



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

Ardmore Flying School Ltd

Confident in educational performance

Confident in capability in self-assessment

Date of report: 3 July 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.....	7
Summary of Results	9
Findings	10
Recommendations	18
Appendix	19

MoE Number: 8638
NZQA Reference: C28581
Date of EER visit: 23 and 24 April 2018

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:	Ardmore Flying School Ltd (AFS)
Type:	Private training establishment (PTE)
First registered:	21 October 1991
Location:	Harvard Lane, Ardmore Airport, Auckland
Delivery sites:	Two sites: Ardmore Flying School HQ and the nearby 'Warbirds' building and also on Harvard Lane. Students are able to walk easily between the two sites.
Courses currently delivered:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New Zealand Certificate in Aeronautical Engineering (Pre-employment Skills) (Level 3)• New Zealand Certificate in Aeronautical Engineering (Workplace Introductory Skills) (Level 4)• New Zealand Diploma in Aviation (Aeroplane and Helicopter) (Level 5)• New Zealand Diploma in Aviation (Aeroplane and Helicopter) (Level 6)• Commercial Pilot and Instrument Rating Certificate (Training Scheme) (Level 5)
Code of Practice signatory:	Yes
Number of students:	Domestic: 65 (two Māori, two Pasifika) International: 110, (47 Vietnamese, 30+ Chinese, several Pasifika, Korean, Indian and Sri Lankan)

	students with the remainder a mix such as Eastern European, Canadian, etc.)
Number of staff:	Full-time 32, part-time 17
Scope of active accreditation:	<p>AFS holds consent to assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aircraft Operation (Domain) (to level 6) • Aviation – Core (Domain) (to level 4) • Various unit standards in Aeronautical Engineering and related subjects to level 4
Distinctive characteristics:	AFS is one of New Zealand’s oldest and largest flight training organisations and the only one delivering both flying and engineering training.
Recent significant changes:	<p>The number of international students has increased significantly – from 14 at the 2014 external evaluation and review (EER) to 110 in 2018.</p> <p>In early 2018, AFS established a governance board to oversee the organisation on behalf of the owner. The board includes an independent chairperson with considerable corporate experience.</p> <p>Change of chief executive – a new chief executive was appointed about six weeks prior to the EER visit. The previous chief executive had been in the position for six years.</p> <p>AFS developed and began delivery of the aeronautical engineering programmes in 2017.</p> <p>AFS has installed a web-based Education and Training Administration (ETA) management system designed specifically for the management of flight training, the curriculum, student records, resources, flight scheduling and other operations.</p>
Previous quality assurance history:	<p>This is AFS’s third scheduled EER. The last EER was conducted in May 2014, at which time NZQA was Confident in AFS’s educational performance and Confident in its capability in self-assessment. The 2014 EER report recommended that AFS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that self-assessment processes are formalised through regular and organisation-

wide, systemic engagement with internal and external stakeholders, and improvements are documented.

- Develop strategies for the recruitment, effective teaching and success of Māori and Pasifika learners.
- Explore and take up opportunities for professional networking with other training providers to help AFS staff gain a more in-depth understanding of self-assessment in practice.
- Consider opportunities for benchmarking performance against other providers within the sector.
- Investigate and effect ongoing opportunities for instructors to develop their teaching practice.
- Explore and implement ways to maintain engagement with at least some international graduates.

Other:

The certification and operation of organisations conducting aviation training and assessments in New Zealand is prescribed under Part 141 of Civil Aviation Rules governed by the Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand (CAA). All theory and practical (flight test) assessments are conducted independently by Aviation Services Ltd, which operates under licence to CAA. All pilot licences are issued by CAA.

AFS was last audited for compliance with Part 141 by CAA in August 2015, and authorisation under Part 141 was renewed. This renewal lasts for five years.

2. Scope of external evaluation and review

Three focus areas were included in this evaluation. Together they cover all the current student enrolments and the mandatory focus area for providers that enrol international students.

Focus Area 1: New Zealand Diploma in Aviation (Levels 5 and 6)
<p>This focus area includes all of AFS's aviation teaching and programme delivery. The New Zealand Diploma in Aviation (Level 6) provides flight training up to a Commercial Pilot Licence with an Instrument Rating.</p> <p>In the second year of their training, students specialise into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Airline preparation – including the Airline Transport Pilot Licence theory examinations and a component in the Multi Crew environment.• Instructor – including the qualification required to become a C-Category Flight Instructor
Focus Area 2: Aeronautical Engineering Suite
<p>Includes: New Zealand Certificate in Aeronautical Engineering (Pre-employment Skills) (Level 3); and New Zealand Certificate in Aeronautical Engineering (Workplace Introductory Skills) (Level 4).</p> <p>Although the programme covering these two qualifications is relatively new and has not yet had graduates, this focus area provides an opportunity to look at how AFS has responded to industry needs in developing a new programme area.</p>
Focus Area 3: International students: support and wellbeing
<p>NZQA is committed to the responsible development and delivery of education to international students. It is essential to New Zealand's 'brand' to ensure that all students are adequately supported in their programmes of study. To that end, from August 2016 NZQA introduced a standard focus area for all EERs of TEOs that enrol international students. This focus area examines how effectively AFS is discharging its pastoral care responsibilities towards its international students.</p>

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-eeer/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.

A pre-EER meeting visit was conducted to inform scoping before the on-site visit. Two evaluators conducted the on-site enquiry at the main campus over two days. The evaluators reviewed an extensive range of documentation and met with:

- The chief executive officer
- AFS board chair
- Chief flying instructor
- Training manager and deputy manager
- Administration staff
- Student support co-ordinators
- Two groups of instructors
- Two groups of students.

The evaluation team interviewed a sufficient range of staff and students for evaluation and review purposes.

During the site visit, AFS provided the EER team with a range of operational documentation, including:

- Strategic planning materials
- Minutes of meetings
- Quality management policies
- Enrolment information and policies
- Records of student achievement
- Student evaluations of programmes and teaching
- Collated analysis of student satisfaction levels
- Graduate destination data

- Delivery and assessment materials.

This documentation complemented the self-assessment information that had been pre-submitted by AFS. The evaluators reviewed all of the materials the TEO provided.

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 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

Statement of confidence on educational performance

NZQA is **Confident** in the educational performance and **Confident** in the capability in self-assessment of, **Ardmore Flying School Ltd.**

The EER team's interviews with students, governance, management and staff demonstrated the success, extent and benefits of the educational performance of AFS. The reasons for NZQA's level of confidence can be summarised as follows:

- The students are achieving good results (refer 1.1) and acquiring useful and meaningful skills and knowledge, evidenced by feedback from students, graduates and staff.
- Feedback from students indicates that AFS's programmes have an appropriate mix of theory and practice and that they are delivered and assessed in a manner that enables the students to understand and apply the material being presented. However, wider sources of feedback, e.g. from graduates and industry, may give the organisation better insight into how effective the programmes are.
- AFS has good student support structures that are matched to the needs of the students. The students interviewed at this evaluation were mostly positive about their experience at AFS. Instructors are enthusiastic and relate well to their students. AFS has systems for gathering student feedback, and there was some evidence that this information was recently being used to make some improvements to the programmes. However, graduate and employer input was missing from much of the self-assessment activity.
- The organisation is well managed and has a clear philosophy and purpose. The training is well resourced and AFS uses its resources effectively. AFS has a newly established board which, along with management, make up a professional and cohesive team that displays a clear understanding of their role and their respective responsibilities both to the aviation industry and their students.

AFS is accustomed to working in a compliance-driven environment and has systems in place to manage many of their external compliance requirements. However, some gaps were identified in the way AFS is managing its compliance obligations under the Education (Pastoral Care of International Students) Code of Practice – refer 1.6 for further details.

Both management and staff at AFS recognise the value of self-assessment and have recently begun to systematically use it as a tool to improve educational performance. There were many examples of reflection and improvement loops, but they need to be part of a more co-ordinated and cohesive continuous improvement regime, centred around improved value and outcomes for students.

Findings²

1.1 How well do students achieve?

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 **Excellent**.

Domestic funded students training on the Diploma in Aviation Programme achieve NZQA unit standard credits toward their qualification. Both domestic and international students gain the knowledge and skills to complete the CAA pilot licences and rating requirements to be able to fly passenger aircraft commercially in all weather conditions. The CAA licences and ratings allow direct employment in the aviation industry in New Zealand, and with varied conversion processes, into flying and other aviation roles in many other countries.

Course completion rates over the past three years range between 68 and 88 per cent. First-time pass rates in CAA examinations are above or near average for flying schools across New Zealand.

In completing these courses, AFS students have been successful in meeting all of the CAA regulation requirements in most cases. AFS has changed the way it monitors ongoing student progress through a new remedial programme developed over the last six months. These changes are expected to make a positive difference to students' first-time pass rates and overall outcomes, by providing students with more timely feedback and support before they sit or resit external examinations.

While a number of Pasifika students (nine) are studying at Ardmore, most of these are international students. With only two Māori students currently, despite its best efforts AFS is still seeing relatively low participation from Māori and Pasifika students. Achievement rates for Māori and Pasifika students are at least equal to that of the whole cohort.

There is a strong student achievement focus at all levels of the organisation. The students and associated staff are split into teams, and staff team meetings are held weekly where the progress of every student is reviewed, discussed and, if necessary, changes made to their programme. The student management system (ETA) holds a wealth of achievement data. Currently this data can be difficult to extract in a useable form, so team leaders use individual spreadsheets, manually updated weekly to create dashboards for team meetings. Although this system is

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

fit for purpose, duplication of systems is inefficient and can lead to errors. AFS intends to address this.

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 immediate outputs from this training, in addition to the level 6 New Zealand Diploma in Aviation, are licences and ratings as awarded by CAA. All students are undertaking this training in preparation for a career in commercial aviation. AFS ensures that the study period is as efficient as possible to enable students to complete in the minimum time while still ensuring they meet all requirements.

AFS has made employment pathways a key strategic focus. This has resulted in several relationships being developed both internationally and domestically with airlines such as Vietnam Airlines, Susi Air, Garuda International and JetStar. However, AFS was not able to demonstrate how successful these relationships have been. At the time of the 2014 EER, AFS was able to show the beginnings of a useful tracking system for graduate employment and other outcomes, but the momentum for this has since waned. At this EER, AFS provided a substantial list of employment outcomes over a decade or more, but there was no indication of what proportion of students this represented, nor any analysis of the data.

Nevertheless, based on anecdotes and data provided, it appears that about 75 per cent of graduates gain employment in the aviation industry. Many AFS graduates, including 100 per cent from 2017, are employed by AFS as instructors. One of the positive outcomes of increased numbers of international students is that there is an increased and ongoing demand for instructors, who will typically instruct for two to five years before moving on to a piloting position with an airline.

International students are gaining formal CAA licence qualifications. Although a small number choose to apply for a work permit in New Zealand, following graduation the majority return to their home countries with the intention of gaining employment as pilots. Accurate employment figures for international graduates have been challenging for AFS to ascertain. This lack of data to show employment or other positive outcomes for international students is a gap/weakness in AFS's ability to show the value gained. Given the increasing number of international students and partnerships with overseas airlines, it is important that AFS is able to show through its self-assessment that the needs of particular stakeholders are being met through the achievement of identified, relevant and important outcomes.

The aeronautical engineering programme equips students with the foundation knowledge and practical skills for successful employment in aeronautical engineering workshops – several of which are located at Ardmore airfield.

Final Report

Students can sit for and gain Licensed Aircraft Maintenance Engineer (LAME) qualifications – as with other qualifications, LAME is assessed by Aviation Services Ltd and issued by CAA. No students have yet completed this course of training.

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**.

The training provided by AFS is relevant and technically sound. The evaluators saw evidence of this in records kept by the school, and telephone conversations with external stakeholders confirmed it. There were no adverse or negative findings in the most recent CAA part 141 audit of AFS. The organisation is also on the longest audit cycle, which indicates CAA's confidence that AFS has sound internal systems to maintain quality and safety in its training operations.

The overall delivery of training at AFS is designed so that students complete all theory components of both the Private Pilot Licence and Commercial Pilot Licence before commencing their practical flying. The training syllabus follows a logical sequence, with ground-based knowledge initially, then initial flying training, further ground-based study, and then more advanced flying training. This structure works well at AFS and means that students do not have to commit to the expensive practical flying part of their programme until they have proved that they can meet the academic and legislative requirements. The recent combining of Private Pilot Licence and Commercial Pilot Licence theory makes it more efficient for students and the organisation. AFS will need to monitor this change carefully to ensure it continues to best meet the needs of the students, as some students expressed concern that they thought it may be too condensed.

Since all (flying-related) assessment is conducted externally, AFS is not required to moderate assessments. AFS staff spend substantial time teaching students exam technique aligned to the theory examination format. The theory examinations can be very difficult, especially for students with English as a second language.

The aeronautical engineering programme has been developed by AFS in direct response to industry need. There are a significant number of small-to-medium aeronautical engineering workshops based at Ardmore Airfield alone. Discussion with two of the workshops confirmed that they are universally short of engineers. Similar to the flying, the course builds on core knowledge and applies that logically through 'scenario-based learning' to develop the hard skills of the students. This has proven a successful methodology, with students able to produce working products such as hand tools. Examinations (LAME) are externally assessed and moderated.

Processes for AFS to formally receive feedback from students lapsed until they were recently reinstated. Student evaluations are now conducted to a regular schedule and gather students' feedback on their experiences of various aspects of their programmes. This includes programme content and delivery, facilities and staff effectiveness. Feedback from these evaluations is collected, summarised, analysed and used to inform improvements. However, the process has only been in place over the past few months and at this stage has provided only the beginnings of useful information.

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

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

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

Guidance and support is individualised and effective. Pre-course information and guidance is appropriate to the programmes offered, although a few students said they found the enrolment process difficult to understand at times. Evidence from student feedback and discussion indicates that students are highly engaged in the learning that AFS provides. Student learning goals are well understood and responses to these goals are appropriate. Students get comprehensive and timely feedback on their progress. The strong rapport between students and staff was confirmed from discussions and student survey results. Students have access to staff outside of formal classes and can make suggestions about improvements. Students noted that the staff were responsive to any concerns or issues raised.

There is a well-established process for briefing before, and a debriefing after, practical flights. Students and staff interviewed during this evaluation commented on the fact that instructors build positive relationships with students. This allows both instructors and students to give and receive frank feedback, confirming the value of this process and its contribution to the overall learning environment. Notes from debriefs are uploaded to ETA where they can be accessed by other instructors if required.

Staff at AFS are demonstrating good understanding of the factors that lead to student achievement. They regularly formally and informally discuss and assess ideas for improving achievement and making the courses more useful and enjoyable for students. The team-based staffing structure at AFS is designed to facilitate this. Staff members are well supported by management and have plenty of opportunities for reflection on their role, which benefits students through improved teaching techniques, student support and graduate outcomes.

AFS has client-friendly systems for the pastoral care of its students. The organisation is providing a safe and supportive learning environment for its

students. There is a designated support staff member with 24-hour phone contact should the students require assistance when away from the site.

AFS provides accommodation for over 100 students in fully self-sufficient four to five bedroom homes in nearby suburbs. Where possible, students from different nationalities are placed together to encourage English language skills and to be more inclusive. Instructors are also living in accommodation attached to each of the houses and can provide additional support for students if needed. Transport to and from accommodation is provided by AFS.

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**.

The new governance and management structure of AFS is appropriate, and there is clear and decisive leadership occurring, based on good quality assurance principles and a shared set of core values. The working environment, staff morale and student experience are all positive. The organisational strategy is formally documented, and management and staff have a common understanding of the vision and direction. The organisation has developed and is embedding effective systems for monitoring, at all levels, educational performance, and for supporting staff to improve outcomes. However, recommendations from the last EER have not been specifically addressed and many of these issues still exist.³

Effective resourcing is well planned and provided for all activities, and the organisation is financially sustainable. There are systems in place to monitor resourcing to ensure there are sufficient aircraft and instructors to meet the needs of the students. The quality of resources to support learning is very good. The recent establishment of the deputy head of training role is positive as it focuses specifically on training quality and standards. Likewise, the introduction of the new ETA training management system has allowed for more effective use of data to inform useful changes to programmes and delivery. As previously discussed, the ETA holds a wealth of performance data but at this point it is not always accessible in a useful form.

AFS has employed qualified and experienced staff, with A-Category, B-Category and C-Category instructors on permanent staff. The value that AFS management places on the experience and know-how of the instructional team is clearly apparent. While the current practice of employing graduates as instructors has

³ For instance: professional networking with other training providers; investigating ongoing opportunities for instructors to develop their teaching practice; maintaining engagement with international graduates.

obvious benefits, there is a risk that the staff lack valuable external experience. This was evident in some of the discussions with instructors who know only how to teach the way they were taught. These staff showed obvious natural passion and ability to engage students. However, the evaluation team believes that stronger policy and practice in this area would enhance the instructors' pedagogical understanding and better demonstrate more effective practice. These practices could include sending instructors to various short courses on adult teaching, contracting an external expert to assist with reflective practice, and/or exchanging instructors with other aviation schools.

Monitoring of performance within AFS is regular, transparent and robust, and the organisation encourages opportunities for reflection on its role and how to continue to make ongoing and continuous improvements to meeting the needs of students and other stakeholders. Self-assessment is being well led by management and is being adopted throughout the organisation. Management and staff enthusiastically encourage opportunities for reflection on their roles and how to better meet stakeholder needs. There were many examples of 'micro' reflection and improvement loops, but they need to be part of a more co-ordinated and cohesive continuous improvement regime, centred around improved value and outcomes for students to demonstrate insightful and authentic self-assessment.

1.6 How effectively are important compliance accountabilities managed?

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**.

The organisation's culture emphasises compliance. AFS staff are accustomed to working in a high-compliance environment and have systems in place to manage many of their external compliance requirements. The evaluators were shown a template for a 'compliance map' which is a useful checklist of compliance obligations, due dates, etc. However, this checklist has not yet been used.

NZQA attestations and returns have been met within required timeframes. The courses are being delivered consistent with NZQA approvals.

Health and safety is at the core of AFS's operation. The organisation has detailed health and safety and risk management plans for all key operations. CAA audits and licences are up to date. Although staff appraisal systems lapsed for a while, there is now a systematic appraisal of individual staff performance in place.

Some gaps were identified in the way AFS is managing its compliance obligations under the Code of Practice. For instance, random samples of the student files selected and checked during this EER revealed that some important and necessary documents, such as for insurance and visas, were missing in over half of the student files selected. Once prompted, AFS staff were, within a few days, able to

Final Report

provide the documents for all students, although it was noted that several of the insurance certificates had a start date since the EER, indicating that those students did not have insurance cover prior to the EER. Equally concerning was the fact that the former chief executive had signed a Code Self-Review Attestation in October 2017, but no-one could find the review document or recall the review having taken place.

These gaps indicate that there are not robust processes currently in place to manage compliance with the Code of Practice. However, intended outcomes of the Code of Practice are largely being met. Retention on programmes is high and student surveys show a high level of satisfaction with the support provided and of the students' overall experience. Attendance expectations as they pertain to programme success and visa rules are actively managed. Warnings and sanctions are fairly applied when student attendance falters. As previously indicated, students are well supported at AFS.

In essence, AFS is unclear about some of its compliance accountabilities under the Code of Practice, and is not managing them effectively to ensure all important obligations are met.

Focus Areas

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

2.1 Focus area: New Zealand Diploma in Aviation (Levels 5 and 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**.

2.2 Focus area: New Zealand Certificate in Aeronautical Engineering (Level 4)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: International Student Support and Wellbeing.

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

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

⁴ Note that ratings for this focus area are centred around KEQs 3, 4 and 5 as there have been no graduates from the programme to date.

Recommendations

NZQA recommends that Ardmore Flying School:

- Ensure that self-assessment processes are formalised through regular and organisation-wide, systemic engagement with internal and external stakeholders, and improvements are documented.
- Explore and take up opportunities for professional networking with other training providers to help AFS staff gain a more in-depth understanding of self-assessment in practice.
- Investigate and effect ongoing opportunities for instructors to develop their teaching practice.
- Implement systems to engage with graduates and use the information gained to inform improvements to programme design and delivery.
- Explore and implement ways to maintain engagement with at least some international graduates.
- Ensure that the staff designated as having responsibility for the Code of Practice are fully conversant with their responsibilities under the code. This should include regular self-review (as required for compliance) and attendance at Code Office professional development sessions.
- Improve compliance management processes, especially in relation to the Code of Practice.

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