



# External Evaluation and Review Report

Canterbury International College  
Limited

Date of report: 19 January 2024

# About Canterbury International College Limited trading as New Zealand English Academy

---

*New Zealand English Academy (NZEa) provides English language programmes in collaboration with the Western Institute of Technology at Taranaki (WITT). The programmes are for international students who want to pathway to further study or study for community and personal goals.*

---

Type of organisation:	Private training establishment
Location:	WITT Te Pūkenga Campus, 20 Bell Street, Welbourn, New Plymouth
Eligible to enrol intl students:	Yes
Number of students:	International: two equivalent full-time students
Number of staff:	Two full-time equivalents

There have been significant changes to NZEA since the last EER. The Auckland and Christchurch campuses closed and staff were released. Current delivery is at the WITT Te Pūkenga Campus. The demographic of students has changed, so that students generally enrol with the aim of pathwaying to mainstream programmes at WITT. This single delivery site is quite recent, and currently enrolment numbers are small.

Some of the information and evidence relating to previous cohorts is limited in its scope. NZEA and WITT have a partnership agreement for the Certificate in General English with Examination Preparation (Level 3) [I.D 108968] Training Scheme that expires in December 2024. This agreement replaces two previous memoranda of understanding.

An application for transfer of shares to a sole shareholder was approved by NZQA in 2021.

TEO profile:	<a href="#">New Zealand English Academy</a> (provider page on NZQA website)
Last EER outcome:	Confident in educational performance and Confident in capability in self-assessment (July 2019)
Scope of evaluation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Certificate in General English with Examination Preparation (Level 3) [I.D 108968]</li><li>• International Students: Support and Wellbeing</li></ul>
MoE number:	7558
NZQA reference:	C52739
Dates of EER visit:	20 and 21 July 2023

# Summary of results

---

*The small team at NZEA has been successful in providing good quality education to international students through NZEA's one approved training scheme. There has been a significant change in direction since the last EER, with a strong focus on providing pathways for students. Early indications are that this change is positive for key stakeholders.*

---

## **Confident in educational performance**

- Recent cohorts of students show improvement in language skills and make gains in formal qualifications. These progressions enable students to make a successful transition to mainstream programmes. Previous cohort data from Auckland and Christchurch is not comprehensive.

## **Not Yet Confident in capability in self-assessment**

- Key stakeholders benefit from a collaborative agreement between NZEA and WITT. Students are study-ready for their new programmes and confident in their study environment. Transition arrangements between the two providers are well managed. Success rates in the mainstream programmes for these students is emerging.
- Academic and management staff work closely together to support the students. There is good evidence of some improvements to a self-assessment approach to support.
- NZEA has invested in a new student management system which provides improved scope for the capture and analysis of performance data. Data provided during the EER for the now closed Auckland and Christchurch campuses was incomplete.
- Management has shown ability in pivoting to new markets. Leadership and academic staff are capable and experienced in delivery. Internal moderation processes, although satisfactory, would benefit from some further external review.
- NZEA's self-assessment processes in managing compliance generally need strengthening.

# Key evaluation question findings<sup>1</sup>

## 1.1 How well do students achieve?

Performance:	<b>Good</b>
Self-assessment:	<b>Marginal</b>
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>There is good evidence that students improve their language skills and, in some cases, achieve qualifications. NZEA measures and reports on student progression in New Plymouth. Comparisons are made between placement tests, weekly tests, progress tests and end-of-course tests. Information on academic performance is stored on the student management system. IELTS<sup>2</sup> scores that are tracked pre- and post-course are generally positive and are benchmarked informally against previous cohorts. Extending the scope of comparison to other, similar providers would add value to self-assessment.</p> <p>Understanding academic performance in the previous iterations of delivery in the now closed Auckland and Christchurch campuses is restricted to completion data. However, the high completion rates recorded (above 90 per cent) are positive.</p> <p>Another good indicator of performance is gathered through the recording of attendance rates, with a strong 90 per cent average for all campuses. In addition, student satisfaction summaries, aggregated by year and campus, indicate that the needs of students are being well met. Students highly rate the quality of the teaching. There is an opportunity for NZEA to gather and analyse gains in soft skills development such as confidence and wellbeing.</p> <p>NZEA has recently developed a bespoke student management system which has a good range of fields and capability in reporting. This will improve the recording of data. Earlier delivery shows some inaccuracies in the recording of outcomes</p>

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

<sup>2</sup> International English Language Testing System

	(for example, withdrawals being recorded as graduate outcomes).
Conclusion:	Overall, students at NZEA achieve well. Students at the New Plymouth campus show good progression of skills and are reaching the required benchmarks for entry to further study. Self-assessment has improved from earlier delivery.

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

Performance:	<b>Good</b>
Self-assessment:	<b>Good</b>
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>Outcome indicators are highly positive. Most graduates of the courses of study have either gone on to further study or, anecdotally, have shown improved confidence in using English in everyday life. NZEA tracks student destinations and records them. In some cases, the records detail a wide range of pathway programmes.</p> <p>A smaller number of students complete the programmes and can demonstrate improved skills to access community services. The relevance of this approach to tracking graduate outcomes is justifiable given the change in circumstances of NZEA's delivery. It is also fit for purpose for a small organisation with very few students. However, further development of this self-assessment process would enable easily identifiable trends and, possibly, further longitudinal tracking of outcomes.</p> <p>Graduates of the New Plymouth campus have ready access to a wide range of mainstream programmes. Early indications of favourable outcomes for this cohort are positive. Of the four graduates, three have continued on to tertiary study within the region. NZEA is currently aiming for and succeeding in delivering a successful conversion rate of 60 per cent into further academic study within the region.</p> <p>As a key stakeholder, the WITT subsidiary benefits from enrolling study-ready students, who are already familiar with the environment and are better prepared for mainstream study.</p>

	NZEA is working with the local regional economic development agency to enable further outcomes for learners through some established and emerging pathways.
Conclusion:	Students at NZEA have reached favourable outcomes, in line with their needs and reasons for studying. Self-assessment has been mostly suitable for a small organisation. However, this is an area for future improvement.

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

Performance:	<b>Good</b>
Self-assessment:	<b>Good</b>
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>Students benefit from receiving individualised study and community-based learning which supports progression in language skills. Experienced and qualified teachers adjust delivery throughout the programme of study to raise levels of student performance. A good example of this is the well-researched and implemented intensive reading plan. While results are not recorded, teachers noted improvements in reading scores after completion of the programme.</p> <p>Feedback to students is well managed. There is regular testing, including a weekly revision test from the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) benchmarked textbook, a mid-course progression test and an end-of-course test. Students receive immediate feedback from teachers and, based on the interviews during the EER, are well versed on their areas of strength and areas for improvement. Students also receive performance reports monthly, which provide some commentary, noting areas for improvement and a performance rating.</p> <p>Moderation of assessments is satisfactory. However, this area of quality assurance could be strengthened. There is a regular process of internal pre- and post-assessment moderation which is well evidenced. This process could be made robust by extending the pool of moderators to include other external advice. There is also the opportunity to refine the recording of moderation. This will enable more chances for critical evaluation and professional development.</p>

	<p>Programme review is embedded within the annual review policies and procedures. Evidence relating directly to review is currently held within teachers' meeting minutes and is fit for purpose. This area of review will require more formalisation in the future. This would benefit from evidence of input from key stakeholders.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>A sound student-centred approach to delivering the programme of study is well suited to the needs of students and stakeholders. There is good evidence that the programme is well managed. Self-assessment processes, including those around moderation and programme review, could be strengthened.</p>

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

Performance:	<b>Excellent</b>
Self-assessment:	<b>Good</b>
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>NZEA has the appropriate policies and procedures designed to support the students. Systems are well managed and contribute to good outcomes for the students.</p> <p>Students benefit from regular, clear and informative feedback which supports their learning. A sound orientation process, which includes a welcome and familiarisation to WITT, identifies individual student needs and goals, and these are revisited during study. Students are supported into pathways in collaboration with WITT staff to ensure a confident and well-informed start to their mainstream programme. This includes students receiving pre-course material and learning subject-specific language pertinent to their mainstream programmes</p> <p>Students have access to a wide range of facilities, including a library, gym, café and accommodation. Any requests for further assistance, including welfare agencies on site at WITT, are supported by NZEA staff.</p> <p>Students apply their knowledge in a variety of contexts, and through well-designed and delivered activities they become familiar with the locality. Students receive culturally inclusive learning and take part in a te reo class.</p> <p>Regular student feedback provides evidence of high rates of satisfaction in a well-designed and comprehensive summary</p>



	<p>report to management. Responses to any potential concerns are reasonably well managed and evidenced. Earlier student feedback summaries from the Auckland and Christchurch campuses are also positive, particularly regarding the quality of teaching. Information on contributing factors that rate the quality of support and welfare is not included. High attendance rates and low withdrawals over all sites also suggests that students were and continue to be satisfied with the quality of education provision.</p> <p>Delivery during the Covid-19 lockdowns appears to have been well managed. However, there is little data or evidential files to support the understanding of how delivery supported the students during this time. This impacts the effectiveness of self-assessment.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Student support over recent delivery is well evidenced and effective at supporting the students to achieve their desired outcomes. Previous delivery is not as well evidenced but appears positive. Overall, recent student support and the self-assessment of its value has improved.</p>

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

Performance:	<b>Good</b>
Self-assessment:	<b>Marginal</b>
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>Since the last EER, NZEA management has set in place astute and effective strategic responses to an unstable economic and education environment, which involved forming a collaborative memorandum of understanding with WITT. The relationship benefits key stakeholders and helps to promote a sustainable business model. NZEA can utilise Te Pūkenga’s marketing infrastructure in addition to managing existing agent relationships. A sound business plan is in place which contains clear strategies to minimise risk.</p> <p>NZEA has a functional quality management system which is reviewed over a three-year period. Policies and processes are in line with delivery. NZEA is supported by an advisory group with appropriate skills and experience. The engagement currently focuses on setting up functions in New Plymouth, so there is scope for continued discussion and involvement regarding the</p>

	<p>quality of delivery. As an example, broadening the scope of external moderation would be a useful addition to quality management processes.</p> <p>Staff are experienced and suitably qualified. Systems are in place to support and monitor the performance of staff, i.e. mid-year informal appraisals as well as annual performance reviews. NZEA supports professional development such as attending first aid courses. Teacher observations are comprehensive and include areas for improvement. There is a clear and regular system of recorded meetings. Many of the processes are in the early days of implementation as the New Plymouth campus is essentially in a start-up mode of operation.</p> <p>The closures of the Auckland and Christchurch campuses prompted a rethink of management of delivery. The quality of the systems managing and supporting these two campuses seems appropriate. Evidencing their effectiveness is challenging for NZEA, as supporting data is not consistently clearly presented. As a result, a new student management system has been set up to improve capability in data collection and reporting. This provides NZEA with the opportunity to analyse and respond to reliable information.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>NZEA responded well to change by forming a positive collaboration with WITT. New systems are embedding and the outcomes from these changes are emerging. Current systems serve to support educational achievement.</p>

### 1.6 How effectively are important compliance accountabilities managed?

Performance:	<b>Marginal</b>
Self-assessment:	<b>Marginal</b>
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>Compliance management processes are mostly effective and well managed. The quality management system outlines policies, and these are reviewed regularly. There are no active complaints, and the complaints policy is clear and easily accessible for students. No disabled students have been reported since the last EER. This is an area of reporting which needs to be included in the quality management system to enable clear and accurate reporting.</p>

	<p>Documents are appropriate, including changes to mode of delivery, transfer of shareholding, site approvals and memoranda of understanding. An audit of student files undertaken during the EER raised no issues.</p> <p>NZEA submitted an attestation in 2022 for the Education (Pastoral Care of Tertiary and International Learners) Code of Practice) 2021. A self-review of the Code undertaken in 2022 presents a fair gap analysis of the safety and support processes available for students. Some further analysis of what NZEA regards as optimal performance and which areas can continue to be improved would strengthen self-assessment. This document should be accessible to the public.</p> <p>The few under 18-year-old students are well supported in line with policies and processes outlined in the quality management system. Reporting on under 18-year-old students should also feature in the Code of Practice self-review.</p> <p>NZEA has a management calendar which shows there are regular meetings. Management of compliance accountabilities would be a useful addition to this calendar and support prompt responses for submitting documents required by NZQA, and assist all staff to have a full understanding of accountabilities. NZEA's annual financial return had not been submitted within the five months allowed under NZQA's rules, an indication of the need for prompt management.</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>Managing compliance is an area where NZEA needs to show some improvement. While there were no significant issues noted during the EER, some further development of processes to support adhering to rules and requirements is needed.</p>

# Focus areas

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

## 2.1 Certificate in General English with Examination Preparation (Level 3)

Performance:	<b>Good</b>
Self-assessment:	<b>Marginal</b>

## 2.2 International Students: Support and Wellbeing

Performance:	<b>Good</b>
Self-assessment:	<b>Good</b>

# Recommendations

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

NZQA recommends that Canterbury International College Limited:

- Extend and formalise current moderation processes to provide further input and generate discussion around delivering and verifying the quality of assessments. Include professional development of academic staff in this quality assurance process.
- Consider extending the scope of the student feedback survey to capture student gains in soft skills.
- Develop and implement a policy for the reporting of students who identify as having a disability.
- Develop and implement a formalised system for managing compliance accountabilities which are visible and easily accessible by staff.
- Broaden the scope of the self-review of the Code of Practice to include information on provisions for under 18-year-old students. Consider using this self-review to identify areas for improvement and evaluate the effectiveness of systems. Provide, and make accessible to stakeholders, evidence of self-review against the Code of Practice.

# Requirements

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

There are no requirements arising from the external evaluation and review.

# Appendix

## Conduct of external evaluation and review

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

### *Disclaimer*

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

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

- *Identify organisational fraud<sup>3</sup>*
- *Provide comprehensive coverage of all programmes within a TEO, or of all relevant evidence sources*
- *Predict the outcome of other reviews of the same TEO which, by posing different questions or examining different information, could reasonably arrive at different conclusions.*

---

<sup>3</sup> NZQA and the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) comprehensively monitor risk in the tertiary education sector through a range of other mechanisms. When fraud, or any other serious risk factor, has been confirmed, corrective action is taken as a matter of urgency.

## Regulatory basis for external evaluation and review

*External evaluation and review is conducted under the Quality Assurance (including External Evaluation and Review (EER)) Rules 2022, which are made by NZQA under section 452(1)(t) of the Education and Training Act 2020 and approved by the NZQA Board and the Minister of Education.*

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

- *maintaining accreditation to provide an approved programme for all TEOs other than universities, and*
- *maintaining consent to assess against standards on the Directory of Assessment Standards for all TEOs but excluding universities, and*
- *maintaining micro-credential approval for all TEOs other than universities.*

*The requirements for participation and cooperation are set through the Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2022, the Consent to Assess Against Standards on the Directory of Assessment and Skill Standards Rules 2022 and the Micro-credential Approval and Accreditation Rules 2022 respectively.*

*In addition, the Private Training Establishment Registration Rules 2022 require registered private training establishments to undertake self-assessment and participate in external evaluation and review as a condition of maintaining registration.*

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

*This report reflects the findings and conclusions of the external evaluation and review process, conducted according to the Quality Assurance (including External Evaluation and Review (EER)) Rules 2022. 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](http://www.nzqa.govt.nz)). All rules cited above are available at <https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/about-us/our-role/legislation/nzqa-rules/>, while information about the conduct and methodology for external evaluation and review can be found at <https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/external-evaluation-and-review/>.*

NZQA

Ph 0800 697 296

E [qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz](mailto:qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz)

[www.nzqa.govt.nz](http://www.nzqa.govt.nz)

*Final*