



Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

External Evaluation and Review Report

Canterbury International College
Limited

Date of report: 12 March 2026

About Canterbury International College Limited trading as Kingston International English College (KIEC)

KIEC provides General English and IELTS¹ exam preparation to international students.

Type of organisation:	Private training establishment (PTE)
Location:	Level 7, 50 Albert Street, Auckland
Eligible to enrol international students:	Yes
Number of students:	International: at the time of the EER visit, there were 27 equivalent full-time students
Number of staff:	Seven full-time equivalents
TEO profile:	Kingston International English College
Last EER outcome:	<p>At the last EER in January 2024, Canterbury International College (then trading as New Zealand English Academy) was found to be Confident in educational performance and Not Yet Confident in capability in self-assessment.</p> <p>At that EER, NZQA recommended that Canterbury International College Limited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.

¹ International English Language Testing System

- 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 is 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.

There were no requirements made.

Scope of evaluation:

- Certificate in General English with Exam Preparation Training Scheme (Level 3) [ID 108968-2]
- International students - support and wellbeing

MoE number:

7558

NZQA reference:

C64523

Dates of EER visit:

On-site visit 7 August 2025, virtual 11 August 2025

Summary of results

KIEC students are gaining skills in using English confidently. Capability in self-assessment is inconsistent and there are significant gaps which impact performance negatively.

Not Yet Confident in educational performance

- Considering the organisation's tenure as a registered provider², KIEC is still at the early stages of being a well-recognised English language provider within the wider community of providers. Self-assessment is inconsistent in its effectiveness and quality and does not yet accurately reflect the strategic direction of KIEC.

Not Yet Confident in capability in self-assessment

- The small cohort of primarily lower-level English language students gain good value from a personalised approach to teaching and learning. Progression is relatively slow but in line with the demographic. There is some capability in collecting and recording data but is not yet clear how this data will be used to inform self-assessment to good effect.
- Measuring outcomes for students is challenging. Students are enrolled in the General English training scheme for long periods. Self-assessment processes are not yet well defined enough to ensure consistency in methodology or effectiveness.
- Programmes are fit for purpose and teachers are qualified and experienced. Student feedback is positive. Academic oversight will need to be improved should the numbers of students and staff increase.
- Student welfare is well managed at the individual level. KIEC lacks a clear, inclusive and measurable framework to guide staff in supporting the students.
- The management of KIEC has been involved in numerous significant changes in location,

² Canterbury International College Ltd was first registered as a private training establishment with NZQA on 10 April 2003.

student numbers and strategic purpose. This has had a negative impact on their ability to provide a coherent and consistent approach to managing and supporting the students.

- Management of key compliance accountabilities is poor. There are gaps in performance which fall below NZQA expectations and requirements. Self-assessment needs strengthening.

Key evaluation question findings³

1.1 How well do students achieve?

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Marginal
Findings and supporting	<p>Current students show measurable gains in confidence. Progression rates may, and in this case do vary.⁴</p> <p>KIEC conducts and records formative and summative assessment results every 12 weeks. The student management system shows good capability in tracking the students and analysing progression. However, performance information is currently at the individual student level, with only one student currently enrolled for over 12 weeks.</p> <p>Most students exit the programme at the same level they enrolled in. Feedback and information on student performance and improvements in skills are mostly restricted to teacher-led feedback. Students interviewed were capable of describing their linguistic strengths and weaknesses, and reported that their teachers provided sound information on their progress.</p> <p>Monthly student surveys show high levels of satisfaction with the teachers' proficiency and support. Confidence in using English rates highly. The inclusion of the confidence improvement barometer in the student survey answers one of the recommendations of the last EER report.</p> <p>Formal achievement and progress documents (six-weekly progress report and leaving certificate) are mostly useful to the reader by outlining 'can-do' statements.</p> <p>Overall, there are sufficient systems in play to gather information on student achievement, and staff are aware of their students' capabilities. Students are well informed</p>

³ The findings in this report are derived using a standard process and are based on a targeted sample of the organisation's activities.

⁴ KIEC has been operational for seven months, with the first enrolments taken in January 2025. Most students hold low-level beginner or elementary levels of English and are over 25 years of age. It is widely recognised in the English language sector that older, low English-level students acquire language competency at a slower rate than their younger peers.

	of their progress. Information on emerging ideas, concerns and trends in student progression are not held in management documents, and this limits the sense that student achievement is foremost in organisational self-assessment.
Conclusion:	KIEC has appropriate processes to measure and respond to student progression rates. However, there has not been sufficient time to measure effectiveness. Reporting and self-assessment of educational performance is at the teacher-student level. Managerial academic oversight of achievement is currently not well reported.

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

Performance:	Marginal
Self-assessment:	Marginal
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>Students make up two main cohorts: those who are studying with the aim of becoming more fully engaged in their community, and those with an educational pathway purpose. The former make up the majority of the total students studying. As stated in 1.1 above, nearly all students have a low level of English proficiency.</p> <p>There are eight graduates within the reporting range of this report. Of those, two have gone on to further tertiary-level study, and three have re-enrolled. The remaining graduates have generally returned to their home countries.</p> <p>Generally, there is scant information available on outcomes, or on how KIEC supports the students to work towards achieving their desired outcomes. An informal needs analysis done at orientation gives staff an indication of student goals. Currently, there is little evidence that these goals are revisited on graduation. There is, however, some good value gained in measuring increased confidence as a barometer of achievement. This is done at regular intervals during and after the course.</p> <p>Self-assessment Information on how KIEC gathers and responds to information on outcomes did not align with the evidence submitted and did not reflect the student demographic. Information and processes described were mostly aspirational.</p>

	<p>KIEC supplied agent feedback as evidence of stakeholder input and involvement. The agent survey is an environmental scan rather than a self-assessment activity gauging the value of outcomes and, consequently, has low significance as an indication of value gained.</p> <p>Graduate data did not completely align with student names. This reduces confidence in how well the student management data systems are being applied.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>There have been only a small number of graduates to track during this evaluation period. Systems and processes are not yet well defined or working effectively. Self-assessment information does not align with the current demographic and therefore has limited value. Students comment positively on their gains in confidence, which is a fair and valid indicator of improved outcomes.</p>

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

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Marginal
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>The programme and its delivery are well suited to the students. There is meaningful learning occurring outside the classroom and natural opportunities for specific teaching of anticipated areas of need. The classroom provides a safe place to rehearse language for use in everyday situations, for example catching the bus. KIEC has a relationship with a local marae and takes students for quarterly visits. Early indications are that the experience is positive for students and local iwi.</p> <p>Teaching resources are appropriate, and there is currently sufficient scope for students to follow a full programme of study without repeating a test. In the future this may be an issue, particularly for students who are very long-term enrolments. KIEC uses CEFR⁵-aligned student workbooks to support the curriculum. These provide teachers with pre-moderated summative assessments. Formative assessments are used as teaching tools and presented in</p>

⁵ Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.

	<p>less formal ways, for example through quizzes. Managing the moderation of student work is still emerging. KIEC has recently met with another provider to discuss best practice in moderation. Improving academic oversight of moderation should continue to be an area of focus for KIEC.</p> <p>Teaching and learning resources are kept in an online platform and have been recently reorganised. Programme review is at this stage informal but is appropriate given the duration of delivery.</p> <p>Teaching staff are highly valued by the students, and student feedback is positive. Teachers are qualified; however, the academic manager should consider enrolling in a higher-level qualification to support the management and guidance of staff and students.</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>Students are getting good value from their learning experience. The emphasis on 'real-life' learning benefits the students. Teachers are committed and well respected by the students. Higher-level academic oversight in managing the consistency of delivery and moderation needs attention, particularly with the projected growth in student numbers.</p>

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

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Marginal
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>Currently, the ratio of students to welfare staff at KIEC is high. This means there is ample access to staff to guide and support the students' learning experience in both their first language and English.</p> <p>Processes to support and orientate students on enrolment are sound. Orientation is well managed and provides students with key information. Staff enquire if there are any additional learning or pastoral support needs. To date, there have been no additional services reported as needed. The student handbook is basic and could do with more information on assessment, particularly for those students who have further education as a desired pathway. There is good connectivity and communication channels available to the students. Most students have enrolled through a local agent, and there was a record of this – and involvement by the agents in a commercial marketing survey on behalf of KIEC.</p> <p>There are enough processes in place to capture and respond to the student voice. Documents showed some evidence of oversight and response by the pastoral team following the monthly student feedback. Weekly staff meetings also enable any issues raised to be responded to in a timely manner. Reporting of areas where students may need additional support could be included in the student management system, which would supply information that is accessible at an organisational level.</p> <p>Staff knowledge of how to use and follow the Code of Practice was inconsistent across the pastoral care staff. Supporting organisational documents did not always provide a clear and accurate description of policy and processes. The Code of Practice self-review refers to several process documents as pieces of primary evidence of capability, but these are not in place, for example the cheating and plagiarism policy. The under-18-year-old student processes mentioned in the Code of Practice are not defined in the quality management system or the</p>

	<p>student handbook. Staff were unsure of what policy or process to follow in the event of a critical incident. The impact of the above is that welfare staff do not have a consistent framework on which to rely on and operate from. This puts both themselves and students at potential risk.</p> <p>Welfare staff were unaware of their job description, which makes self and organisational review of performance challenging. All staff would benefit from further professional development to support their roles.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>On an individual basis, the students are well cared for and supported at KIEC. Staff are obviously responding to the individual needs of the students, and all staff were confident in talking about how they did this. At an organisational level, documents do not align and there is missing information. Student pastoral care is not well managed, and staff would benefit from clarity around their roles, with measurable accountability.</p>

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

Performance:	Marginal
Self-assessment:	Poor
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>The small management team shows some capability at contributing to improved educational outcomes. The student management system is well designed and has the capability to capture key data. Key organisational processes, such as regular staff meetings, are in place and general administration looks well managed. The mid-year management document provides some information on strategic positioning, and there is emerging discussion of risk management. There is good evidence of some effective governance from the advisory board, for example the introduction to a marae visit. Student feedback is positive, and students enjoy their learning experience.</p> <p>Leadership capability is sufficient for the size, scale and scope of the current school. However, academic oversight needs strengthening; the role of the academic manager needs to be at a level above the teaching staff, and further professional development is recommended. Other staff</p>

	<p>would also benefit from further externally led training. Sustainability and succession planning are of concern to NZQA, particularly if the expected expansion in student numbers were to occur.</p> <p>Organisational documents do not always align and have either conflicting information or need development. For example, the improvement plan and the self-assessment and the quality management system do not align. Documents referred to are not yet developed. Developing key documents, such as job descriptions, will provide guidance and accountability measures for the staff. This indicates a lack of managerial cohesion and oversight. The evaluators noted during the on-site visit that staff were not always in agreement with organisational policies and processes.</p> <p>The self-assessment submitted to NZQA did not reflect the organisation. Evidential documents were not consistent. The quality of evidence supplied by KIEC to support claims was at times poor.</p> <p>The delivery site is attractive and well placed in commercial and retail Auckland.</p> <p>The evaluators noted that large physical spaces in which to teach students were at a minimum, and the sustainability of delivery in such a commercial venue is questionable should KIEC continue to grow at the current proposed rates.</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>Key organisational documents, policies and processes are not yet fully embedded. Consequently, self-assessment is inconsistent in quality and effectiveness. Staff engage well with the students and are well respected. Capability-building is strongly advised.</p>

1.6 How effectively are important compliance accountabilities managed?

Performance:	Poor
Self-assessment:	Poor
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>Compliance has not been well managed over the evaluation period. KIEC has a compliance calendar, although the PTE's capability in time management, planning and reporting continues to be of concern to NZQA.</p> <p>Documents required by NZQA have not been submitted on time, which led to the issuing of a compliance notice in 2024. KIEC has a history of late reporting or non-compliance in submitting requested information to ensure ongoing registration with NZQA. These include the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual financial return • Annual declaration • Student fee protection audit. <p>On receipt of the compliance notice, KIEC submitted all required financial documents to NZQA. However, at the time of writing this report, NZQA notes that the 2025 financial documents required to ensure ongoing registration are more than one month overdue.</p> <p>NZQA has some concern about the ongoing financial viability of KIEC. Interest in the current demographic of students, strategies employed to address the length of study, and sustainability of the delivery site have already been mentioned in this report.</p> <p>In addition, in 2024 KIEC was required, but failed, to submit an improvement plan to NZQA following the last EER report.</p> <p>KIEC has completed the required Tertiary and International Learners Code of Practice attestation and self-review. KIEC welfare staff have had some training in the Code and were able to give examples of how they offered support to their students. It was not clear from records, or from conversations, where KIEC felt there were areas where pastoral care processes could be reviewed and improved. NZQA recommends extending staff knowledge and understanding through external professional development.</p>

	<p>This includes professional development on supporting students who may have a disability.</p> <p>The Code of Practice self-review and the complaints and incidents policy and reporting are not currently on the website as required.</p> <p>Programme review is not yet formalised, but discussions are ongoing and they are at an appropriate place for the length of delivery.</p> <p>As mentioned, organisation documents are not well aligned. Other documents viewed, such as visas and insurance as part of the student file check, were well managed and maintained.</p> <p>During the on-site visit, KIEC informed the evaluators that students may on occasion join classes using an online platform. This was restricted to unwell students or those students who may be unexpectedly delayed overseas. KIEC must ensure that the current delivery of the programme meets with NZQA Programme Approval, Recognition and Accreditation Rules, 2025, as well as with international student visa requirements.</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>Since the last EER in January 2024, KIEC has failed to meet NZQA compliance requirements in a timely manner, and the PTE's compliance calendar has not been effective in guiding staff. Capability in self-assessment needs improvement. This is a repeat finding.</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 Exam Preparation Training Scheme (Level 3)

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Marginal

2.2 International students - support and welfare

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Marginal

Recommendations

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

NZQA recommends that Canterbury International College Limited trading as Kingston International English College:

- Strengthen academic oversight to accurately guide and support staff and students.
- Review and develop all organisation documents to accurately reflect KIEC's policies and processes, and provide an organisational framework from which to measure and respond to indicators of performance to inform and support effective self-assessment.
- Engage staff in external professional development and include staff in organisational development.
- Ensure that all compliance requirements are planned for and implemented on time.

Requirements

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

NZQA has several requirements for Canterbury International College Limited trading as Kingston International English College:

- KIEC has failed to comply with NZQA rules through its failure to submit required documentation on time. As of 6 October 2025, KIEC has failed to complete and submit to NZQA the following documents:
 - Document annual financial return, annual declaration, student fee protection audit.
 - Ensure the PTE remains financially sustainable and meets its financial reporting commitments, in line with rule 6.1.3(g) of the Private Training Establishment Rules 2025.
 - Under rule 6.1.3(g) of the Private Training Establishment Registration Rules 2022, NZQA requires the organisation to prepare and implement an improvement plan. The organisation must submit the improvement plan to NZQA.
 - Establish that adequate and effective processes for programme review are ongoing in accordance with Part 1, criterion 3 , 5 and 7 of rule 4.1 and 13.1(a) and 13.1(b) of the NZQF Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2025 and Section 452 of the Education and Training Act 2020.

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 fraud⁶*
- *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.*

⁶ 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 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). 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

www.nzqa.govt.nz