



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

Leadership Management Australasia
(NZ) Limited

Not Yet Confident in educational performance

Not Yet Confident in capability in self-assessment

Date of report: 20 August 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	9
Recommendations	15
Appendix	16

MoE Number: 7722
NZQA Reference: C28806
Date of EER visit: 15 and 16 May 2018

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:	Leadership Management Australasia (NZ) Limited (LMA)
Type:	Private training establishment (PTE)
First registered:	21 April 2006
Location:	Registered office: Staples Rodway Limited, 9th Floor, 45 Queen Street, Auckland
Delivery sites:	At employer or rented premises
Courses currently delivered:	<p>Within the last 12 months, LMA did not deliver any of its NZQA-approved programmes or training schemes. It did, however, deliver other courses, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Success Strategies for Team Leaders and Supervisors – an unapproved training scheme containing unit standards, delivered in that format until NZQA withdrew consent to assess those standards on 31 October 2017. LMA then reverted to a non-unit standard-based version of the same course.• The Performance Edge (not unit standard based). <p>Prior to October 2017, LMA delivered the National Certificate in Competitive Manufacturing (Level 3 and Level 4) once, in 2016.</p>

It also delivered its approved training scheme, Leading and Managing for Results (Level 4) to a small number of students in 2015-2016.

Code of Practice signatory:	No
Number of students:	Domestic: 2018 year to date – 32 participants
Number of staff:	0.25 full-time equivalents
Scope of active accreditation:	There is currently an application submitted to NZQA for programme approval and accreditation.
Distinctive characteristics:	<p>Participants are all employed and the employer pays the course fees and associated costs and supports the participant as a mentor throughout the course.</p> <p>Courses are workplace and classroom-based and participants undertake assessment online.</p>
Recent significant changes:	<p>In November 2017 a new quality assurance manager was appointed. This is LMA's only New Zealand-based employee.</p> <p>Student numbers have fluctuated since the previous external evaluation and review (EER). In 2015 there were 221 participants, 795 in 2016, and 75 in 2017.</p> <p>The EER confirmed that LMA had not delivered any of its approved programmes or training schemes in the preceding 12 months. As a result, LMA was advised on 8 June 2018 that its registration as a PTE had lapsed.</p> <p>20 June 2018 LMA applied for and was approved to be re-registered as a PTE following a lapse in registration on 8 June 2018.</p>
Previous quality assurance history:	LMA's national external moderation results for 2012-2016 for NZQA-managed standards demonstrated a failure to meet national external moderation requirements in respect of a significant proportion of the standards submitted for moderation during this period. As a result, on 25 August 2017, NZQA issued LMA with a compliance notice stopping new enrolments and the release of assessment results for NZQA-managed standards, and giving LMA the

opportunity to outline how it would improve its assessment practice.

LMA's proposed actions were insufficient and did not give NZQA confidence in LMA's internal capacity and capability to ensure its assessment practice against NZQA-managed standards would be fair, valid and consistent with the national standard. As a result, on 31 October 2017, NZQA withdrew LMA's consent to assess against standards in the Domains: Interpersonal Communications (up to Level 4) and People Development and Coordination (up to Level 4), and standards 16614, 1987, 8081 and 27568.

This had an impact on LMA's ability to deliver and assess the unit standards contained in its Success Strategies for Team Leaders and Supervisors course.

Other:

Leadership Management Australasia (NZ) Limited is part of an Australian company that delivers a range of management and leadership training options in Australia and New Zealand. The New Zealand company is wholly owned by the Australian parent company. The PTE is governed from Australia, and managed locally in New Zealand.

LMA delivers courses through marketing agents who manage their own businesses. Marketing agents are recruited by LMA and operate under an agreement to deliver LMA courses and using systems. Marketing agents generate and maintain a client base.

Facilitators are appointed and allocated through LMA, which they have a formal agreement with. LMA retains full control over and responsibility for all delivery and assessment and moderation systems, all facilitation standards, and all systems pertaining to student enrolment and results reporting.

LMA have had no previous sub-contracting approvals. However they have now submitted an application following discussions with Approvals and Accreditation in June 2018.

2. Scope of external evaluation and review

The EER looked at one focus area: All Programmes. This provides a comprehensive overview of the entire PTE.

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.

Prior to the EER, the NZQA lead evaluator and LMA quality assurance manager agreed on the proposed focus area and procedures for the visit. A range of information was supplied to NZQA prior to the visit, which informed the EER planning.

Two NZQA evaluators met with the New Zealand quality assurance manager and Australian-based head of delivery and product development over two days. Phone interviews were conducted with LMA licensees, facilitators and stakeholders.

A range of documents, information and records were made available and reviewed to confirm and validate the on-site discussions.

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 and **Not Yet Confident** in the capability in self-assessment of **Leadership Management Australasia**.

The key reasons for these judgements are:

- Governance and management has been ineffective in monitoring and managing various NZQA registration and compliance requirements. Overall, the inconsistency in the performance of governance and management to support educational achievement has had a significant impact on NZQA's confidence in both the performance and self-assessment of this PTE.
- LMA's course achievement – particularly for Māori and Pasifika – needs improvement. Better understanding of achievement data would more strongly support and provide evidence of the quantitative and qualitative outcomes important to stakeholders and LMA.
- There are areas of mixed performance and self-assessment. Achievement of unit standard and non-unit standard courses varies significantly. The courses that do not contain unit standards have very high rates of achievement. However, between 2015 and 2017 the achievement rates of courses containing unit standards were consistently well below LMA's own internal achievement benchmark.
- LMA is meeting the needs of stakeholders through the provision of courses which reflect industry need for leadership and management skills and knowledge. The delivery approach supports participants to integrate the learning into their workplace practice to improve their performance.
- LMA is effectively engaging with industry and companies to understand current needs and is using this information to inform course development and update teaching and learning resources.
- Facilitators are experienced, and comprehensive systems and processes are in place to recruit, monitor and recognise effective facilitation of courses and support for participants. Feedback from trainees and employers indicates high levels of satisfaction with courses and delivery.

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**.

Since the previous EER in 2014, LMA has delivered courses that contain unit standards as well as courses that do not contain unit standards. There is significant variation in the successful completions of these courses. Delivery of courses containing unit standards ceased in October 2017.

Completion rates for courses containing unit standards are: 2015, 29 per cent; 2016, 50 per cent; and 2017, 31 per cent. These completion rates include aggregated achievement for three courses delivered several times during each year. Results per course can be extracted for analysis, but LMA does not do this. The validity of these rates of achievement is undermined by several years of poor NZQA external moderation results and the decision in 2017 to remove LMA's consent to assess (see Introduction). The National Certificate in Competitive Manufacturing was delivered once in 2016 with very good completion rates of 82 per cent.

Māori and Pasifika rates of achievement prior to 2016 are unknown. Results for 2016 and 2017 are not reviewed or analysed to understand parity of achievement with other learners. This is potentially significant as the participation rates of Māori and Pasifika learners for 2015-2017 range from 4 to 27 per cent of all learners.

Half of all learners participated in non-unit standard courses in 2015-2017. Anecdotally, these course completion rates are estimated at being higher than 90 per cent. Attendance and participation are the primary criteria for successful completion. LMA collects data on course completions but has not analysed the information to gain an understanding of these outcomes – for example per course or cohort to see patterns and trends over time with a view to improving course outcomes. This gap was also identified as an area for improvement in the 2014 EER. LMA and participants consider the achievement of the agreed win-win goals within the course as a qualitative indicator of successful achievement. This is a reasonable indicator to reflect achievement. However, LMA needs to more strongly show evidence of the analysis of outcomes data to demonstrate learner achievement against this qualitative measure.

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

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 value of the outcomes for participants and their employers is clear. At the completion of the course, participants are applying the acquired skills and knowledge directly to their role within the company and note behavioural changes and improvements in their workplace performance. For example, participants identify an improved ability to communicate to their direct reports and manager, delegate work appropriately in relation to their role, and position and prioritise work demands. Some participants indicate through the completion of the win-win goals that the skills and knowledge gained benefit them in their personal lives. As part of the course, participants determine a measurable return on the company's investment in their education and training as a dollar value. Evidence that employers confirm the participants' calculation on the return on investment would strengthen this highly valued outcome.

Genuine attempts to gather information regarding the outcomes beyond the immediate completion of courses have been made by LMA via surveys. These are sent to graduates and to all employers. Although the response rate is low, those graduates who did respond indicated a continued use of the skills and knowledge gained, and employers noted a positive impact on the business.

Employers pay for course fees and associated costs and support the participant as a mentor throughout the course. As such, they are an important stakeholder. Employers indicate through direct communication with LMA their satisfaction with the course outcomes. Some companies have enrolled staff on LMA courses over several years, an indicator that the courses have met the needs of employers and graduates.

Overall, LMA has several very useful and strong indicators that stakeholder needs are well met. These outcomes including measurable improvements in efficiency and productivity that can be shown to arise from participation in the LMA courses. These need to be more reliably captured and comprehensively analysed to support a higher rating for this key evaluation question.

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**.

Course design and delivery of the non-unit standard courses are well matched to the needs of participants and employers. LMA undertakes significant research to understand the education and training needs of industry to develop leadership and management skills in the New Zealand environment, and designs courses to match this need. Annual course review uses information from surveys to update content to ensure courses maintain relevance. Wherever possible, courses are adapted and tailored to reflect each company's processes and practices. Facilitators are provided with comprehensive course documents to guide delivery and teaching to ensure consistency of delivery across regions.

LMA's delivery approach over the duration of the course engages the employer in the role of mentor. Teaching and learning activities and meetings between the mentor, facilitator and participant support the integration of classroom learning into workplace practice.

Transparent processes guide the selection and monitor the effectiveness of facilitators. Professional development is strongly encouraged and facilitators are rated annually against a set of informative and practical criteria that acknowledge good performance. This is important as facilitators work in regions and LMA monitoring is via the New Zealand quality assurance manager in a 0.25 position and from head office in Australia. Systematic monitoring of facilitators' engagement with trainees and mentors and the progress of win-win goals during the course would better ensure the needs of stakeholders are matched.

Feedback is sought throughout the courses from participants. LMA has an internal benchmark of 80 per cent positive response to measure satisfaction with the course content, facilitator and mentor. This benchmark is consistently met. At the completion of the course, a report outlining the participants' feedback on the skills and behaviours they have gained and incorporated into the workplace are provided to the employer, demonstrating the effective matching of the course to stakeholder needs.

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 **Good**.

LMA's facilitator and company mentor work closely together to effectively support participants through the duration of the current non-unit standard courses LMA delivers. There is a high ratio of support for every participant as classes have fewer than 10 participants in each and a mentor for every participant in the workplace. Study information and avenues for participants to seek advice and support are accessible and clear and feedback on progress and assessment is timely. Opportunities to review progress are structured into the course, and the progress of participants is tracked and monitored via the LMA-managed systems, including participants' own win-win goals which 80 per cent of all participants achieve.

Employers determine who will participate in the course. LMA has a process for providing an indication of the potential literacy, numeracy and language needs of the participants. These and the cultural and well-being needs of participants that could have an impact on teaching and learning are addressed by individual facilitators. LMA recognises the need to more closely monitor potential support needs of participants and looks to identify any commonalities that may indicate an opportunity for improvement. Overall, participants are well supported over the duration of the course, and feedback by participants consistently rates the course highly.

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**.

There is inconsistency in the performance of governance and management to support the educational achievement of participants.

LMA has good resources to support learning and teaching and undertakes research to better understand the training needs of New Zealand businesses. Governance and management support the professional development of facilitators and monitor their performance. Recruitment is based on a synergy with LMA's core values. These areas of organisational focus ensure responsive and innovative course delivery of non-unit standard courses that strongly meet the needs of stakeholders.

The academic leadership of LMA has been ineffective. The courses that contained unit standards offered until late 2017 in New Zealand, have not performed as well

compared with similar course delivery by LMA in Australia. Issues raised by NZQA include LMA's external moderation results over several years and lack of overall data analysis, particularly around Māori and Pasifika parity of achievement. Governance and management's lack of response to these significant areas has had an impact on educational performance and the validity of achievement results.

LMA recognises these gaps in performance and recently contracted a new external moderator and recruited a new quality assurance manager to improve academic practices. It is too soon to determine the impact of these staffing changes.

1.6 How effectively are important compliance accountabilities managed?

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

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

LMA has processes to effectively identify and manage some compliance accountabilities, such as relevant legislation – in particular the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 regulations and responsibilities. NZQA attestations and returns have been met within required timeframes.

LMA has become increasingly aware of PTE registration requirements and compliance matters as NZQA draws their attention to these areas. Several areas have not been effectively identified or managed. Examples include the non-delivery of an NZQA-approved programme within 12 months of approval, failure to deliver two training schemes within a 12-month period, and LMA not notifying NZQA of temporary delivery sites as required. LMA is working with NZQA and has begun to rectify these breaches. However, the number and variety of breaches shows that LMA is not managing important compliance accountabilities well.

Focus Areas

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

2.1 Focus area: All Programmes

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 Leadership Management Australasia (NZ) Limited:

- Analyse qualitative and quantitative data and information per course and per cohort to identify patterns and trends over time with a view to improving course outcomes.
- Review data collected to ensure Māori and Pasifika participation and achievement information is available and achievement is analysed, reviewed and acted on as appropriate.
- Strengthen the academic leadership of LMA and develop and review systems to ensure LMA manages its important compliance capabilities effectively in the future.

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