External Evaluation and Review Report

Longlas Limited trading as Innovative Hospitality

Date of report: 11 February 2020

About Longlas Limited trading as Innovative Hospitality

Innovative Hospitality provides unit standard training in food safety and towards the Licence Controller Qualification (LCQ). The two LCQ unit standards are prerequisites for a Manager's Certificate at publicly licensed premises.

Type of organisation:	Private training establishment (PTE)
Location:	237 North Manakau Road, Levin
Code of Practice signatory:	No
Number of students:	Data for 2016-2018 shows that annually around 500 individuals will complete the half-day food safety unit standard training with Innovative Hospitality.
	The data also shows that, annually, 800-900 individuals will complete the full-day LCQ unit standards training with Innovative Hospitality.
	Collectively, this level of participation equates to an indicative enrolment basis of 40 equivalent full-time students.
	Participant demographic data (2018):
	• around 12 per cent in LCQ and 18 per cent in food safety are Māori
	• around 32 per cent in LCQ and 35 per cent in food safety are Asian
	• around 55 per cent in LCQ and 58 per cent in food safety are female
	• around 40 per cent in LCQ and 23 per cent in food safety are aged under 25.
Number of staff:	1.5 full-time equivalents
TEO profile:	See Longlas Limited
Last EER outcome:	Confident in educational performance, Confident

in capability in self-assessment

Scope of evaluation: All current delivery, including:

- Training Scheme – Licence Controller Qualification (LCQ) (Level 4); unit standards 4646 and 16705

- Food Safety – unit standards 167 and 168

- Food Safety

MoE number: 8357

NZQA reference: C37070

Dates of EER: 3 December 2019[1]

---

[1] Held at NZQA offices, Wellington.

Summary of Results

Innovative Hospitality is effective in delivering unit-standard based training in food safety and for liquor licence qualifications.

Confident in educational performance

- Innovative Hospitality is effective in delivering its current range of unit standard training in food safety and LCQ. There are few gaps or weaknesses, with unit standard competencies being demonstrated by nearly all learners. These outcomes are useful and relevant to employment contexts.

- Innovative Hospitality is generally strong in matching its programmes with the needs of participants and other stakeholders, including employers.

Confident in capability in self-assessment

- There is scope to develop a renewed professional development programme, to ensure all staff/subcontractors are appropriately supported in their teaching practice.

- In the context of limited unit standard delivery, performance is generally strong. Any growth in the breadth of delivery will likely require a more extensive approach to internal quality assurance and self-reflective practice. Incoming owners will need to ensure systems to develop and maintain professional development are embedded in future delivery.

Key evaluation question findings[2]

1.1 How well do students achieve?

Performance:	**Excellent**
Self-assessment:	**Good**
Findings and supporting evidence:	Innovative Hospitality's self-review reports that 98 per cent of fully enrolled participants are able to demonstrate competencies against the unit standards at the conclusion of their training days.[3] [4] This is a positive outcome. This result reflects the type of training presently offered by Innovative Hospitality, namely: - half-day or full-day guided training focused on demonstrating competencies against one or two unit standards (as opposed to more exploratory and extended educational delivery) - work-related learning whereby participants are largely in the workforce; and unit standard competencies are aligned with standard workplace practices and regulatory guidance. This means participants typically have a strong pre-existing level of familiarity with the learning outcomes sought. Innovative Hospitality gathers evaluations from all training participants. These were sighted for this evaluation and generally show participants valued both their learning outcomes and the way Innovative Hospitality conducted training. This finding is congruent with direct calls to former participants undertaken for this evaluation. Participants said they considered the training highly useful and relevant for their work and that they enjoyed the training approach and style of the tutor.

---

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

[3] In this instance, fully enrolled participants means those people who have had their relevant training fees paid (normally by their employers).

[4] As the provider does not receive government funding, grants outcome data cannot be checked against Tertiary Education Commission datasets.

Final

Conclusion:	Innovative Hospitality is highly effective in delivering its current range of unit standards in food safety and LCQ. There are few gaps or weaknesses, with unit standard competencies being demonstrated by nearly all learners. These outcomes are useful and relevant to employment contexts.

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

Performance:	**Excellent**
Self-assessment:	**Good**
Findings and supporting evidence:	The food safety unit standard training delivered by Innovative Hospitality has high relevance to the hospitality sector as it is one means for public food providers to help ensure their compliance with the Food Safety Act 2014. This means participants who complete this training with Innovative Hospitality improve their knowledge of how to meet regulatory standards in this sector.

The LCQ training scheme delivered by Innovative Hospitality has high relevance to the hospitality sector as the scheme is a prerequisite for a person wishing to obtain a Manager's Licence at a licensed premise.

In addition to positive participant feedback already noted (refer 1.1), other positive stakeholder feedback about Innovative Hospitality was directly provided by five employers and one district licensing board. All of these entities considered that Innovative Hospitality's training was fit for purpose and relevant to their sectors. In particular, the tutoring competency of the key trainer in delivering the training was again noted.

Innovative Hospitality's self-assessment materials also identify that for both sets of training there is value to the wider society via harm minimisation and prevention. Interviews conducted for this evaluation support that conclusion. |
| Conclusion: | Innovative Hospitality is highly effective in meeting stakeholder needs in relation to delivering unit standards in food safety and LCQ. Stakeholders generally seek regulatory compliance and there are very few gaps or weaknesses in this delivery in that regard. |

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:	**Good**
Findings and supporting evidence:	*Learning materials* For the delivery of food safety unit standards training, Innovative Hospitality has developed its own delivery materials. Some material has in the past also been translated into Mandarin to assist Chinese-speaking participants. The evaluation team sighted the teaching materials for these unit standards and noted alignment with the required learning competencies.[5] For the delivery of LCQ unit standards, ServiceIQ (industry training organisation) learning materials are used. In addition to its own materials, Innovative Hospitality provides participants with a range of related resources produced by the Ministry for Primary Industries (for food safety) and the Health Promotion Council (for LCQ). This is a good practice and provides participants with useful material that they reportedly take to their workplaces (along with their course books). *Teaching* Both trainers have a Certificate in Adult Education, and during the evaluation were able to outline their classroom strategies and teaching methodologies (for example peer review, warm-up exercises, 'fun'-based learning, demonstrations). As noted (refer 1.1 and 1.2), there is evidence of positive feedback from participants on how the training is delivered by key staff. Both the half-day and one-day training requires significant unit standard credit uptake during the day. When queried on this, one trainer said that 'accelerated learning' was used to ensure this could occur; however, neither evidential examples of this pedagogy or detailed theoretical explanation was provided to support this statement. Notwithstanding, this level of credit uptake was seen as achievable by trainees spoken to for this EER. No educational training/professional development had been undertaken over the last few years by either trainer. Informal

---

[5] For English language materials only.

	peer support was in place, but formal internal moderation was not occurring.
	Accordingly, it is likely Innovative Hospitality could benefit from tuition staff receiving greater professional development on pedagogical matters, including teaching and learning strategies and internal moderation. In particular, Innovative Hospitality may need to reflect on the teaching approach of not providing materials in advance of the training programme to registered participants, as this likely reduces the opportunity for early absorption and reinforcement of desired learning outcomes.
	Each scheduled training session has no more than 25 participants, although many sessions are smaller (with 12 being a notional average). In addition, Innovative Hospitality also provides individual, self-paced training and specialist training within workplace settings. These two supplementary options provide access for a greater range of participants and allow for an appropriate degree of customisation. One stakeholder, for example, noted that workplace learning of this nature had allowed a group of refugees to gain food safety unit standards as a stepping-stone towards settling in New Zealand.
	Assessment
	Open book assessment is used for the unit standards delivered. All assessments are developed (and pre-moderated) by ServiceIQ. Examples of marked assessment were sighted showing independent participant workings.
	Innovative Hospitality has clear assessment guidance and policies. For participants who need assistance, and only based on their unique needs, a 'writer' option is available for assessment. Where this occurs (which is infrequently) records indicate this, allowing for further external verification if required.
	Innovative Hospitality also satisfied external moderation requirements in 2018, and there are no open issues arising.[6]
Conclusion:	Innovative Hospitality is generally strong in matching its programmes (design, delivery and assessment) with the needs of participants and other stakeholders. There is scope to develop a renewed professional development programme, to ensure all staff/subcontractors are appropriately supported in their teaching

[6] There was an external moderation matter arising between this provider and an external moderator in 2016/2017. However, this related to cookery assessments which are no longer offered by Innovative Hospitality.

Final

	practice. Formal internal moderation and classroom observations are recommended as components of such development.

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

Performance:	**Good**
Self-assessment:	**Good**
Findings and supporting evidence:	Innovative Hospitality is presently a provider of half-day or one-day training. In this context, evidence of appropriate student support was provided, including:
	• a clear induction session
	• special assistance, including (where appropriate) for second-language English speakers
	• tutor awareness of barriers to learning (examples of hearing impairment and fatigue were given)
	• written assistance for assessments (where the need for this is shown)
	• provision of supplementary learning materials (refer 1.3)
	• supplementary (and without cost) additional support if needed, including re-enrolment in training programmes.
	Innovative Hospitality does not collect, prior to enrolment, information on any potential barriers to learning or information on English language skills. This information may be of benefit to ensure any learning issues are identified early.
Conclusion:	Innovative Hospitality generally provides suitably effective student support for its context (training programmes of one day or less). Gathering further initial information on any potential learning barriers for participants is recommended.

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

Performance:	**Good**
Self-assessment:	**Good**
Findings and supporting evidence:	*Strategic direction* Innovative Hospitality has reduced the scope of its training since the 2016 EER. Throughout 2018 and 2019, Innovative Hospitality has contained its formal educational offer to four unit standards. Since the last EER (2016), subcontractors used to deliver programmes have fallen from three to one (and one director is involved in delivery). At the time of the EER, the company was being sold, and the new (incoming) directors were seeking approval from NZQA to carry on formal training. This transition will mean new trainers will be recruited to replace the existing tutoring staff. A management transition plan has commenced. It will be important for the incoming management team to develop a revised strategic plan that outlines approaches to supporting the educational achievement of programme participants. *Quality assurance approach* With its reduced offer, Innovative Hospitality has also reduced the scope of its quality management system and range of policies. However, key policies requested for this EER were evidenced, including the student complaints policy (which accords with student guidance materials) and assessment policy. Policies sighted were appropriate in the organisational context. One director has assumed the key academic-administrative role, to ensure unit standard recording is timely and accurate, and to ensure all compliance requirements are met. *General support* The directors say there are no open or serious complaints from programme participants and no broader legal or ethical issues arising. Staff/subcontractor communications indicate they feel valued and supported; although, as noted (refer 1.3), there has been no or very limited professional development in recent years. Going forward, Innovative Hospitality will need to ensure staff/subcontractors are part of a single integrated tuition

	workforce – with regular team engagements and support – in order to maintain consistency and quality in the delivery of unit standards.
Conclusion:	In the context of limited unit standard delivery, performance is generally strong at this time. Any growth in the breadth of delivery will likely require a more extensive approach to internal quality assurance and self-reflective practice. Incoming owners will need to ensure systems to develop and maintain professional development are embedded in future delivery.

1.6 How effectively are important compliance accountabilities managed?

Performance:	**Good**
Self-assessment:	**Good**
Findings and supporting evidence:	At the time of the on-site visit there were no 'non-compliance' matters arising. Since the last EER (2016), there was one compliance matter regarding external moderation acted upon by ServiceIQ. The final outcome was agreement for the withdrawal of assessment for Cookery level 4. The issue is closed.
Conclusion:	There is presently effective management of compliance accountabilities.

Focus Areas

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

2.1 Focus area: All programmes

Performance:	**Good**
Self-assessment:	**Good**

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 Longlas Limited trading as Innovative Hospitality:

- Develop a renewed professional development programme, to ensure all staff/subcontractors are appropriately supported in their teaching practice. This should include internal moderation processes and in-class support (such as observations) and be available for all incoming tutoring staff.

- Gather further initial information on any potential learning barriers for participants.

- Recognise that any growth in the breadth of delivery will likely require a more extensive approach to internal quality assurance and self-reflective 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[7]*

- *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.*

---

[7] 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.

Final

Regulatory basis for external evaluation and review

External evaluation and review is conducted under the Quality Assurance (including External Evaluation and Review (EER)) Rules 2016, which are made by NZQA under section 253(1)(pa) of the Education Act 1989 and approved by the NZQA Board and the Minister authorised as responsible for Part 20 of the Education Act.

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 including ITOs but excluding universities, and*

- *maintaining training scheme approval for all TEOs other than universities.*

The requirements for participation and cooperation are set through the Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2018, the Consent to Assess Against Standards Rules 2011 and the Training Scheme Rules 2012 respectively. These rules were also made by NZQA under section 253 of the Education Act 1989 and approved by the NZQA Board and the Minister.

In addition, the Private Training Establishment Rules 2018 require registered private training establishments to undertake self-assessment and participate in external evaluation and review as a condition of maintaining registration. The Private Training Establishment Registration Rules 2018 are also made by NZQA under section 253 of the Education Act 1989 and approved by the NZQA Board and the Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills and Employment.

NZQA is responsible for ensuring non-university TEOs continue to comply with the rules after the initial granting of approval and accreditation of programmes, training schemes 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 2016. 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/.

Final

NZQA

Ph 0800 697 296

E qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz

www.nzqa.govt.nz