



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

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

Report of External Evaluation and Review

Workforce Development Limited

Not Yet Confident in educational performance

Not Yet Confident in capability in self-assessment

Date of report: 1 March 2018

Contents

Purpose of this Report.....	3
Introduction	3
1. TEO in context.....	3
2. Scope of external evaluation and review	6
3. Conduct of external evaluation and review.....	6
Summary of Results	8
Findings	10
Recommendations	23
Appendix	24

MoE Number: 8693
NZQA Reference: C25281
Dates of EER visit: 12-14 September 2017

Purpose of this Report

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

Introduction

1. TEO in context

Name of TEO:	Workforce Development Limited
Type:	Private training establishment (PTE)
First registered:	23 July 1992
Location:	60 Prebensen Drive, Onekawa, Napier
Delivery sites:	60 Prebensen Drive, Onekawa, Napier 22 Amersham Way, Manukau, Auckland Level 2, 330 High Street, Lower Hutt 100 Lovedale Street, Hastings 42 Takapau Road, Waipukurau Site approvals for the Dannevirke and Paihiatua delivery sites are currently being considered by NZQA.
Courses currently delivered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New Zealand Certificate in Hospitality (Level 2)• New Zealand Certificate in Cookery (Level 3)• Pathway to a Career in Hospitality (Levels 1-2)• National Certificate in Early Childhood Education (Level 3)• National Certificate in Early Childhood Education (Level 4)• National Certificate in Youth Work (Level 4)• New Zealand Certificate in Youth Work (Level

	4)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Diploma in Youth Work (Level 6)
Code of Practice signatory:	No
Number of students:	<p>Domestic: numbers not available; 61 per cent under 25 years, 47 per cent Māori, 20 per cent Pasifika, 74 per cent female</p> <p>International: nil</p>
Number of staff:	Full-time 19; part-time 11
Scope of active accreditation:	<p>Please follow the link below:</p> <p>http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers/nqf-accreditations.do?providerId=869316001</p>
Distinctive characteristics:	<p>The provider is based in Hawke's Bay with a head office and classrooms in Napier and another teaching facility in Hastings. There are further significant branches in Lower Hutt, Waipukurau and Manukau City. These branches specialise in teaching discipline areas for which there is an identified need locally.</p> <p>Workforce Development Limited is owned by a family trust with one of trustees being the sole director of the organisation, replacing the former board. Workforce Development has a chief executive who reports to the director.</p>
Recent significant changes:	<p>A major restructure of the organisation was carried out in 2015-2016. The effects of this are still being felt throughout the organisation.</p> <p>In response to programme changes resulting from the Targeted Review of Qualifications, Workforce Development has had several programmes approved by NZQA. Among these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Zealand Certificate in Hospitality (Level 2) • New Zealand Certificate in Hospitality (Level 3) • New Zealand Certificate in Youth Work (Level 4) • Youth Guarantee Pathway to a Career in Hospitality (Levels 1-2)

	<p>At the time of the 2017 external evaluation and review (EER), Workforce Development Limited was in the process of considering multiple sale and purchase opportunities of the company. One of these has since been accepted.</p>
<p>Previous quality assurance history:</p>	<p>At the previous EER in 2013, NZQA was Confident in the educational performance, and Confident in the capability in self-assessment of Workforce Development.</p> <p>National external moderation results from NZQA in 2016 show that Workforce Development has a history of inadequate results in moderation of assessment standards, which appeared to be getting worse in 2016 with five poor results from six assessment units tested.</p> <p>Workforce Development deals with three industry training organisations, but the evaluators learned that there has not been ongoing external moderation from one of these organisations in recent years.</p> <p>The Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) has conducted audits of funded programmes over the last two years. These audits found that most of Workforce Development’s functions are in order, and the PTE is working to remedy any shortcomings. The TEC progress reports show that Workforce Development course and qualification completions are behind the median rates for PTEs in New Zealand.</p>

2. Scope of external evaluation and review

For this EER the following focus areas were selected by the lead evaluator in consultation with the chief executive and head of school of Workforce Development. The reasons for the selections are included.

No.	Focus area	Rationale for selection
1.	New Zealand Certificate in Hospitality (Level 2)	These programmes cover a representative cross-section of disciplines provided by Workforce Development at different levels, and allowed the evaluators to view educational performance at three different sites. These are also the programmes in which the greatest numbers of students are enrolled.
2.	National Certificate in Early Childhood Education (Level 4)	
3.	Diploma in Youth Work (Level 6)	

3. Conduct of external evaluation and review

All external evaluation and reviews are conducted in accordance with NZQA's published policies and procedures. The methodology used is described fully in the web document Policy and Guidelines for the Conduct of External Evaluation and Review available at: <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/registration-and-accreditation/external-evaluation-and-review/policy-and-guidelines-eer/introduction>. The TEO has an opportunity to comment on the accuracy of this report, and any submissions received are fully considered by NZQA before finalising the report.

The lead evaluator and the senior management of Workforce Development negotiated the parameters of the visit over the telephone and by email. The provider supplied the TEO details and self-assessment summary, which were useful in the scoping process.

The evaluation team comprised two evaluators and an active observer, who visited Workforce Development for three days from 12 September 2017. The team held interviews with the chief executive, the director and senior staff members. For the programme-based focus areas, the team met with heads of department, teaching staff and students. Members of advisory committees, employers, graduates and other external stakeholders were interviewed by telephone.

The evaluators began the visit at head office in Napier and travelled to Hastings to cover the hospitality pathways focus area. Day two was spent in Manukau covering the Diploma in Youth Work, and day three covered early childhood education and the EER synthesis in Lower Hutt.

In addition, the evaluation team studied a large range of monitoring and administrative documents, programme reviews relevant to the focus areas, and information relevant to student support. This reading was carried out to further inform the EER and to validate some of the areas discussed at the interviews.

Disclaimer

The findings in this report have been reached by means of a standard evaluative process: <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/external-evaluation-and-review/policy-and-guidelines-eer/introduction/>. 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 fraud¹*
- *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.

¹ 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.

Summary of Results

Statements of confidence on educational performance and capability in self-assessment

NZQA is **Not Yet Confident** in the educational performance of **Workforce Development Limited**.

NZQA is **Not Yet Confident** in the capability in self-assessment of **Workforce Development Limited**.

Workforce Development is in a rebuilding phase, especially in terms of its self-assessment, and not all its systems are fully established in its current practice. There are some persistent issues, such as the moderation of assessment, which are a cause for concern. The recent restructuring is causing a sense of instability among staff and students alike. The evaluators discovered several instances where the educational philosophy as espoused by management was not being practised at teaching level. There are several recent changes to self-assessment systems which show promise but have not yet been fully embedded, so the benefits are not yet evident.

For these reasons and others, the evaluators are not able to be confident in Workforce Development at this time. Some of the factors that lead to this judgement are:

- There was no evidence able to be presented at the time of the EER visit, that the findings of NZQA moderation in 2016 have been actioned.
- There are some inappropriate administrative practices in the practicum logbook information, as well as insufficient monitoring of this and training on appropriate processes.
- The relatively high staff and management turnover is unsettling for students and other staff.
- Staff monitoring and support from management is lacking. In one case, professional development was put on hold for some time, and in other cases performance appraisals are not consistently carried out.
- Internal moderation procedures need to become more focussed on maintaining the quality and consistency of assessment to give total assurance that the results are valid.
- There is a lack of assurance about what learning is taking place in practicums.
- The evaluators found that the overall philosophy and direction of the provider, while understood at executive level, was not always evident at operational level.

- There is little formalised collection and analysis of feedback from employers and graduates to get a sense of the long-term value of the learning.
- There have been recent advancements in introducing standard education monitoring procedures. However, these are not yet fully embedded and direct guidance in their use is lacking.

Positive aspects of the PTE's operation include:

- Several teaching staff that have been at Workforce Development for some time were experienced and dedicated in their work.
- Programmes are carefully selected to meet the needs of the local area.
- There is good use of project work of a practical nature to keep students engaged in the foundation programmes.

Findings²

1.1 How well do students achieve?

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

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

The evaluators found some variation in student achievement as measured by the completion rates in different discipline areas and campuses, but it is not clear how these factors are related. Student participation in the foundation hospitality programme is: Māori 47 per cent, Pasifika 20 per cent, and Pākehā 28 per cent. These participation rates for Māori and Pasifika are higher than the proportions of these groups in the surrounding communities. Unfortunately, the achievement rates of Māori are lower than the overall hospitality group. The hospitality programme has a low achievement rate with course completions at 33 per cent and qualification completions at 22 per cent in 2016. Workforce Development was not able to provide earlier figures for this programme in the annual programme reviews, which means that no comparisons or tracking of trends over time is possible. More analysis of achievement data would help the provider gain a better understanding of how to respond in order to improve retention and raise achievement rates.

Workforce Development does not achieve some of its TEC targets. The PTE features in two categories of TEC-funded providers. In these categories, Workforce Development's results for qualification completions are lower than those of PTEs overall.

- Levels 4-7 (non-degree) – Workforce Development 69 per cent and all PTEs 75 per cent
- Levels 1-3 – Workforce Development 20 per cent and all PTEs 54 per cent

Overall, Workforce Development has a qualification completion rate of 44 per cent in the funded programmes that the TEC reports on. Arguably the most important ranking is that of Workforce Development's place among PTEs in overall qualification completions. On this measure, Workforce Development is in place 188 of 229 PTEs.

Workforce Development has started to provide annual programme review reports for each programme delivered in 2016. This is a positive step, but the documents are not a full account of development within the programmes. Nor is there an analysis of results or actions arising to lead to improvement of outcomes. The evaluators were told that because the annual programme reviews are a recent

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

innovation, the systems are not fully developed or embedded in practice. There are some inconsistent situations noted in the annual programme reviews. For example, some of the other achievement figures are measured against the European/New Zealander figures, and it is not clear why this is so. The problems in this programme were put down to the quality of the teachers, the restructuring, and the issues with moderation. These problems have been worked on and better results are expected by the provider in the future.

The annual programme reviews could have more detail in them. Currently they concentrate on completion figures so further statistics would be useful such as retention, employment numbers, higher learning, attendance, moderation and programme changes, along with useful analysis of these. Workforce Development sets itself a target of 80 per cent achievement, but this is not used as a point of comparison in the annual programme reviews. The reviews do not contain the programme structure.

Figures for the Certificate in Early Childhood Education (Level 4) show that less than 50 per cent of graduates go on to level 6 and get certification as teachers. This is because the graduates can find work in the sector as teacher aides and the like. There are some retention issues in the programme. The current class has only nine students (64 per cent) remaining from 14 who started. These situations need to be better understood to see if improvements can be made. This understanding will be linked to improvements made in the annual programme reviews so that an in-depth analysis can be made using these as a tool.

The Diploma in Youth Work has good achievement rates for all students. Māori achievement results are lower than those of other groups, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Achievement results for the Diploma in Youth Work (Level 6) in 2016

	All students	Māori	Pasifika
Course completions	85%	68%	96%
Qualifications completions	82%	60%	91%

Figures taken from Workforce Development's annual performance review report 2016 for this programme.

The figures for retention and progress to higher study are not included in the annual programme reviews and so cannot be included here. The evaluators were told that a few students drop out from the programme, usually for family and/or financial reasons. Attendance in this programme is closely monitored, and for the most part is very good.

Workforce Development results show a variation in the quality of the outcomes across the programmes sampled for the EER. These outcomes differ for a variety of reasons, but it is not clear that Workforce Development is learning from the well-performing programmes and faculties and using the learning to improve other areas that do not perform as well

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

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

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

The programmes sampled for the EER had valuable outcomes for those students who completed them, keeping in mind that these programmes have different outcomes.

The level 2 foundation hospitality programme provides valuable life-skills for the students such as enhanced confidence, self-assurance and interpersonal communication. One objective of the programme was to give the students good preparation for employment, and this appears to be met in that some students go on to employment and some go on to further studies. The students that were interviewed said they noticed the difference in their knowledge and skills between when they started and finished the programme. Teachers said that pastoral assistance was given to help the students learn, as the students tended to be somewhat transient and difficult to keep engaged.

Student evaluations and feedback from the advisory committee are the main ways that the PTE gains information and advice about improvements to this programme. The graduates are tracked for three months which gives the PTE some indication of the value of the learning. The data given about outcomes in this programme is mostly for the TEC's information. Some graduate feedback is collected and analysed, but in one programme it was stated that it was difficult to gain graduate feedback as the graduates were hard to track. A systematic approach is required for each programme to gain graduate feedback. There is no clarity around the numbers of students moving to higher-level training after completing the Youth Guarantee level 2 programme. The provider offered to compile figures of staircasing, but does not produce them normally.

The National Diploma in Youth Work provides a different type of value. Students learn about the professional boundaries and professional practice required to counsel youth. The level of the programme is different so the study is of a more complex nature. Students need level 4 credits to enter the programme and tend to enrol in study to gain employment or to validate skills they already have. This programme staircases to a degree programme. A memorandum of understanding has been signed with Wellington Institute of Technology (Weltec) for students to move into degree-based study, and some students take advantage of this. Cross-credits are given with Workforce Development's National diploma programme. Students learn in a practical work-related environment, as the programme includes a 400-hour work placement segment. This provides the value of experiencing workplace conditions.

There are formal observations of workplace learning and these are entered and signed off in a student log book. There were irregularities in the way some log

Final Report

books had been signed off in advance, or not at all by the workplace supervisor, tutor and student. Students can provide feedback in a series of evaluations throughout the programme. This feedback is seen by the tutors and compiled by the head of school, but the analysis is not added to the annual programme review. Graduate information is anecdotal and the provider is considering tracking graduate outcomes and how well skills and knowledge are transferred into practice in the future.

The early childhood education level 4 qualification is a six-month programme with one or two days of teacher contact per week and 12 hours of work placement a week. Completion of this programme allows the graduate to become registered as an early childhood education teacher. Registered early childhood education centres are required to have a certain number of qualified teachers at each worksite. For this reason, there are many people who operate home-based early childhood education centres who are studying on the programme. Graduation will allow them to continue to seek registration as early childhood education centre operators, which provides valuable leverage towards establishing their careers in this field.

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

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

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

Stakeholders' needs in the focus areas are generally well met. In the foundation hospitality programme, it is hard to say that all stakeholders' needs are being met because of the relatively poor achievement rates (see Table 1). However, interviews with some employers and graduates showed general satisfaction with the outcomes of the programme.

The Youth Guarantee programmes are project-based which is normally a useful way of keeping students engaged. However, the achievement rates for this programme give a different message. Pre-moderation of assessments is not occurring in a consistent and effective way, and a matrix of how the programme activities cover the learning outcomes would be an advantage. The advisory board for the Youth Guarantee programmes is based in Hawke's Bay and has only met once, so it is unclear how it contributes to meet the needs of Youth Guarantee programmes in other parts of the country.

Youth Guarantee class sizes have been capped at 15 students to give them the best attention from the teacher. There have been some changes to the entry requirements in 2017 to ensure that more students stay involved in the programme. It is too early to see how effective this is, but anecdotally attendance is improving.

In Hastings, where the Youth Guarantee programme was sampled, the teaching activities and projects were relevant to the students, e.g. the cooking of a 'boil-up', marae food service, and use of a microwave.

Many of the students studying the National Diploma in Youth Work are already working and are seeking qualifications as validation of their skills. Others are seeking employment in this field. The sector is trying to become more professional through gaining qualifications. Students can staircase to the Weltec degree programme and voluntary registration is available through the peak body. To reach a wider audience, the programme is also taught in Lower Hutt and Napier. The programme structure appeals to learners with one day in class, two days practicum and one day self-directed learning.

As with other areas of Workforce Development, there is a sense of uncertainty in the social services school. An acting head of department is managing the programmes in this sector for now, and a replacement is arriving soon. There is no clarity as to how consistency of delivery and assessment is maintained across the different delivery sites for this programme.

The evaluators learned that Workforce Development is now developing marking schedules for its assessments of unit standards to maintain marking consistency on some programmes. Marking schedules were not available previously. These new schedules follow the format and content of the unit standards.

The evaluators found that the tutor on the programme was well respected by the students and programme management. This tutor has not had direct contact with the advisory group (situated in Hawke's Bay).

Programme assessment and marking have not been externally moderated for several years, with Careerforce moderation resuming only recently. Peer-to-peer post-assessment moderation commenced in 2016. There were some procedural disagreements resulting from this which has led to a cluster-style moderation session being adopted. The schedule of standards from the programme showed that approximately 50 per cent will be sampled during delivery of the programme.

The provider has asked Careerforce for a moderation workshop to support tutor practice. Workforce Development has begun putting answer schedules in place for its assessments in 2017. These could be more detailed and give specific guidance.

There are several irregularities in the way that the practicums are administered. This is significant in that the practicum forms a large part of the Youth Work programme. These irregularities are the pre-signing of tutors' visits, uncertain coverage of learning within this module, and inconsistencies in the students' recorded hours of attendance. There was no evidence that the students give formal feedback on practicums, or how the sequence of learning is structured to occur within the practicum.

The early childhood education programme is better organised. This programme is at level 4 and allows entry to the degree programme, which is the requirement for

registration. Eighty to 90 per cent attendance is required. The programme structure suits the students as they spend only one day a week in class. The programme teacher in Lower Hutt has six years' experience, is well qualified and part-time in the position.

For early childhood education work placement, Workforce Development has vetted appropriate sites and the students pick their own site from the list. Some students use their own places of work for the placement. Each placement is covered by a memorandum of understanding which outlines the areas of responsibility of the parties. The student does not get to reflect on the practicum experience.

Workforce Development has adopted the 'puanga' style of learning in 2015, which considers people of all cultures and encourages project-based learning and team teaching. This development is still in its early stages, and the achievement figures do not yet show its effectiveness.

The evaluators were told that although professional development is part of the provider's human resources policy, some teachers had not had any for several years. The tutors are looking forward to receiving additional professional development in regard to the writing and moderating of assessments, in preparation for the curriculum development work they are about to undertake. Some teachers said they did not get to see the moderation reports from industry training organisations, but said the results are discussed at team meetings. Moderation of unit standards through NZQA is continuing to show adverse results. The action plans that are supposed to show how remedial action is taking place were not able to be presented when they were asked for by the evaluators. The provider is using old assessments for this programme and these had been pre-assessment moderated in the past. There is group moderation internally and the early childhood education tutors share resources across the sites. There are monthly telephone conferences across the sites between the tutors to share ideas.

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

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

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

At Workforce Development the students are effectively supported and this support is adequately self-assessed. This support is shown in many ways. Typically, in situations that require support, the students will turn to the tutor as the first port of call. Depending on the nature of the student's problem, they may then be directed to external support agencies if required. Many of the smaller problems can be dealt with in-house. For the foundation Youth Guarantee programmes, Workforce Development works very closely with social service agencies to ensure the students at that level are closely supported through their studies. Many of these

students come from troubled backgrounds and need much support, so Workforce Development fosters a 'family atmosphere' to encourage engagement.

Retention of students is an ongoing problem in the Youth Guarantee classes and so attendance is carefully monitored. Some students have difficulty getting to and from their residences for reasons of cost and distance, and so travel allowances are paid to the students by the funding agency

To gain the most effective outcomes for the students, Workforce Development requires teaching staff at this level to have literacy and numeracy and adult education qualifications to level 5, including standard 4098 *Use standards to assess candidate performance*. Performance reviews for new teachers and annual reviews for the more experienced are part of the policies and procedures at Workforce Development, but the application of this is inconsistent. To provide focus for the teaching there is an internal KPI³ of 80 per cent student achievement in the programme in the teachers' performance reviews. The completion figures (see Findings 1.1) for the hospitality programme are below this target.

As part of performance review, the teachers are encouraged to take part in professional development to further their skills and remain current with advancements in their field. The engagement with professional development varies according to the discipline area and how long the teacher has been employed. Experienced teachers in early childhood education keep current through maintaining professional body membership and through newsletters. They also maintain sector contacts through arranging placements and attending youth forums. Professional development is supported by Workforce Development, but the application of it could be more systematic and structured. As part of performance review, the teachers in this programme undergo informal observations of their teaching practice.

While annual programme reviews have been produced for these programmes, there is no indication that these reports are part of a systematic annual review process to see if the programme is still fit for purpose and if any development needs to take place to improve content or delivery. Some programme reviews have been suspended until a replacement qualification has been developed in response to NZQA's Targeted Review of Qualifications. For instance, for early childhood education the last programme review was in 2015.

There are some disparities in the application of staff performance reviews across the disciplines and across the sites. For instance, there was a completed performance review of one teacher in one site, the performance review of another teacher was interrupted, and there has been no performance review of another tutor since that person commenced several years ago. The evaluators also learned that there has been considerable teaching staff turnover; for example, one

³ Key performance indicator (KPI) is a target criterion in the teacher's performance review at Workforce Development.

particular programme has had four teachers in three years. Some of the student groups interviewed had some reservations about the teacher turnover and the unsettling effect on their studies. In the early childhood education sector, all staff and students are police vetted as required by law.

Students can provide feedback to the staff on the quality of delivery through student evaluations approximately once every six months, depending on the length of the programme. Teachers said they found the feedback useful and could show examples of how they had adjusted their practice as a result. Students also selected a class representative who attended student forum meetings to express the students' views. There has been one such meeting in 2017 so far.

Tutors are accessible to the students by phone and by text at most times of the day. As a result of feedback, the delivery time of some courses was increased to include an extra tutorial. Students can get one-to-one tutorial sessions if they need them. One teacher who was interviewed was positive and well qualified, and described how work and life experiences helped to illustrate the lesson points, how feedback was given regularly on assessments and formative progress, and how individual students are supported as needed. Generally, she described how she worked in a self-reflective way and used her personal learning to make improvements in the lessons. While these are valuable approaches, it was not clear that they are being implemented as a systematic strategy by all teachers or whether it is up to individual teachers to implement them for themselves. For the early childhood education teachers there is a fortnightly telephone conference to facilitate the exchange of ideas.

To assist the Māori learners and better assimilate the appropriate tikanga and kaupapa into the programmes, the PTE seeks input from kaumātua from local marae where available. Sometime this knowledge comes from the teachers themselves with the assistance of guest speakers, depending on the resources available.

In those programmes where it is necessary, Workforce Development measures the progress in literacy and numeracy using the TEC tool. The PTE is contemplating voluntarily extending this to other programmes as well. The evaluators found that, generally, the campus facilities at Workforce Development are spacious, conducive to learning, and adequately resourced and equipped, including computer facilities for students.

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

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

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

The evaluation team concluded, after careful consideration of all the evidence presented, that governance and management at Workforce Development still had some work to do. It needs to boost achievement rates in key areas, attain consistency of processes throughout the organisation, and attend to some gaps and shortcomings in self-assessment processes to help better understand the business. There is also a need to stabilise staff and further develop their skills to build an effective, steady workforce on which to base development of the programmes and improvement in student achievement.

Workforce Development has experienced disruption in recent times from the restructure, and the effects are still being felt. There have been a lot of staff and management changes in the last few years which have had an unsettling effect on staff and students alike. At the time of the EER visit there were some vacant senior positions which were being covered temporarily by other staff. In the restructuring process there have been many changes in management and staff. The new system has not yet been completely embedded and there appears to be a disconnect in the working relationship between the senior managers and those operating at the 'chalk face'. This is evident in the way that knowledge and implementation of management policies has not completely filtered down to the teaching staff. Nor are the teachers effectively monitored by management. The turnover of teaching staff is a concern as it has an effect on the cohesion of the study environment.

Workforce Development's academic board comprises three external advisors. The board was established in 2014 and meets at least three times a year. The role of the board is to be 'instrumental in supporting the development of [Workforce Development's] key strategies'. It is interesting that there is no academic board featured on the 2017 organisational chart supplied to the evaluators. The role of the academic board should be clarified to take a more active position in the oversight and accountability for academic quality. The academic board should be an essential component of academic management. In 2015, as part of a company restructure, a head of school position was created. An appointment was made shortly thereafter. This person is responsible for academic quality in the school. Many of the recent initiatives have been implemented under the guidance of the head of school. While these developments show that Workforce Development is heading in the right direction, some of them have not been embedded and there are signs of inconsistency across the delivery sites. Prioritisation of the review of academic functions needs some focus. A systematic approach to review programmes is one area to work on.

The organisational chart lists a 'board of directors. There is in effect one director who is one of the three shareholders. The evaluators learned that in the past, Workforce Development had a board of directors, and had intended to bring another independent director into the company. The chief executive runs the PTE and reports to the director; both individuals are experienced. The evaluators found that Workforce Development would benefit from a more holistic oversight of the business, with external independent viewpoints from various business sectors to add a balanced outlook for the organisation.

Since the previous EER in 2013, Workforce Development stopped delivering the training it supplied for the Corrections Department in prisons. The contract for this training was revised and the amount of training was severely cut back, so that it was deemed to be uneconomic for Workforce Development to continue. This has caused a realignment in the rest of the training.

Workforce Development has invested in an upgrade to its learner management system to better track student achievement data.. The system was collecting achievement data but it was not able to configure the data in useful ways for analysis. The quality management system is available online for staff access.

Workforce Development has taken on a few early childhood education students from another school which had closed a programme. These students are still being taught by their tutors from the original school to maintain continuity. Workforce Development is getting good results with these students, and it is a credit to the organisation that it can assist in this way.

To consolidate its policies and procedures, Workforce Development has engaged in targeted reviews of the important focus areas in New Zealand education, namely literacy and numeracy, Māori and Pasifika achievement, and youth achievement. Workforce Development has developed documents containing strategic direction for these areas. These strategies now need to become more evident in practice.

Workforce Development has conducted staff satisfaction surveys in the past, the last being in the period May to June 2016 which covered 2015, and is able to be compared with earlier surveys of that nature. The surveys identify areas of strength and areas for improvements in staff engagement, which is useful in identifying where staff management can be improved.

1.6 How effectively are important compliance accountabilities managed?

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

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

Workforce Development could do better in managing compliance. This finding is based on the following factors. For several years up to 2016, Workforce Development has been below the required moderation standard in a number of standards with NZQA, and this appears to be a trend. There are several standards that have been non-compliant repeatedly through this time. Workforce Development has had no external moderation from Careerforce for several years, and has not arranged external moderation with other parties to seek independent assurance of its processes throughout this time. Workforce Development has requested that Careerforce hold a workshop to familiarise staff with the requirements of Careerforce moderation. The ServiceIQ moderation report of 2017 was generally positive, with some issues that are being worked on.

Various other discrepancies suggest a lack of supervision and perhaps training at the lower echelons of staff. The evaluators identified that there are inconsistencies in sign-off of student attendance at the practicum segments in one programme. This may cast doubt on the integrity and authenticity of attendance at the practicum segment – which is a large part of the programme at level 6 – and the standard of monitoring of these systems. Workforce Development could do more to quality assure the practicums. It was not clear what qualities a place of employment needed to have to be considered suitable for a practicum placement, or how it was assessed for this. It was not clear who (Workforce Development or the employer) had the responsibility for students' well-being in placements. In programmes such as the level 6 Youth Work, students are placed in some high-risk situations (like youths absconding from home detention while under a student's supervision). In these circumstances, areas of responsibility need to be defined consistent with legislation covering this work, so that the student is protected from culpability and physical risk while they are learning. The nature of the students' previous work may be different from what they are expected to undergo as training. All possible care needs to be taken.

Other factors concerning the practicums also came to light during the EER visit. In one case, pre-signing of a supervisor's visits in a student's practicum logbook brings the authenticity of the events into question. The placement hours that are being recorded bring the length of practicum time into question. Some students are occasionally recording 12-hour sessions. As no assessment takes place during practicums, it is unclear how the learning during this time is structured and, if practicum sessions have learning outcomes, where they are assessed. The evaluators found that a few students had been allowed to enrol weeks after the level 6 programme had started, and that this was in breach of Workforce

Development's own policies. Policies and procedures on the management of practicums need to be reviewed and a set of ethical standards developed.

Focus Areas

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

2.1 Focus area: New Zealand Certificate in Hospitality (Level 2)

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

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

2.2 Focus area: National Certificate in Early Childhood Education (Level 4)

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

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

2.3 Focus area: Diploma in Youth Work (Level 6)

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

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

Recommendations

NZQA recommends that Workforce Development Limited:

- Implement a consistent and robust system of remedial action on external moderation requirements.
- Strengthen monitoring of practice in the practicums and provide clarity around where the learning is occurring in these parts of the programmes.
- Consider how to manage the impact of relatively high staff and management turnover on classes and other staff.
- Strengthen systems of staff monitoring and support, particularly in areas of performance appraisals and professional development.
- Implement a consistent and robust approach to internal moderation, to provide assurance that the assessment results are valid.
- Ensure there is explicit alignment of management policies and the practical application of these policies.
- Systematically gather and analyse feedback from employers and graduates to get a better sense of the long-term value of the learning.
- Find ways of boosting Māori achievement rates in the programmes.

Appendix

Regulatory basis for external evaluation and review

External evaluation and review is conducted according to the External Evaluation and Review (EER) Rules 2013, which are 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.

Self-assessment and participation in external evaluation and review are requirements for maintaining accreditation to provide an approved programme for all TEOs other than universities. The requirements are set through the NZQF Programme Approval and Accreditation Rules 2013, which 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.

In addition, the Private Training Establishment Registration Rules 2013 require registered private training establishments to undertake self-assessment and participate in external evaluation and review, in accordance with the External Evaluation and Review Rules (EER) 2013, as a condition of maintaining registration. The Private Training Establishment Registration Rules 2013 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 and/or registration. The New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC) has statutory responsibility for compliance by universities.

This report reflects the findings and conclusions of the external evaluation and review process, conducted according to the External Evaluation and Review (EER) Rules 2013.

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).

The External Evaluation and Review (EER) Rules 2013 are available at <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/assets/About-us/Our-role/Rules/EER-Rules.pdf>, while information about the conduct and methodology for external evaluation and review can be found at <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers-partners/external-evaluation-and-review/policy-and-guidelines-eer/introduction/>.

NZQA

Ph 0800 697 296

E qaadmin@nzqa.govt.nz

www.nzqa.govt.nz