



NEW ZEALAND **QUALIFICATIONS** AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD
KIA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

External Evaluation and Review Report

Land Based Training Limited

Date of report: 28 November 2019

About Land Based Training Limited

Land Based Training Limited (LBT) provides primary industry pre-employment education and training, predominantly in the lower North Island.

Type of organisation:	Private training establishment (PTE)
Location:	191 St Hill Street, Whanganui
Code of Practice signatory:	Yes (although LBT has not enrolled any international learners)
Number of students:	Domestic: 551 equivalent full-time students; 60 per cent Māori, 0 per cent Pasifika ¹ , 35 per cent under 25 years; 40 per cent female, 60 per cent male
Number of staff:	75 full-time equivalents
TEO profile:	Land Based Training
Last EER outcome:	Highly Confident in educational performance Highly Confident in capability in self-assessment
Scope of evaluation:	Youth Guarantee and Student Achievement Component (SAC) provision within three focus areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Youth Guarantee and SAC 1 and 2 (programmes of specific interest: Apiculture, Horticulture, Civil)• Māori-focused provision and services• SAC Agriculture level 3 (programmes of specific interest: Livestock Production and Farming Systems)
MoE number:	8405
NZQA reference:	C35545
Dates of EER visit:	26-28 August 2019

¹ Due to the low number of Pasifika enrolments, this report does not provide statistical analysis of that cohort.

Summary of Results

LBT is meeting many of the important needs of its learners and other stakeholders. However, programme and qualification completion rates require focused attention. LBT's education systems contribute to valued outcomes. LBT is now working to embed new quality assurance systems to strengthen its education offer.

Confident in educational performance

- Overall educational achievement results show inconsistent programme and qualification outcomes.
- For learners who complete their programme of study, LBT provides useful and relevant work and life skills.
- Employers and community stakeholders highly value LBT's educational provision.
- There is evidence of coherent and complete learning materials.

Confident in capability in self-assessment

- Tutors at LBT are experienced and knowledgeable in their subject and industry areas.
- LBT is still in the process of stabilising as a large education provider. New quality assurance systems are generally at the design and testing stage and are yet to be fully embedded within the organisation.
- LBT has maintained effective systems to manage its key accountability responsibilities.

Key evaluation question findings²

1.1 How well do students achieve?

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Marginal
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p><i>Formal programme and qualification outcomes</i></p> <p>Since the last EER, LBT has had significant growth in learner numbers and changes to its mix of provision.³ The PTE has demonstrated an ability to promptly establish new programmes to ensure learners can complete their studies. However, the rapid growth has also had some negative impacts on programme and qualification outcomes, as LBT has needed to quickly adjust to new areas of provision, and has instigated a new rolling enrolment approach in some areas. Present data (2017 and 2018) shows⁴:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) performance data shows LBT achieved a 62 per cent qualification completion rate for 2017. This was just below the sector median of 63 per cent for the year, and below the rate of 72 per cent achieved in 2016.⁵ Changes in qualification completion rates relate to the changes in mix of provision arising from growth and new cohorts of learners. • Programme and qualification outcomes for Youth Guarantee learners are not at TEC contract levels, and are relatively low – less than half are gaining the qualification sought (44 per cent in 2017 and 45 per cent in 2018). It should be noted, however, that Youth Guarantee learners

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 This growth is positive as LBT has responded quickly in successfully tendering for primary sector training in 2016, and later fulfilling a void left by the closure of another provider in primary sector education (in 2018).

⁴ Data from 2017 onwards reflects the extensive growth that LBT has experienced. Earlier data does not capture this. (Note LBT notes it was affected by the late tendering process conducted by the Tertiary Education Commission in this period.)

⁵ Cohort-based qualification completion rate.

	<p>comprised only around 5 per cent of LBT trainees in 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme and qualification outcomes for adult learners enrolled in NZQF⁶ level 1 and 2 programmes are not at TEC contract levels, and are in fact regressing (qualification completions were 69 per cent in 2017 but fell to 62 per cent in 2018). • Programme and qualification outcomes for adult learners enrolled in NZQF level 3 and 4 programmes are higher, and qualification completions are above the TEC contract level (qualification completions were 71 per cent in 2017 and 74 per cent in 2018). • LBT now has a large proportion of Māori learners (over 60 per cent in 2018). While in each funding stream area some disparities have presented since the last EER, in 2018 the Māori qualification completion rate was 62 per cent.⁷ This EER found good evidence of responsiveness to the needs of Māori (see Focus Area 2.2). <p>On balance, the EER team considers that these results require ongoing consideration by LBT to ensure more successful programme and qualification completions. Self-assessment documentation, and the EER team’s on-site analysis, shows the beginnings of such analysis. However, LBT now needs to take this further and set in place an education-centred plan that focuses on achieving better outcomes for learners.</p> <p><i>Graduate outcomes</i></p> <p>LBT has yet to complete its own evidential analysis of outcomes for graduates or students who exit early. Preliminary work for this type of activity has commenced, and its completion will be important given that LBT considers it is successful in placing learners in employment, and that high employment is a significant contributing factor to early student exits from programmes.</p> <p>TEC graduate data available shows employment outcomes of over 51 per cent, 67 per cent and 66 per cent for one year, three years and five years post-study at LBT. This data is a</p>
--	--

⁶ New Zealand Qualifications Framework

⁷ Refer to Focus Area 2.2 and data tables in Appendix 1 for further details.

	<p>positive indicator of likely success in providing useful and relevant workplace skills.⁸</p> <p><i>Relevant and useful skills</i></p> <p>Students and graduates interviewed for the EER said they have received useful and relevant work and life skills through their studies at LBT. While there is a focus on employment and practical skills, students said their social and work-readiness skills also improved following their programmes of study.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Overall achievement results show some inconsistency of outcomes since the last EER. However, most students will gain the qualification they seek, providing them with useful and relevant work and life skills. LBT now needs to gather data to determine whether its provision has met its goal of providing enhanced work opportunities for its graduates (and early exiters).</p>

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

Performance:	Excellent
Self-assessment:	Good
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>LBT's primary stakeholders are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners and graduates • Employers (largely in primary industries) • Communities (particularly Māori communities). <p>Learners and graduates interviewed said they value the learning opportunities presented by LBT, and the PTE met their needs in facilitating new career pathways and (for some in Vocational Pathways) in completing NCEA level 2. These positive reflections are consistent with learner information gathered by LBT through programme surveys.</p> <p>Employers interviewed said that LBT learners/graduates presented themselves with sufficient work-readiness skills such as reliability, and in matters such as expected industry knowledge which could usefully be applied in workplace settings.</p>

⁸ Other factors can influence TEC data, such as enrolments with other education providers.

	<p>Community stakeholders said that LBT provided a valuable range of educational services which allowed for and fostered community development. Programmes could be tailored to suit particular community needs and aspirations (such as sequential programme offerings to provide ongoing education and training), and had practical applications within communities. For example, in one instance a beekeeping programme focused on ensuring a community could produce their own honey.</p> <p>LBT has over 20 formally established Māori community/iwi relationships. These relationships are of value to stakeholders.</p> <p>LBT also offers education services to people in prison. LBT explained how it worked through challenges to ensure the suitability of this provision, and this was supported by feedback from stakeholders working in this sector.⁹</p> <p>Some stakeholders involved in this EER indicated that they had no involvement in developing programmes; however, they had an opportunity to observe teaching and programme provision by LBT and were satisfied with the delivery. The self-assessment for this EER, as well as on-site work, did not find a collated view of stakeholder input, but noted this quality assurance area was being further developed and strengthened.</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>LBT is strong in meeting the needs of stakeholders and ensures programmes are well linked to stakeholder needs, with practical outcomes in communities and useful work-ready skills for learners. There is scope for self-assessment to collate stakeholder views in a more systemic and regular way to strengthen programme design.</p>

⁹ It was not feasible to directly interview learners in prison.

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:	<p><i>Programme design</i></p> <p>LBT has coherent and complete programme design materials (programme structures and regulation material). Programme content is generally designed by senior LBT staff with relevant experience to ensure practical applicability within their teaching contexts. Theory components typically precede practicums (to allow application), and health and safety aspects are appropriately incorporated as prerequisites.</p> <p>In 2019, LBT has been undertaking an extensive self-review of its suite of programmes. This is good practice; however, for 2016-2018 there is no comprehensive evidence of formal programme review leading to pedagogical improvements.¹⁰ In this period, the design of some programmes was considered through external processes, such as programme approvals submitted to NZQA; but this evaluation did not find internal academic considerations were systematically used to improve teaching practices. (For example, academic board meetings, teacher observations, teacher feedback and a systematic programme of teacher upskilling.)</p> <p>Some full-time level 3 programmes in the agriculture area are designed with only six hours of direct tuition per week. Self-reflection on the sufficiency of this model of design is recommended, particularly if learners are engaged in other (non-study) activity, such as employment.</p> <p><i>Programme delivery</i></p> <p>Tutors at LBT are experienced and knowledgeable in their subject and industry areas. Learners said they value this and</p>

¹⁰ Through current internal processes, LBT anticipates seeking a comprehensive range of new approvals and/or permitted programme changes from NZQA for 2020 and beyond. Programme reviews sampled did not demonstrate a 'closed loop' of managerial feedback and continuous improvements being applied via formal review processes.

	<p>also the positive rapport and energy tutors bring to the learning environment. Learners say tutors are approachable and helpful with their individual learning needs. Tutor ratios do not exceed 1:15.</p> <p>Tutors use a wide variety of teaching methods and resources to facilitate learning opportunities. This includes one-to-one support, classroom peering, group exercises and the like. Monthly reports are used to report on delivery and learner progressions; however, managerial feedback on this was not clear.</p> <p>LBT uses rolling intakes, whereby learners join classes that have already begun. Self-reflective evidence on this, such as ways to manage multi-levels within a single class, was not clearly demonstrated for this EER. Tutors expressed concern that this area needed greater attention and consideration.</p> <p>Individual learning plans are in place; however, there was minimal evidence of the effectiveness of this approach. Student diaries were considered to be a better tool for tracking the progress of learners. Over the past year, LBT has focused on improving the reflective inputs of learners into these diaries to ensure they better capture both the range and number of learning activities.¹¹</p> <p>Some tutors hold the Certificate in Adult Literacy and Numeracy Education or similar (circa 20 tutors at the time of the EER). A further 12 tutors were working towards this qualification. There is scope for LBT to improve and increase pedagogical thought throughout the organisation and strengthen teaching approaches. Some staff said that greater access to professional development (within the education sector and within industry areas) would benefit their professional practice.</p> <p><i>Assessment and moderation</i></p> <p>LBT uses a range of its own and ITO (industry training organisation) assessment tools and information. Evidence of self-reflection on the usefulness of assessment approaches (such as assessment task design) was presented for this EER. Evidence of internal moderation was also presented. Staff meetings to discuss assessment and marking are factored into programme schedules. These are good practices.</p>
--	---

¹¹ This relates in particular to level 3 and 4 agriculture students who have large practical components 'on farm' within their programmes of study.

	External moderation systems that LBT participates in are managed by NZQA and four ITOs. LBT satisfactorily passes the majority of its external moderation requirements. Where this has not occurred, there is evidence of remedial action to improve assessment activity. On balance, the assessment of students at LBT is fair, valid and consistent.
Conclusion:	<p>LBT performance in programme design and delivery (including assessment) is generally strong and matched to the needs of stakeholders, including learners.</p> <p>There are few gaps, although it is important that LBT complete its programme design review as advised to the EER team, and within that give consideration to matters such as the number of hours that direct delivery may require to improve learning outcomes. Additionally, LBT should also reflect on tutor support and development, to better ensure a staffing base with strong understanding of teaching best practice, and to maintain currency in teaching approaches.</p>

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

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Good
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>LBT seeks to provide programmes that have practical work outcomes for its learners. Learner surveys undertaken by LBT, and comments received for this EER, indicate that learners consider they are being well supported towards that goal. Learners say their tutors are approachable, that teaching and physical resources are of a suitable and sufficient quality, and that classroom settings are positive.</p> <p>Learners are also generally aware of programme components, and their learning progress to date. Learners receive handbooks at the commencement of the programme, but were unclear on induction processes, such as what to do if they have concerns (other than talk to their tutor).</p> <p>LBT has identified that many learners present with social challenges. However, ongoing linkages to external support services to mitigate these barriers to learning were not evident during the on-site visit. In many cases in the Vocational Pathway programmes, both learners and tutors said that pastoral support</p>

	<p>was given only by the tutors, and tutors felt some pressure to balance these needs and requests with their teaching responsibilities. LBT does, however, have a network of providers that it seeks to work with across various regions, and use of this will be important to its student cohort.</p> <p>To ensure engagement, LBT tutors in the Vocational Pathways stream provide student pick-up and drop-off services. This is useful and ensures a higher degree of participation. In other areas, LBT has 'field officers'. This role provides pastoral support and career guidance to learners and graduates, and was considered of high value by graduates who had access to these two services. Equally, some students in residential-based programmes had access (through partnership arrangements) to pastoral support within their locality.</p>
Conclusion:	There is good evidence that performance is generally strong in supporting the learners. LBT should consider working further with social sector providers and ensure tutors are well positioned to balance their teaching and non-teaching duties.

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

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Marginal
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p><i>Planning and leadership</i>¹²</p> <p>LBT has a clear leadership and management structure and set of strategic objectives. Notwithstanding, LBT has had significant growth in learner numbers since 2017. Much of the growth was not pre-planned, and funding for it was negotiated within a tight timeframe. This tested LBT's systems and equally demonstrated adaptability to change and innovation. LBT is still in the process of stabilising as a large education provider, and new quality assurance systems are still in the design stage and yet to be fully embedded. For example, since April this year all programmes, the quality management system, tutor reports on outcomes, collating data on outcomes, and the development of</p>

¹² There have been no governance changes at LBT since the last EER. One of two directors participated in this EER (the other being unavailable off-shore). Since this director is involved in both governance and management, for the purposes of this report both functions are included under the term 'management'.

	<p>graduate surveys are under review.</p> <p><i>Understanding educational performance</i></p> <p>While monthly tutor reports on educational performance are used, the extent to which this data, or other data on learner progress and outcomes, is discussed and understood at a wider organisation level was not clearly demonstrated. For example, there is no formal feedback to staff on these reports, and staff did not appear to have a formal opportunity to discuss whole-of-organisation performance. This EER did not find sufficient aggregation and assessment of classroom-based activity to guide the organisation effectively in improving its educational offer.</p> <p>Further, interview comments highlighted externalities as barriers to improving student achievement; but there was little reflection on internal measures (such as tutor professional development). Understanding of funding expectations – such as desired qualification completion rates – and full understanding of data trends presented in these areas were not well demonstrated by LBT in the EER interviews. However, some analysis is provided within the self-assessment document.</p> <p>LBT had not followed up on a recommendation from the 2015 EER report to ‘strengthen its outcomes-focused approach to self-assessment, to ensure the self-assessment activities focus on how well initiatives lead to improved outcomes’.</p> <p><i>Quality management system</i></p> <p>LBT has a quality management system. At the time of the EER it was under redevelopment to ensure ongoing fitness for purpose. During the on-site visit, staff were not readily able to demonstrate how the system managed student complaints (or show the policy in that area).¹³ It is important that the review of the quality management system ensures greater coverage of all key student-focused areas, such as safe expression of concern, in ways suitable for the cohorts of learners that LBT enrolls. (For example, cultural and gender considerations may need to be taken into account, and/or the nature of concerns.)</p> <p><i>Organisational culture and staff support</i></p> <p>Staff said they generally felt valued and supported at LBT.</p>
--	--

¹³ A complaints procedure is provided in the student handbook. The relevant policy was provided in a post-EER submission.

	<p>However, access to professional development was not clear, and seemed sporadic and largely unplanned. Teaching observations occur for new tutors, although a structured approach is not maintained across the full tutoring workforce. Self-assessment documentation does not outline ways to develop and support staff. One staff member said he was not aware of programme regulations around how much delivery was required, indicating further support for staff in this area may be required.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Management performance in relation to supporting student achievement is variable. There is good evidence of responsiveness to significant change; however, stronger systems to manage a much larger amount of education provision are not yet fully embedded.</p> <p>Further analysis of performance trends, including outcomes being achieved, and what internal changes LBT may need to make to improve results, has not yet been completed.</p>

1.6 How effectively are important compliance accountabilities managed?

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Good
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>LBT has effective systems to manage its key accountability responsibilities. This includes health and safety policies and procedures, and student record management. There is some evidence that LBT's quality management system is used to guide the development and application of these types of policies.</p> <p>The managing director attests that there are no legal or ethical matters arising. This EER has found evidence of knowledge of NZQA and wider system requirements. Since the last EER, LBT has maintained the position of academic and compliance manager, although there has been notable turnover in this role. The current manager was appointed to this role in April 2019, since which time significant improvements have been made to educational management systems, such as programme reviews, quality assurance reviews, and external moderation management.</p> <p>The EER team is confident that these changes are significantly</p>

	strengthening the quality of provision at LBT, and that this is necessary in order for LBT to manage its growth (which began from 2017).
Conclusion:	LBT is effectively managing important compliance and accountability matters. There are no issues of concern at this time. Embedding the system changes currently being led by the academic and compliance manager will be important to maintaining effectiveness in this area.

Focus Areas

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

2.1 Focus area: Youth Guarantee and SAC 1 and 2 (programmes of specific interest: Apiculture, Horticulture, Civil)

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Good
Findings and supporting evidence:	LBT is attracting students with significant social and pastoral support needs to some of these programmes.
Conclusion:	<p>LBT may need to set in place an education-centred plan that focuses on achieving better outcomes for learners within this cohort (refer 1.1).</p> <p>LBT may need to focus on developing stronger systems to manage rolling enrolments (refer 1.3).</p> <p>On the site visited, training and support for staff and/or further engagement of external social service providers may need to be considered to improve outcomes (refer 1.4).</p>

2.2 Focus area: Māori-focused provision and services

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Good
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>Māori participation rates are high at LBT. Management has a strategic intent to support smaller communities with high Māori populations through the provision of training opportunities that support community life and wellbeing.</p> <p>As noted (refer 1.2), LBT has a wide range of stakeholders who support Māori learners. Formal agreements are reviewed and enacted on an ongoing basis. Stakeholders said students gain valuable and worthwhile skills for the industry and demonstrate important soft skills relevant to success in employment. They said that LBT was responsive and adaptable to meet the ever-</p>

	<p>changing needs of industry, and relations with Māori communities were healthy, productive and outcomes-focused.</p> <p>Overall qualification achievement for Māori fell from 68 per cent in 2016 to 59 per cent in 2017, but rose slightly to 62 per cent in 2018. LBT analysis undertaken for this EER indicates that these swings correlate with growth (from around 150 Māori learners in 2016 to over 400 in 2018) and, in their view, that they exceed national averages. This EER supports these conclusions.¹⁴</p> <p>Notwithstanding, beyond data analysis, this EER found little evidence that the actual reasons for falling educational performance are analysed and linked to effective educational interventions. Early exit and graduate surveys are recommended, and cohort analysis (for example focus group meetings) and external expert support may be options to consider.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Overall, Māori learners at LBT gain relevant skills and training which can pathway them to higher levels of study or valuable work in community and industry. Tutors interviewed are highly regarded by the Māori students and are student-centred and respectful of Māori culture. Focused attention on improving Māori qualification outcomes is now required.</p>

2.3 Focus area: SAC Agriculture level 3 (programmes of specific interest: Livestock Production and Farming Systems)

Performance:	Good
Self-assessment:	Marginal
Findings and supporting evidence:	<p>LBT runs two distinct streams of these programmes – residential and general. The levels of achievement, retention and progression in the residential model are notably higher than the non-residential.</p> <p>Within both delivery streams, tutors are readily available to students and give them regular feedback. Tutors and a field officer regularly check in with students (refer to 1.4 for support information).</p> <p>LBT’s residential-based (Otiwhiti and Awhiwhenua) programme delivery has good outcomes and graduates are well regarded by</p>

¹⁴ For clarity, this EER has not undertaken a comparative analysis of Māori learning outcomes but considers that LBT has undertaken sufficient self-assessment in this area.

	<p>employers and industry. There was also evidence that graduates of non-residential programmes are also valued.</p> <p>LBT has not demonstrated a considered review of how achievement can be improved in its non-residential programme delivery (Manawatu).</p> <p>Some full-time level 3 agriculture programmes are designed and approved with only six hours of direct tuition per week (refer 1.3). The sufficiency of this, particularly where learners are balancing full-time employment, requires greater self-reflection. Further professional development is also required to ensure all staff are fully aware of programme regulations in this area.</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>Students generally receive relevant skills and training and pathway to higher qualification levels or employment. Self-reflection on the sufficiency of the model of design is recommended, particularly if students are engaged in other (non-study) activity, such as employment, and to understand and address the uneven performance across delivery modes.</p>

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 Land Based Training Limited:

- Set in place an education-centred plan that focuses on achieving better overall programme and qualification outcomes for learners.
- Gather data to determine whether its provision has met its goal of providing enhanced work opportunities for the learners.
- Collate stakeholder views in a more systemic and regular way, to strengthen programme design.
- Complete its programme design review as advised to the EER team, and within that give consideration to matters such as the number of hours that direct delivery may require to improve learning outcomes.
- Undertake self-reflection on tutor support and development, to better ensure an ongoing staffing base with a strong understanding of teaching best practice, and to maintain currency in teaching approaches.
- Consider developing working relationships with social sector providers.

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 1

LBT programme and qualification data 2016-2018¹⁵

Table 1. Programme completions

Programme completions	Successful programme completion, all LBT qualifications percentage, all funding sources								
	2016			2017			2018		
	SAC 1&2	SAC 3&4	YG*	SAC 1&2	SAC 3&4	YG	SAC 1&2	SAC 3&4	YG
All students	71.6%	71.4%	52.70%	70.3%	70.4%	59.20%	61.9%	70.4%	45.6%
Māori students	63.9%	61.9%	58.5%	66.4%	66.9%	60.2%	64.7%	67.1%	41.1%

*Youth Guarantee

Table 2. Qualification completions

Qualification completions	Successful qualification completion, all LBT qualifications percentage, all funding sources								
	2016			2017			2018		
	SAC 1&2	SAC 3&4	YG	SAC 1&2	SAC 3&4	YG	SAC 1&2	SAC 3&4	YG
All students	76.4%	87.2%	60.30%	68.4%	71%	44.1%	62.2%	73.9%	45%
Māori students	70%	76%	60%	62.6%	63.4%	51.1%	58.7%	74.5%	44.4%

Table 3. Qualification completions by ethnicity

Cohort	Qualification completion, all LBT qualifications percentage, all funding sources								
	2016			2017			2018		
	Qual comp %	Total learners	Total learners completed qual	Qual comp %	Total learners	Total learners completed qual	Qual comp %	Total learners	Total learners completed qual
All learners	71.7%	269	193	62.5%	277	173	64.3%	607	390
Māori learners	68%	147	100	59.2%	152	90	61.6%	409	252
Pasifika learners	78.9%	19	15	57.1%	14	8	66.7%	39	26

¹⁵ Information tables provided by LBT.

Appendix 2

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 fraud¹⁶*
- *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.*

¹⁶ NZQA and the 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 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/>.

NZQA

Ph 0800 697 296

E qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz

www.nzqa.govt.nz