



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

Employers and Manufacturers
Association (Northern) Incorporated

Not Yet Confident in educational performance

Not Yet Confident in capability in self-assessment

Date of report: 31 May 2018

Contents

Purpose of this Report.....	3
Introduction	3
1. TEO in context.....	3
2. Scope of external evaluation and review	5
3. Conduct of external evaluation and review.....	5
Summary of Results	8
Findings	10
Recommendations	21
Appendix	22

MoE Number: 8714
NZQA Reference: C27085
Date of EER visit: 7 and 8 November 2017

Final Report

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:	Employers and Manufacturers Association (Northern) Incorporation (EMA)
Type:	Private training establishment
First registered:	4 November 1991; re-registered 14 March 2016
Location:	145 Khyber Pass Road, Grafton, Auckland
Delivery sites:	EMA Northern: 145 Khyber Pass Road, Grafton, Auckland EMA Waikato: 103 Tristram Street, Hamilton
Courses currently delivered:	Certificate in Communication Skills for First Line Managers (Training Scheme) (Level 3)
Code of Practice signatory:	No
Number of students:	Domestic: approximately 5,000 registrations for 2017. Of these, 174 were registered on tertiary courses with unit standards attached to them and through which learners can work toward achieving a qualification. Seventy-two per cent identified as New Zealand European, 10.5 per cent as Other European, 10.5 per cent as Māori, 0 per cent as Pasifika, 4 per cent as Asian, and 3 per cent as Other. International: nil
Number of staff:	EMA Training: full-time 21; part-time two;

	temporary one
Scope of active accreditation:	Please follow the link below: http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/providers/ngf-accreditations.do?providerId=871459001
Distinctive characteristics:	EMA represents and provides a variety of consultancy services to its members. Training is one of the services provided, and the learners that register on these courses and events do so through their employer who pays for their training.
Recent significant changes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New training scheme approved in December 2016 • Currently preparing applications for the approval and accreditation of two programmes leading to New Zealand qualifications • EMA Northern recently underwent a restructure. The main outcome for EMA Training was an increase in staffing levels at the Grafton office.
Previous quality assurance history:	<p>At the previous external evaluation and review (EER) held on 2 November 2016: NZQA was Not Yet Confident in the educational performance, and Not Yet Confident in the capability in self-assessment of EMA.</p> <p>NZQA's moderation of unit standards assessment in October 2016 was satisfactory which was an improvement on previous years' results. The 2017 NZQA moderation showed some inconsistent results.</p> <p>EMA's current moderation results of unit standards assessment from industry training organisations (ITOs) are satisfactory, and both SkillsOrg and Competenz had no major issues with EMA's assessment at the time of the EER.</p> <p>A NZQA compliance visit to EMA was conducted in August 2016, and subsequently there were a number of outstanding concerns which were also evaluated at this EER. The continuing issues of workplace learning and notional learning hours are</p>

discussed in the body of this report.

2. Scope of external evaluation and review

The following focus areas were selected in consultation with the chief executive and head of school. The reasons for the selections are included.

No.	Focus Area	Rationale for selection
1.	Certificate in Business (Introduction to Team Leadership) (Level 3)	This is a relatively popular programme based on four unit standards. This is not a New Zealand Qualifications Framework programme. The business discipline is a main area for EMA.
2.	Diploma in Workplace Health and Safety Management (Level 6)	This programme is in a different discipline area, and at a higher level. It seems to be held often, according to the EMA website.

Context

The evaluation team selected these two focus areas because of the complexities of the organisation, and to get a range of evidence to assist with triangulation. The volume of training at EMA justifies having two focus areas.

The scope was centred on the programmes that EMA terms ‘tertiary options’¹ in that they comprise registered unit standards from the Directory of Assessment Standards. These are ‘self-developed’ programmes, have not been subjected to NZQA approval processes, and comprise less than 10 per cent of the training supplied by EMA. They are taught based on the provider’s accreditation to assess the unit standards. EMA is aware that the ability to teach these programmes will be curtailed by the further embedding of the New Zealand Qualifications Framework. EMA has stated that it intends to apply for approval of programmes that lead to the new qualifications, and it states that these applications will not have unit standards.

The above two tertiary programmes were selected as focus areas because the formal processes and trainee support that are required in a longer programme will reveal more about the academic management than short courses. Some employers and trainees are not interested in gaining the unit standards, and so engage in programme learning without the assessment of the unit standards. This, among other factors, affects the completion rates.

EMA also supplies training through many short training courses in the fields of business and information technology, which are tailored to the client’s needs.

¹ In this report, these programmes will be referred to as ‘tertiary programmes’.

These short courses comprise most of the training services supplied by EMA and are typically around two to three days in duration.

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 quality assurance manager of EMA negotiated the parameters of the visit. The provider supplied the TEO details and self-assessment summary, which were very useful in the scoping process.

The evaluation team comprised two evaluators, who visited EMA on 7 and 8 November 2017 and for a half day on 17 November 2017. The team held interviews with the chief executive, the chairman of the board, the general manager business, the portfolio manager for quality assurance, and senior staff members. EMA members, employers, graduates and other external stakeholders were interviewed by telephone.

The EER visit was conducted entirely at EMA head office in Khyber Pass Rd, Auckland. The summary statement was delivered in a formal email and accepted by the provider.

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. These documents helped to further inform the EER and to validate some of the areas discussed at the interviews.

It should also be noted that further information came to NZQA's attention significantly after the conclusion of the site visit (in December 2017 and January 2018). This information had to be considered by the evaluation team before draft could be finalised because it related to possible misleading advertising by EMA.

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 fraud²*
- 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.

- 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.*

² 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 **Employers and Manufacturers Association (Northern) Incorporated**.

NZQA is **Not Yet Confident** in the capability in self-assessment of **Employers and Manufacturers Association (Northern) Incorporated**.

The evaluators made these judgements after considering all the evidence presented before and during the EER visit. This evaluation highlighted the following aspects of EMA Training:

- There is ongoing monitoring of training through the Net Promoter Score which shows increasing trainee satisfaction with the training delivered. The Net Promoter Score is used on each course, then analysed and reported on. Any issues are immediately responded to.
- The provider operates in a modern, purpose-built facility, and makes ongoing efforts to improve trainee engagement, especially through the development of technology in the classroom.
- There has been improved self-assessment in some key areas, especially to try to understand why trainees do not submit assessment material on time, and why it takes them so long to fulfil all the programme requirements. Some good work has been done, and small improvements made, but it is too soon since the last EER to see the entrenched effects of the work.
- Good use is made of mid-course and end-of course student feedback to identify and act on any issues.
- Some worthwhile quality assurance initiatives – such as engaging consultants to give advice on EER expectations and programme development – provide a sound basis for further development of quality assurance and self-assessment.
- Significant work and needs analysis has gone into improving workbooks and assessments which shows that EMA is responding to the issue of student engagement.
- Good internal moderation systems provide assurance of the quality of the assessments.
- There is a lack of a wider overview and external endorsement of processes and EMA should continue its efforts to engage with systematic external advice.

- EMA member organisations are a good source of industry advice; however, a formalised approach (such as an advisory committee) to the gathering and implementation of industry and academic advice would make advisory processes more accountable.
- The issue of non-submissions, resubmissions of assessments and late completions of programmes has a detrimental effect by lowering annual completion rates. Work in this area is required.
- A more conscious approach is needed to more clearly align the learning hours of courses and programmes with the credit value of the underlying unit standards. The evaluators were unable to get a clear impression that course learning hours tied in with credit values.
- The information given to students on the programme and course outlines needs to be specific regarding how long the study could take, and provide advance knowledge of the nature of the assessments so that learners have a clear understanding of requirements.
- A lot of training involves on-the-job time, so initiatives to work with employers to gain more support for students to complete the programmes are useful and need strengthening.
- More management focus is needed on meeting NZQA requirements for registration as a PTE to ensure that compliance matters are not overlooked, and that EMA is aware of its responsibilities.

Findings³

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 that the programme achievement rates of EMA could be improved.⁴ The main concern is that trainees are taking a relatively long time to complete the programme requirements due to the self-paced nature of the assessments. Many trainees do not have the time to commit to study in the workplace, and are not motivated to do self-directed learning. This, and other factors like family responsibilities and life pressures, adversely affect the annual achievement rates and trainee retention. The pass rates are not high for the first year of the programmes, and some trainees do not complete the programme requirements for several years. Prior to the EER there were no time limits on the completion of these programmes. However, it is positive that EMA provides additional support to ensure its learners have a chance to achieve the qualifications.

EMA spends considerable time contacting trainees and encouraging them to complete, which is time consuming. Different ways of analysing achievement figures may help EMA to understand this situation in terms of what outcomes are valued by the students and employers.

Table 1 below has been generated using EMA figures and shows updated achievement rates in the tertiary programmes. The figures are updated as students complete. In 2017, the figures for achievement in programmes run in 2012 are still being updated as trainees complete years later. Indicative data provided by EMA suggests some improvement from 2016 results is possible.

As a result of these belated updates, some of the achievement rates can become quite respectable, but the percentages of students completing at the end of the first year is a concern, as shown by the figures for 2016. Predictive data provided by EMA up to November 2017 suggests some improvement in this area.

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

⁴ The following comments are based on the achievement rates for the tertiary programmes and not for the short courses provided by EMA.

EMA records the demographics of the trainees and Māori and Pasifika achievement rates separately. The evaluators were told that Māori and Pasifika trainees achieve at the same rates as trainees from other groups.

Table 1. Qualification completions, EMA training 2012-2017 (updated April 2017)

Qualification	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Certificate in Adult Education and Training (Level 5)	75	NA	60	45	40
Certificate in Business (First Line Management) (Level 3)	18	33	11	0	0
Certificate in Business (First Line Management) (Level 4)	73	NA	50	NA	0
Certificate in Occupational Health and Safety (Workplace Safety) (Level 3)	63	67	85	67	60
Certificate in Occupational Health and Safety (Co-ordination) (Level 3)	77	78	86	46	33
Diploma in Workplace Health and Safety Management (Level 6)	NA	70	55	48	33

Figures provided by EMA and used with permission.

All figures are percentages.

EMA has done some important data collection and analysis to understand the problem of repeated resubmissions and the rate of non-submission of assessments. There are 75 per cent resubmissions on assessment material so far in the level 6 health and safety diploma in 2017, so there is little improvement yet.

Some work has been done in combining assessments, but this has had mixed success. Detailed surveys have been carried out to identify the factors that impede attendance and completion of assessments. The factors have been identified, but methods to counter these issues are as yet uncertain. There is good tracking of student achievement results. The provider engages in worthwhile self-assessment, understands the issues affecting achievement, and is trying to deal with them. Intensive efforts are being made to improve achievement rates, mainly through contact with enrolled learners to encourage them to complete the assessments. It has also been identified that extramural trainees do not perform as well, so EMA has decided to curtail the enrolment of extramural students.

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**.

There is good value in the learning for those trainees who complete the programmes. Recent student survey results show that trainees overwhelmingly (approximately 90 per cent) feel that the training is useful for their career, and approximately 80 per cent stated that the quality of the training was above average or excellent. The trainees who were interviewed by the evaluators were pleased with the standard of delivery and support given by EMA teaching staff. The successful trainees become more knowledgeable and self-assured in their jobs. In some cases, gaining the level 6 health and safety qualification was a requirement of employment, if the trainee wanted to work in management roles. It is notable that some trainees do not opt to complete unit standards. For these learners, engaging in the learning is all they (and presumably, their employers) want. This is likely to change soon – requirements for health and safety supervisors to register with the Health and Safety Association of New Zealand will include achievement of an appropriate qualification.

Recently EMA carried out a student survey (30 per cent response rate) to identify factors contributing to trainee learning and future success. Such factors include the trainee having been engaged in prior tertiary study, the standard of achievement at high school, and the value of engaging with self-directed learning. Some adjustments to entry processes and assessment practice have been attempted to improve achievement results, but these have been recent and it is too soon to see the results.

EMA is working at creating a learning pathway for its trainees, by linking the level 4 and level 6 health and safety programmes and encouraging the trainee to progress to further enhance their knowledge, skills and employment opportunities. This will help in the EMA strategy to professionalise the health and safety sector in the industries it represents. Such recognition of professional qualifications will create value in the promotion of career paths, enhanced by training and the gaining of qualifications. Feedback from a variety of sources shows that health and safety practice in the workplace is improving steadily in places where training is an integral part of employment.

For the short courses that make up most of the provider's training activities, one of the main indicators of value in courses is the increasing numbers of enrolments and the steadily improving Net Promoter Score. This data is analysed and compared within the sector with other results, and any issues are immediately highlighted. Generally, this data shows a high level of student satisfaction in the short courses.

Employers have input into programme content and design and that they have been asked what value they get from the training and how this could be enhanced. Informal feedback is gained from the EMA membership, but a more formalised system would give more accountability to the industry input.

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 **Good**.

EMA is adapting the delivery and assessment of its programmes in response to vigorous self-assessment in this area. These adaptations are recent so the effects of them have yet to be seen, and the ratings in this section reflect this.

EMA has put considerable work into self-assessment to ensure that it is meeting the needs of its major stakeholders. It has gained some good feedback from the trainees. There was evidence of some informal feedback gained from a couple of employers, but this is an area that needs more work. The establishment of an advisory committee will also help to ensure a systematic approach to meeting the needs of industry. EMA maintains good relations with regulatory agencies like ACC and WorkSafe New Zealand to ensure that content remains current.

One area of concern for EMA is how well the short courses meet the students' needs, as discussed earlier. EMA knows it is important to get employers to further support the trainees where the learning involves some work-based training. This is still a work in progress and it will be interesting to see how well this relationship can be formed and maintained to support the students through their studies. The programmes are made up of short, in-house block courses of two days each. The level 3 business programme has four of these totalling 64 hours. The remainder of the programme comprises up to 500 hours of self-directed learning while the student is working. The intention is that this time involves applying the learning and completing the assessments. The assessments are often based on workplace activities, and it is here that employer support is needed. The students are working as well as studying, and this is a mitigating factor for the extended time some students require to finish the programme.

The block course approach to the learning suits those in employment, and the face-to-face component allows the trainees to interact with the trainers, and allows networking with other trainees. It enables trainees to share their 'real-world' scenarios. Having the assessments in the workplace allows for the use of workplace examples for assessments. EMA has identified that trainees can be distracted by the pressures of work and lifestyle and that their focus on sustaining

their studies sometimes wanes. There were 57 students in 2017 for the health and safety diploma programme at level 6. Some students (about 20 per cent) take up to four years to complete. The programme is 123 credits (this is the total of the unit standard credits). This is not an NZQA-approved programme and it is made up of eight two-day blocks (128 hours). The rest is made up of self-directed learning and on-job experience to total around 1,230 hours. The programme is largely applied learning.

The selection of trainers and the monitoring of delivery at EMA is of a high standard within the current training set-up. Work needs to be done to measure this effectiveness in terms of the low annual completion rates. Trainers are selected for their industry expertise and strong subject knowledge and experience. All are occupational health and safety consultants. The trainers are mainly contractors, with five full-time trainers employed at EMA. The full-time trainers work based on 'rolling contracts' and are observed once a year as part of their performance review. The trainers engage in professional development, most of which is adult learning oriented. Attendance at the sessions is not obligatory, but most staff attend a good proportion of the sessions. A competency register for staff capability is being established so that professional development needs can be determined. EMA will support the trainers to achieve the Certificate in Adult Education and Training and offers it to all trainers, but not all take up the offer. All trainers gain unit standard 4098 *Use standards to assess candidate performance*.

The trainers undertake regular professional development among themselves, using their available skills. They are encouraged to engage in self-reflective practice and make small adjustments to delivery. However, this is a recent development and the effects are unclear. Programmes are reviewed annually, but the trainers do not meet regularly as a group to exchange ideas.

The gathering of feedback from trainees is comprehensive and includes formal end-of-course feedback, mid-course feedback, informal word-of-mouth feedback, a post-course survey and a management debrief with trainers. Any issues revealed by this feedback are quickly dealt with, such as students' difficulty in uploading online material.

Employers have indicated a significant need for short training courses. EMA has about 100 ready-made courses of which 17 are unit standard-based. As mentioned, these short courses provide the main part of the training business for EMA. Again, the number of clients re-booking, and Net Promoter Score survey results indicate that clients' needs are being matched.

The evaluators looked at examples of internal moderation. Samples of both pre- and post-moderation were scrutinised and found to be satisfactory. There has been no external moderation from standard-setting bodies, other than NZQA since the previous EER. SkillsOrg and Competenz had no major issues with EMA

assessments at the time of the EER. Moderation is done on a sampling basis, with any moderation problems being fed back to the trainers.

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**.

EMA has a good sense of its students' learning needs, using intensive feedback and survey results. It is actively working to improve the completion rates for the programmes, and the time taken to complete them. The most tangible of these actions is the attempt to contact trainees and encourage them to continue with assessment submissions. Students' progress with their assessments is tracked rigorously on wall charts and spreadsheets and trainees are regularly made aware of progress and urged to hand in assessments. This work has yet to see much improvement in the number of resubmissions and trainees going over time with their submissions. EMA keeps contact with the students in between facilitated block courses.

Student workbooks provide reading and exercises, one for each block course. These have a very good standard of production and are updated and peer reviewed as needed. However, they are not handed out for advance reading.

EMA uses electronic media for programme delivery where practical. Online forums are encouraged for programme discussion, but there is only light trainee uptake so far. E-learning is now used in stand-alone online programmes. Short courses use phased webinars, and intend to use an app in future which means the content can be updated to stay current and provide an ongoing resource. The information services department is sufficiently staffed, with two staff as well as consultants as needed.

Trainers teach two block courses each and tend to specialise. Feedback shows there are different class dynamics with different trainers. EMA sees this as an unsettling influence and is taking positive steps to counteract it, such as reorganising trainers to cover all block courses. Trainers make themselves available to explain assessment material. Written feedback is given on assessment results.

As well as increasing the support during the programme, EMA is refining programme entry criteria to ensure that the trainees that are accepted are the most likely to succeed. For example, the entry to the level 6 health and safety diploma now requires a pass in the level 4 certificate in occupational health and safety

and/or industry experience to safety manager standard. The trainee also needs the support of the employer to do the programme.

Workplace factors sometimes prevent the students finishing their programme, such as not being able to access employers' data for assignments. Some students leave their employment during training and so cannot complete. EMA is considering a system of 'bonding' the trainee to the workplace for the duration of the programme to improve attendance in the on-job component, and the completion rates.

Some programme information could be emphasised more at induction. It was not clear that the important role of self-directed learning hours is well communicated to students in advance of enrolling; this information is not prominent in course books or on the EMA website. The nature of assessment and the length of the programme could also be communicated better. Many of the trainees are mature students and have lifestyle and family commitments and so need to know specifically what the training involves.

Students can be re-assessed if they do not pass all aspects the first time; most programmes will allow up to three attempts. EMA tried to cut the number of assessments by combining them, but this seemed to overwhelm the students and increased the incompleteness rate in 2017. These students have been given until the start of 2019 to complete. Additional staff have been employed to help track student progress and encourage them to submit. In response to student feedback, additional study time has been added to the block courses. This attention to existing students could be at the expense of new students.

There are no requirements for the measurement and enhancement of the trainees' literacy and numeracy. EMA believes that literacy and numeracy deficiencies may explain why some trainees have difficulty completing. It will be testing entrants to the level 3 business programmes in the future. The student survey shows that level 3 entrants often have no prior qualification and their study skills are often found wanting.

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

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**.

EMA has an improved understanding of the management required to run a competent training establishment. This understanding is supported by improved self-assessment since the last EER. Management has gained valuable insight into the issues that impede student progress. As a result, some remedial actions have been tried, a few have not been effective, and a number are still awaiting results.

EMA has an effective board of directors comprising 14 representatives from across the membership. The board meets monthly and covers all aspects of EMA business, of which training is only a part. They receive a report from the general manager monthly on training, as well as the chief executive's report which includes student attendance trends, course satisfaction, and feedback from NZQA. The board feels that NZQA registration is important for credentialing the training at EMA, as well as the use of unit standards.

EMA's approach to compliance with NZQA rules has included not having its programmes approved by NZQA. There are some compliance aspects that EMA could improve on, as described in 1.6. The provider has engaged education consultants for advice on quality improvement and how to respond to the 2016 EER. EMA also appointed a full-time quality assurance manager to address some of the problems previously encountered. Management put together a quality improvement plan for the training arm to address the gaps identified in the 2016 EER. It is too soon for these measures to show an improvement in student achievement.

The provider's trainers are carefully chosen, with a comprehensive system of monitoring, supported by professional development.

Educational quality assurance occurs through a variety of means. The EMA membership provides the ongoing links with industry. The provider states that it is hard to benchmark with other providers because of commercial sensitivity and the unique nature of EMA's programmes. The provider believes it is performing similarly to other providers, but no supporting comparisons were offered. The EMA members provide a ready source of guidance for programme development and changes. The programme used to have an advisory board and there is an intention to do this again, enlisting members from industry, EMA members, academia and employers to gain advice in a more cohesive manner.

The courses offered by EMA will become more important in the future with the registration of health and safety workers on the new Health and Safety Association of New Zealand register. EMA has stated that its new programmes will be developed to align with the New Zealand Qualifications Framework. It will soon begin seeking approval for the New Zealand Diploma in Workplace Health and Safety Management (Level 6). The quality assurance manager took part in the three-year review that led to the new qualification structure. A matrix has been developed to match the content of the previous programme to that required for the New Zealand qualification. The new programme will not be based on unit standards, with EMA preferring to develop its own modules to meet the learning outcomes.

End-of-programme feedback is gained by using Customer Monitor. A score is given for customer satisfaction of which EMA averages 60, which is a positive

result (the benchmark is the New Zealand average of 20 points). All negative responses result in 'actions' from the manager.

As mentioned, EMA management has identified the need for better induction to inform students about the volume of work and the time needed to complete the programme. It is too early to see any results from this initiative.

EMA management closely monitors courses through the Net Promoter Score survey, and any issues with the training are immediately followed up with the trainer. There are regular reviews of workshops and courses. The quality assurance manager intends to re-institute graduation for some programmes to raise the profile of the programmes. The main priority is to provide service and satisfaction to existing EMA members. EMA will facilitate courses to 'casual' clients but encourages them to become members. Fifteen per cent of training business is from non-member clients. The success of training is measured by repeat business and positive member feedback. Ready-made and bespoke short courses, some containing unit standards, are typically of 0.5 to two days in duration to meet the needs of industry members.

EMA management has hired a consultant to develop the new programmes. This person was involved in the targeted review of health and safety qualifications. The consultant is developing the programme and assessments for approval, and will be teaching on the level 6 programme next year.

EMA has a sophisticated suite of electronic programmes to help manage student administration and academic progress. In the last few years the organisation has made a large investment in a new training centre. The provider is establishing a contemporary media capability, with staff and learners engaging with these new platforms. Improvements include unlimited data uploads (to allow for the submission of large assessment documents), and allowance for students to amend submitted documents before assessment.

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**.

The training section of EMA is a significant part of the organisation's services to its members. Until recently, EMA has not had any approved programmes. The certificates and diplomas that EMA delivers have been developed by EMA using unit standards that the provider has consent to assess. The programmes have not been approved or quality assured by NZQA

EMA meets the minimum NZQA requirement of having one training scheme approved and delivered. A lack of understanding of NZQA rules has previously resulted in EMA's temporary lapse of registration due to EMA not delivering an approved training scheme. Management could be more aware and observant of the requirements of registration as a PTE, as there have also been issues with advertising programmes on the EMA website that have not been accredited to the provider. This still appears to be happening.

The approved training scheme has been delivered in 2016, and makes up the first block of the health and safety diploma programme. The training scheme is being reviewed and changes will be made before being taught again next year.

EMA must ensure learning hours are aligned to its programmes' credit values. The provider was unable to assure the evaluators how the learning hours are made up, especially in the work-based portion of the programmes. As the programmes have not been approved by NZQA, it is also unknown whether they are adequate for full-time or part-study.

Compliance updates are received by the board in the monthly report. There is an internal audit conducted annually, which focuses on targeted areas of concern or areas that need to be developed. This EER report has been used by EMA as its internal audit tool for the 2017 year. Relevant improvements are being made as per the recommendations of the internal audit.

Focus Areas

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

2.1 Focus area: Certificate in Business (Introduction to Team Leadership) (Level 3)

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

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

2.2 Focus area: Diploma in Occupational Health and Safety Management (Level 6)

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

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

Recommendations

NZQA recommends that Employers and Manufacturers Association (Northern) Incorporated:

- Continue to strengthen academic practices with respect to programme design and delivery, including assessment and moderation.
- Address the non-submissions, resubmissions of assessments and late completions of programmes as these are major contributors to the low annual achievement rates.
- Formalise a system to check that the learning hour requirements of courses and programmes fit the credit value of the unit standards being used.
- Clarify the information given to trainees about the length of programme and the nature of the assessments.
- Intensify the work with employers so that the students gain more support in the workplace to complete 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