

Confident in educational performance

Not Yet Confident in capability in self-assessment

Date of report: 28 August 2013

Contents

Purpose of this Report.....	3
Introduction	3
1. TEO in context.....	3
2. Scope of external evaluation and review	4
3. Conduct of external evaluation and review.....	4
Summary of Results	6
Findings	8
Recommendations	18
Appendix	19

MoE Number: 7375
NZQA Reference: C10690
Date of EER visit: 19 and 20 March 2013

Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this external evaluation and review report is to provide a public statement about the Tertiary Education Organisation's (TEO) educational performance and capability in self-assessment. It forms part of the accountability process required by Government to inform investors, the public, students, prospective students, communities, employers, and other interested parties. It is also intended to be used by the TEO itself for quality improvement purposes.

Introduction

1. TEO in context

Name of TEO:	Bridge International College NZ Limited (Bridge)
Type:	Private training establishment (PTE)
Location:	115 Queen Street, Auckland
First registered:	21 December 2000
Courses currently delivered:	General English and Bridge IELTS (International English Language Testing System) preparation
Code of Practice signatory:	Bridge is a signatory to the Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students and approved for students aged 14-17 and students aged 18 years and above. Approximately 10 per cent of all learners are under 18 years of age.
Number of students:	Domestic: none International: approximately 54
Number of staff:	Eight full-time and one part-time
Scope of active accreditation:	Bridge has accreditation to deliver and assess General English and the Bridge TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) courses.
Distinctive characteristics:	Seventy to 80 per cent of learners are from Japan and Korea. The remainder are from Europe, Saudi Arabia and South America. The majority of learners enrol for an average of 10-12 weeks and a good proportion are university students or graduates, either about to enter university, on a semester break or just completing university study.

Recent significant changes:	Bridge has been registered as a PTE since 2000. A new owner purchased the school in 2011. Since that time, new people have been appointed to all management and all bar one teacher positions.
Previous quality assurance history:	At the previous NZQA quality assurance visit in 2009, Bridge met all but one requirement of the quality standard, relating to immigration requirements for international students enrolled on one short course of less than three months. The issue was resolved.

2. Scope of external evaluation and review

A scoping meeting was held between the director of studies and the NZQA lead evaluator. Following this and a review of Bridge's self-assessment and other documentation, the following focus areas were agreed for inclusion in the external evaluation and review (EER):

- Governance, management, and strategy
- International student support

These are mandatory focus areas.

- All Programmes

All programmes are included in this focus area, specifically General English and the Bridge IELTS preparation courses. These courses encompass the entirety of the PTE's programmes.

3. Conduct of external evaluation and review

All external evaluation and reviews are conducted in accordance with NZQA's published policies and procedures. The methodology used is described fully in the web document Policy and Guidelines for the Conduct of External Evaluation and Review available at: <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/registration-and-accreditation/external-evaluation-and-review/policy-and-guidelines-eer/introduction>. 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.

The EER was conducted over two days by two evaluators. Interviews were conducted with the Bridge managing director, director of studies, general manager and administration manager. All permanent teaching staff (four full-time and one part-time) were interviewed. Approximately half the learners at Bridge were interviewed in person, and four graduates, two agents and an ex-teacher were

interviewed by phone. The EER included a review of a number of documents including learner progress documentation, a variety of internal evaluation surveys and meeting minutes, and management planning documentation.

Summary of Results

Statement of confidence on educational performance

NZQA is **Confident** in the educational performance of **Bridge International College NZ Limited**.

Bridge International College is a small English language school with a clear focus on enhancing the language acquisition skills and competence of its learners, most of whom are university students from Korea and Japan who enrol for study in the 12-week General English and Bridge IELTS preparation courses that are offered.

Overall, learners are progressing in their language development. In General English, 95 per cent of all learners progress to the next level before or by the end of the course. Learners, graduates and agents consistently record the highest level of satisfaction with the teaching and learning in the Bridge IELTS preparation course. Standardised testing occurs every four weeks in the General English course and weekly in IELTS. Use of an internationally recognised text, augmented with quality teaching and moderation, ensures learners are progressing in their English language skills.

Learners have a positive experience and are confident they are progressing in English acquisition, receive good value from the courses they have invested in and believe that Bridge takes their study and experience seriously. Overall, learners are satisfied and getting what they want from the General English and IELTS courses. Graduates say their English has improved greatly and that they are much more confident and able to communicate their needs to others and to solve the problems that occur in their daily lives in New Zealand.

Bridge's management is encouraged by the confidence that learners, agents and international partners have in the school. One indicator of this confidence is the significant and steady increase in student numbers in 2011 and 2012, and the confirmation of 40 learners from a university in Korea for a month's stay in 2014, following on from the positive experience of students from that university in 2012 and 2013. These increases have occurred despite the current economic environment and other global factors affecting English language schools, and are indicators that validate the confidence in the educational performance of Bridge.

A second indicator is the consistently high rating of Bridge's teachers by students in both General English and IELTS. Agents increasing their referrals to Bridge have done so because of consistent student praise of the Bridge teachers, most of whom have relevant postgraduate qualifications as well as seven or more years English language teaching experience. The teachers are strongly committed to teaching excellence and share expertise among themselves to enhance teaching practice where the school cannot afford the latest resources.

Bridge needs to strengthen the capability of the management team to ensure leadership in subject knowledge and programme coordination. In particular, the director of studies would benefit from an advanced qualification, as well as quality mentoring and expert performance appraisal for that role. Ultimately, the managing director needs to ensure that quality assurance of the teaching is robust and the effectiveness of all roles ensures the ongoing educational achievement of the learners.

Statement of confidence on capability in self-assessment

NZQA is **Not Yet Confident** in the capability in self-assessment of **Bridge International College NZ Limited**.

Self-assessment by Bridge is in development, as the director of studies develops systems, which are reliably monitored and reviewed, for assessing the school's performance in a range of areas by surveying key stakeholders. For example, regular surveys of learners, agents, graduates and teachers are used to measure satisfaction as well as sense of achievement, perceptions of teaching quality and the adequacy of resourcing and support.

However, the self-assessment processes used are most often process-focused and compliance-driven rather than focusing on student outcomes. This is somewhat to be expected as the owner and management have been in place for just two years and their experience and self-assessment practices are evolving. As a result, some activities are providing comprehensive and useful information, such as in the areas of understanding achievement and the quality of the teaching. However, not all priority areas of the school are being sufficiently reviewed. Measures of support and guidance for learners and their experience of the value of the outcomes are rudimentary and few clear conclusions can be drawn from the data obtained to effectively inform management decision-making.

While a lot of anecdotal information on Bridge's performance is available, attempts to validate this with more comprehensive and robust measures have been narrowly focused and the analysis is too shallow to provide sound information from which Bridge can make sound decisions or draw valid conclusions about its performance. Bridge has a good base on which to continue to develop its capability in self-assessment and would benefit from systematically completing the cycle of self-review to validate the effectiveness of improvements in outcomes and learner experience, which are anecdotally evident.

Findings¹

1.1 How well do learners achieve?

The rating for performance in relation to this key evaluation question is **Good**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this key evaluation question is **Adequate**.

The large majority of international students enrolled at Bridge reported good progress in the development of their English language skills. Learners are more confident in their everyday use of English and have noted improvement since first enrolling. Bridge understands how well learners are achieving through regular and formal testing of skills acquisition, analysis of the progress of learners from one level to another, teacher observation and learner and agent feedback.

Learner achievement in General English is formally tested through the use of standardised testing from an internationally recognised text, the results of which are discussed by teachers and the director of studies comprehensively and reliably. The same core text is used for testing all levels of English language, and an internal benchmark is used as a guide to inform placement of the individual learner into the appropriate level.

The testing and assessing of learners' progress is sound. Testing occurs every four weeks and is pre- and post-moderated to ensure consistency in testing. At weeks four and eight, testing formally tracks progress in areas of grammar and listening, and the student's placement is reviewed to ensure each student has an optimum opportunity to learn. Teachers provide further perspectives on each student as to the accuracy of the test results and the development of other language skills. A final comprehensive test at week 12 assesses all areas of language acquisition and provides an objective measure to inform decision-making about the ongoing placement of each learner. Approximately 95 per cent of learners progress to a higher English language level, either at the week four or eight assessment or after having completed the 12-week course and assessment.

Speech is tested at week 12. This may be a gap as Bridge has identified that 95 per cent of learners indicate at enrolment that pronunciation is a priority skill they wish to develop, and some students wanted more frequent opportunities to talk with native English speakers. Providing testing of this language skill prior to week 12, which is the end of the course, would benefit learners and teachers to formally understand their progress in this area.

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

The 12-week IELTS course provides weekly testing and results are discussed with learners. In addition, anecdotally Bridge receives feedback that IELTS learners are achieving well, through agent surveys and feedback, learners returning to enrol in IELTS and the consistently top ratings and feedback from learners about the teaching and content. Bridge graduates interviewed reported greater achievement at Bridge than at other English language schools they had attended. There is only informal tracking or comparison with the actual IELTS testing that learners undertake. Formal tracking of results would provide an opportunity to further validate and inform the teaching of the IELTS programme at Bridge.

IELTS and General English learners know how they are progressing formally, as test results are shared with learners and the class analyses the test results. Teacher observations of the language acquisition of learners are formally documented at each assessment point. The director of studies reviews all individual learner assessment results and they are discussed at weekly teacher meetings, which is good practice. However, gathering systematic information as to how well learners believe they are progressing in language skill acquisition, compared with their anticipated or actual experience of achievement, would strengthen Bridge's overall understanding of learner achievement.

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

The rating for performance in relation to this key evaluation question is **Good**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this key evaluation question is **Adequate**.

A feature of the learners at Bridge is that the majority, 70-80 per cent, are from Japan or Korea. Most are about to enter university, are on a semester break or have just completed undergraduate university studies. They are serious about language acquisition and have clear expectations that developing these skills will lead ultimately to an improved likelihood of gaining employment in their country of origin and internationally. Overwhelmingly, these learners believe that in order to work for multinational companies and to make their work and study skills more transferable, gaining confidence and skill in the use of English is a significant factor. More immediately, all learners want to enjoy their stay in New Zealand, and being able to communicate socially is an important factor in that experience.

Bridge understands well the outcomes that are most important to learners and stakeholders and works well to support learners to improve in confidence and skill in English to meet these outcomes. This is evidenced formally in the very high satisfaction feedback on teacher performance from learners and agents, and in exit surveys by graduates. Bridge's student management system shows a significant increase in learner numbers in 2011 and 2012, and retention of these learners, and includes information from daily interactions between support staff and learners, the

numbers of learners re-enrolling, extending study and recommending the college, and from unsolicited emails, Facebook comments and visits from graduates.

Bridge formally reviews all surveys to understand learners' perspectives on the value of the course and their experience. However, the learner survey is rudimentary and no clear conclusions on programme value or ways to improve the programmes can be drawn from the questions asked. Opportunities that are present to validate the supporting anecdotal evidence are not systematic or fully utilised. For example, Bridge has established a partnership with a Korean university that sends engineering students to the University of Auckland to study; these students attend Bridge in the afternoon for General English. This arrangement occurred in 2012 and 2013, and the Korean university has again confirmed that 40 learners will attend Bridge for one month of General English in 2014. This is a significant number of learners for Bridge and implies a high level of satisfaction from both a reputable university and the engineering learners. However, feedback obtained from these students by Bridge is insufficient to either validate the experience or provide information with which to improve the educational achievement of this group of learners.

Overall, learners and stakeholders are achieving well in their English language skills and believe they receive good value. This view was confirmed by a previous Bridge teacher and agents. The two agents interviewed had strong confidence in Bridge's ability to deliver quality teaching and outcomes for learners, and had increased their referrals accordingly. However, Bridge needs to review its self-assessment activities with a view to being clear about the purpose and uses of the information collected, to ensure activities and processes are relevant and sufficiently comprehensive to validate and/or enhance the experience of learners and their perception of Bridge.

1.3 How well do programmes and activities match the needs of learners and other stakeholders?

The rating for performance in relation to this key evaluation question is **Good**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this key evaluation question is **Adequate**.

As a small English language school, Bridge delivers courses that are most relevant to the learners, who on average enrol for 10-12 weeks and have specific goals as to the language level they wish to attain.

Bridge has a number of monitored processes that occur at entry and throughout the courses to inform it of learner needs. These include: four-weekly progress assessments; identifying and recording learner goals at entry and providing teachers with that information; checking learners' needs during class and in weekly teacher meetings; monthly learner surveys and an exit survey; quarterly staff surveys; and an annual agent survey. The information from these sources is

collated by the director of studies and discussed by the teaching staff, director of studies and management at regular meetings. These are good processes, and the discussions in particular provide some good information which Bridge uses to improve aspects of the courses offered.

Bridge has very experienced teachers with small class sizes, mostly around 10 learners, with a maximum of 15. Teachers constantly monitor learners' needs in class and initiate suggestions for learners to further develop and extend themselves. The director of studies and some teachers are available to provide further tuition after classes for learners, which is appreciated. Learners are asked monthly specifically about the opportunities to practise all language skills in class, and the feedback is discussed between the director of studies and the teacher. All courses are rated highly in the area of course delivery, teaching and opportunities to practise skills, and learners enrolled in the IELTS preparation course consistently report the highest satisfaction.

Teachers, the director of studies and learners confirm that there have been changes in classroom activities that have improved the experience of learners. One significant example is the recent introduction of a new core text. Teachers were recognising that the previous practice of alternating core texts was useful if learners repeated a class level, but as this was rare they recommended another text to the director of studies. Recent surveys of staff and feedback at weekly meetings indicate that teachers are finding the new core text excellent. Approved features include the review of previously taught skills and increased opportunities for practising vocabulary. Learners each have their own copy of the text to use while studying. While they have not specifically been asked about the change in the use of texts, learner surveys indicate high levels of satisfaction with the current text.

Each learner's placement is reviewed one week after entry by the teacher and director of studies. There is movement of less than five per cent at that time, indicating that the placement test and interview are accurate at initially identifying the appropriate placement for each learner. Learners interviewed felt that they were well placed. The results from testing at week 12 determine the level that a learner in General English may move to. Learners are able to request a move outside of this process, and test options are available for learners who enrol for less than four weeks. These opportunities meet the needs of the variety of learners for gauging their progress and ensuring they remain in the most suitable class for their skill development.

Although self-assessment activities occur reliably, the information gathered is not always utilised sufficiently to improve possible outcomes for learners. For example, while the goals of learners are identified and recorded at entry and then shared with the teachers, subsequent use of that information varies between teachers, and it is not revisited by the director of studies or imported into the exit survey for review.

As Bridge is a small school, with the vast majority of learners being Korean or Japanese, not all learners feel they are getting exposure to as wide a variety of

nationalities as they might like. Therefore, following the General English course a number of learners enrol in IELTS courses elsewhere. Bridge management is aware of this pattern, but also that some learners are returning or feeding back that they recognise the advantages of the strong academic and work focus aspects of Bridge for learners who are serious about language acquisition. Purposeful self-assessment of this pattern may provide information that will inform Bridge as to how courses and activities can be improved to further support educational achievement as well as meet the social goals of learners in all courses.

Bridge appears to have strong relationships with agents and works to ensure that the services to students meet agents' quality expectations.

1.4 How effective is the teaching?

The rating for performance in relation to this key evaluation question is **Good**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this key evaluation question is **Adequate**.

The teaching at Bridge is very effective and demonstrated through the achievement of learners who progress to advanced classes and have a positive learning experience. Agents, previous students and management attributed the increase in the number of learners enrolling at Bridge to the quality of the teaching.

Opportunities occur reliably to gather information from learners and others about the effectiveness of the teaching and about how the teaching and Bridge can improve, through quarterly staff surveys, regular student surveys and weekly teacher meetings where learner achievement and non-achievement are discussed comprehensively. Learner surveys ask specifically about the class structure, lesson content and professional skills of the teacher. These information-gathering activities occur systematically and are comprehensive enough to gather reliable and useful information that informs teachers, the director of studies and management about the quality of the teaching at Bridge. Evidence of the effectiveness of the actual changes is limited in that the analysis of the data collected is too shallow to validate whether programme changes have led to improved outcomes for learners.

All teachers are in permanent positions; four are full-time and two part-time (including the director of studies, who teaches part-time). All teachers are very well qualified, some with high-level qualifications that pertain specifically to teaching English. In addition, most have at least eight years experience of teaching English, both internationally and in New Zealand. Teachers said they are more than adequately resourced in general and feel listened to by management who are responsive.

Bridge utilises a standard core text which is internationally recognised. It provides an excellent resource which teachers supplement from their own knowledge and experience. Teachers participate in the pre- and post-moderation of all testing.

There is a collaborative teaching team, who share resources and are creative, with new ideas to support each other in a collegial environment. Regular professional development occurs reliably in-house, has topics of interest and utilises the expertise of skilled staff. However, there is no gap or strengths analysis occurring to target professional development, which is especially important for highly skilled teachers to further support and stimulate professional development that might lead to improved teacher effectiveness. The teachers felt that professional development needed to occur more often and to include external expert input.

The director of studies has been promoted from within Bridge and is highly regarded by teachers, management and learners. All stakeholders reported high levels of confidence in the support provided by the director of studies, and in the changes that have been occurring since his appointment in 2011. Changes have included revision of the syllabus, addition of checklists and formal documentation to improve monitoring of learners and their achievement, and support for teacher requests such as the change in the core text. However, the director of studies has limited qualifications and experience for this role and his position is split between teaching and the director of studies role. These limitations are significant as the director of studies is required to manage qualified staff and conduct their performance reviews, offer leadership in subject knowledge, coordinate programme development and provide quality assurance of all teaching. The director of studies and management are aware of these limitations but as yet have no clear strategy to address them.

1.5 How well are learners guided and supported?

The rating for performance in relation to this key evaluation question is **Good**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this key evaluation question is **Adequate**.

Identification of the support needs of learners is the collective responsibility of all staff at Bridge, who have all lived and worked internationally. Learner support is taken very seriously, especially for under-18-year-olds. Each management team member is responsible for supporting a specific group of learners as a key function of their position, and all take this role seriously.

Learner support relies on staff observation and learner self-identification. There are expectations that management engages with specific groups, and this is appropriate for a small language school where the majority of learners are young adults. Staff members genuinely care about the students and Bridge's systems rely on the caring nature and approachability of individual staff. However, the support processes are not systematically reviewed to ensure all learners are reliably accessing or being offered support. Regular staff and learner surveys are also used as an indicator of the satisfaction of the support provided; however, these surveys are limited and are not capturing specific information about learner support. Self-assessment as to the sufficiency of these processes needs further review to

validate the direct positive feedback from learners, and to provide a management perspective on the quality of the actual support provided to all learners.

This small language school is described by students as having a family atmosphere, with a small number of learners and a high staff-to-student ratio. There are approximately 50 learners to nine management and teaching staff, eight of whom are full-time, where facilities, other than classrooms, are open-plan and centralised and shared by staff and learners. These features of Bridge facilitate constant engagement of staff and learners throughout the day. The general manager is seated at reception from 9.00am to 5.00pm daily as a key support for Japanese learners and those under 18 years of age in particular, but is also available to all learners. The opportunity to sight and engage with every learner repeatedly throughout the day, especially as they arrive and leave, increases access to and observation of learners by the general manager. The managing director and operations manager are located near reception and have an open-door policy. Learners commented that Bridge is very responsive to identified problems, which are mostly addressed the same day.

Bridge management appears to be doing everything to comply with the Code of Practice and provides the expected support and guidance for learners, including airport pick-up and orientation and social activities, and monitors immigration requirements such as visas and insurance. Bridge utilises the services of a homestay company to carry out quality and safety checks and visits. In the case of learners under 18 years of age, Bridge also visits homestays to confirm that the monitoring is occurring and any issues are identified quickly. Bridge has a manageable pool of homestays, the majority of which have been used by Bridge for many years.

With the small number of learners aged under 18 years – less than 10 per cent – Bridge provides additional opportunities for support through frequent text messaging, and each learner is engaged daily on site. Attendance is monitored closely for indications of problems. The director of studies and managing director interview these younger learners at specific times during their enrolment and communicate with guardians monthly.

There is no female counsellor on staff or who is accessible for the female students, who make up half of the learner population. This is an area that needs to be considered for improvement, as culturally and socially for some women, especially if aged under 18 years, having access to a male only for support may be a barrier to accessing fully the support Bridge can offer learners.

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

The rating for performance in relation to this key evaluation question is **Adequate**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this key evaluation question is **Adequate**.

The current owner and all management personnel have been at Bridge for two years. All have 10 years or more experience in the English language sector in New Zealand and overseas, variously in the areas of marketing and teaching. Bridge has a very shallow management structure which suits the size and function of the organisation. Communication is very good as all teachers (except one) and management are full-time and share the facilities. Opportunities for input into the operation and functions of the college occur through informal discussions daily plus regular meetings. Collated survey and achievement data provides a basis for discussions which include reviews of learner achievement, and this data informs decision-making. The process for decision-making is effective; the managing director is willing to be challenged and also to be decisive, as evidenced in the prioritising and purchasing of resources.

The management at Bridge is hard-working and genuinely committed to and interested in the progress of the learners, and there are good processes to ensure the efficient operation of the school. However, there is a gap in education expertise which the evaluators consider to be significant. To keep abreast of changes that are occurring in the English language school environment, Bridge relies mostly on receiving notification from statutory and compliance bodies such as Immigration New Zealand and NZQA. This reliance on external bodies is a risk. Bridge needs to be proactive in understanding and anticipating changes in the sector, including legislation, to ensure sufficient time, resources and capacity to respond in a timely way to those changes that may have a significant impact on a small language school. Examples are the introduction of New Zealand certificate English on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework and the ability of Bridge to continue to deliver current courses offered into the future.

Internally, Bridge relies largely on the educational expertise of the director of studies who, although an experienced teacher and well respected by staff, is not sufficiently qualified or experienced for the role. Bridge does not have a mentor or active plan to support the director of studies in developing in this role. Performance appraisal occurs quarterly for teachers and annually for management. The process is described as useful by the teachers; however, the director of studies' performance appraisal is completed by the managing director whose skill set is not in education and who does not have the expertise to determine the effectiveness with which the role is performed, except to check that the processes outlined in the quality management system are completed.

The managing director has an ongoing relationship with another English language school which is useful and provides some support for the role of owner and director. Bridge would benefit from purposefully developing this relationship further, seeking expert advice or mentoring, and actively planning to build capacity in the management team and improving the overall capability of Bridge to ensure the ongoing educational performance of the learners.

The cohesive team at Bridge is genuinely focused on quality management as distinct from quality improvement. In general, quality assurance, including systems and practices, is process-focused rather than outcomes-focused. This is to be expected to some extent, as with all new staff in management and teaching positions, the structure, mission and planning are still being embedded. There are a number of self-assessment activities whose purpose is significantly compliance and monitoring. While that focus is useful and necessary, analysis of the data that is collected formally is too shallow to provide opportunities for Bridge to make wide-ranging improvements. Where there is an abundance of anecdotal data, including student feedback, this has not been harnessed sufficiently or systematically to provide useful and robust information with which to guide the organisation's decision-making. There are some good initiatives and Bridge has a good base on which to build a comprehensive self-assessment structure going forward.

Focus Areas

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

2.1 Focus area: Governance, management and strategy

The rating in this focus area for educational performance is **Adequate**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this focus area is **Adequate**.

2.2 Focus area: International student support

The rating in this focus area for educational performance is **Good**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this focus area is **Adequate**.

2.3 Focus area: All Programmes

The rating in this focus area for educational performance is **Good**.

The rating for capability in self-assessment for this focus area is **Adequate**.

Recommendations

NZQA recommends that Bridge International College Limited review its self-assessment activities to ensure the purpose is clear, and to enable better collection and analysis of data to improve outcomes for learners.

Appendix

Regulatory basis for external evaluation and review

Self-assessment and external evaluation and review are requirements of programme approval and accreditation (under sections 249 and 250 of the Education Act 1989) for all TEOs that are entitled to apply. The requirements are set through the Criteria for Approval and Accreditation of Programmes established by NZQA under section 253(1)(d) and (e) of the Act and published in the Gazette of 28 July 2011 at page 3207. These policies and criteria are deemed, by section 44 of the Education Amendment Act 2011, to be rules made under the new section 253.

In addition, for registered private training establishments, the criteria and policies for their registration require self-assessment and external evaluation and review at an organisational level in addition to the individual programmes they own or provide. These criteria and policies are also deemed, by section 44 of the Education Amendment Act 2011, to be rules made under section 253. Section 233B(1) of the Act requires registered PTEs to comply with these rules.

NZQA is responsible for ensuring non-university TEOs continue to comply with the rules after the initial granting of approval and accreditation of programmes and/or 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 EER process approved by the NZQA Board.

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).

Information relevant to the external evaluation and review process, including the publication Policy and Guidelines for the Conduct of External Evaluation and Review, is available at: <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/registration-and-accreditation/external-evaluation-and-review/policy-and-guidelines-eer/introduction/>

NZQA

Ph 0800 697 296

E qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz

www.nzqa.govt.nz