# *Tertiary Education Commission*

## Focused review of Tectra Limited PTE

April 2015

pwc

# Contents

**Distribution List:**

Bo Gardner (Tectra Limited, CEO)
Gavin Rowland (Tectra Limited, Director)
Hilary Sharp (Tectra Limited, Academic Manager)

**Sponsor:**

Graeme Cahalane (Tertiary Education Commission, Manager, Monitoring and Crown Ownership)

# 1. *Executive summary*

In accordance with our Contract for Services signed in November 2014 we performed review of Tectra Limited PTE on behalf of Tertiary Education Commission.

## *Background*

The Tertiary Education Commission ("TEC") requested PwC to undertake an independent review of a selected Private Training Establishment ("PTE") Tectra Limited ("Tectra"), following concerns raised around its processes and procedures.

Tectra is a wool industry PTE that is based in Christchurch and delivers training in niche qualifications in regions throughout New Zealand. The primary qualifications delivered by Tectra include shearing, wool technology, handling and harvesting from level two to level four, as well as agriculture at level two. Tectra receives Student Achievement Component ("SAC") funding at level two and above. Tectra is also a Modern Apprenticeship Co-Ordinator ("MAC") and receives MAC funding at level three and four.

Tectra was subcontracted by the Primary Industries ITO ("PRITO") to provide training to the PRITO's trainees. In August 2014 PRITO raised concerns regarding services provided to them by Tectra, including:

- The integrity of enrolment procedures
- The appropriateness and eligibility of students enrolled
- The accuracy of course attendance, completion and qualification procedures and data
- Confirmation of appropriate students' employment in the industry.

TEC engaged PwC to perform an independent review of Tectra's processes and procedures around SAC and MAC funded programmes and subcontracting arrangements between PRITO and Tectra.

## *Objective and scope of this engagement*

The objective of this engagement was to check Tectra's compliance with the TEC's funding requirements in relation to:

- SAC funded programmes
- MAC funded programmes.

The scope of this engagement also included understanding the nature of subcontracting arrangements between PRITO and Tectra to validate the substance of concerns raised by PRITO.

## *Tectra Limited overview*

Tectra is a private training establishment with the headcount of approximately 20 full time employees, including management and administrative personnel based in Christchurch and Wellington and 8 regional managers based in different regions. There is also a number of tutors delivering training across New Zealand. The core team has been working for Tectra for several years, however, there was a recent change of the Academic Manager. The new Academic Manager started in April 2014, replacing the prior one who left Tectra in January 2014.

Tectra use the WiseNet system as its student management system. WiseNet was implemented in January 2013, replacing the prior JDB system. All students' records for the previous two years have been manually transferred from JDB into WiseNet system by Tectra. Along with the main WiseNet system Tectra use Excel spreadsheets and an Access database to keep required records.

Processes used by Tectra to support its admission, enrolment, assessment, completion and qualification procedures vary depending on the particular programme. However, all the processes are highly manual and paper

based, where some of the documents are manually entered into WiseNet system and then archived by courses and programmes.

# Key observations

We have tested Tectra's compliance with MAC and SAC funding requirements for a sample of apprentices and students who have been enrolled with Tectra during the period 2012 – 2014. The samples we selected are detailed in the Appendices to this report.

Our key observations from this engagement are summarised below. For detailed results of the procedures performed refer detailed observations section in this report.

## 1. Compliance with Modern Apprenticeship Co-Ordinator funding requirements

### 1.1 Validity of Modern Apprentices

Modern Apprenticeship Programme requires certain entry criteria to be met by applicants before they can be enrolled. This includes relevant training experience and employment in the industry. The Modern Apprenticeship (MA) Co-Ordinator is responsible for checking applicants' eligibility for enrolment in the programme.

For a sample of 30 apprentices enrolled with Tectra as their MA Co-Ordinator, we have tested ID documents, records of employment and conducted phone interviews to confirm their validity.

We noted that Tectra's process to verify applicants' identity was relatively informal and didn't require official ID documents to be presented. NSI numbers and applicant's declarations were accepted as identity confirmation.

We also noted that the identity of the apprentices who have been previously enrolled as trainees with PRITO have not been independently verified by Tectra. They relied on the confirmation of identity performed by PRITO and recorded in their TIM system. There were 5 such apprentices in our sample.

From a review of provided ID documents and phone interviews with apprentices we were able to confirm identity of 24 apprentices out of 30 selected. Identity of the remaining 6 apprentices hasn't been fully confirmed due to either missing ID documents or inability to contact the person by phone and email.

We checked evidence of apprentices' employment in the industry by reviewing their Industry Training Agreements with employers and conducting phone interviews. According to the agreements all 30 apprentices were employed in the shearing industry. However, per results of the phone interviews one apprentice didn't confirm that he was employed in the industry. According to Tectra's records this apprentice was employed in the shearing industry. We cannot verify this inconsistency.

### 1.2 Validity of Industry Training and Modern Apprenticeship Co-Ordinator agreements

Modern Apprentices upon entering the programme sign Industry Training Agreements and Modern Apprenticeship Agreements with the employer and Co-Ordinator, where they specify the qualification to be achieved and the Modern Apprentice (MA) programme start and end dates.

For a sample of 30 apprentices we reconciled their MA programmes start and end dates in the Brokerage reports with the dates in their Industry Training Agreements, Modern Apprenticeship Agreements and WiseNet system profiles.

We noted 15 Industry Training Agreements and 15 MAC agreements where the programmes' dates didn't correspond with the dates in Brokerage report. Tectra explained these inconsistencies by a technical problem between TIMS and Industry Training Register systems or by changes in the programmes names initiated by NZQA which do not require resigning and changing the dates in the agreements.

We also noted 2 apprentices who have changed their employers, but didn't sign new MAC agreements with the new employers; and 1 MAC agreement missing the front page, so we were not able to confirm the programme dates.

### 1.3 Modern Apprenticeship Co-Ordinator's meeting with apprentices

Tectra as a Modern Apprenticeship Co-Ordinator is required to make sure each apprentice has an Individual Training Plan specifying his key goals and required on the job and off the job training to achieve the target qualification. The Co-Ordinator is required to have face-to-face meetings with each apprentice on at least a quarterly basis to assess their progress against the objectives and provide any support required.

We confirmed that 27 out of 30 selected apprentices had signed by them and their employers Individual Training Plans, while the other three had plans which were considered as deficient (one plan had missing pages with the start and end dates of the programme, and another two related to the old programmes).

We noted that Individual Training Plans didn't provide the necessary information required on the job and off the job training hours, as well as not specifying objectives and progression. Instead of this Quarterly Activity Plans have been used to specify objectives and review progress.

We inspected a sample of Quarterly Activity Plans and confirmed that 15 apprentices have been setting objectives and reviewing their progress with their Co-Ordinator on a quarterly basis. For the remaining 15 apprentices we didn't find sufficient evidence to confirm this, i.e. we didn't sight up-to-date plans that have been reviewed by the Co-Ordinator. Considering that the Co-Ordinator's review of quarterly plans is the only evidence confirming their quarterly face-to-face meetings with apprentices we don't have sufficient evidence to confirm that these meetings have taken place on a regular basis. This was corroboratively confirmed with the interviewed apprentices. We phoned 30 apprentices, but were able to contact 8 of them and only 5 contacted apprentices confirmed that they had regular face to face meetings with their Co-Ordinators.

## 2. Compliance with Student Achievement Component funding requirements

### 2.1 Validity of SAC funded students

Each education provider is required to verify prospective students' full legal name, date of birth, citizenship or residency status and record sightings of documents confirming these.

For a sample of 50 SAC funded students enrolled with Tectra in various programmes, we have viewed their ID documents and conducted phone interviews to confirm their validity.

As a result we were able to confirm the identity of 47 students, noting that in 20 cases there was not sufficient evidence to confirm Tectra's sighting of the original documents. For 3 students enrolled in the Wool Technology programme we were not able to fully confirm their identity due to missing ID documents (3 students) and inability to contact them by phone and email (2 students).

### 2.2 Admission of SAC funded students

Each education provider is required to keep admission records. Based on discussions, Tectra don't have formally documented admission criteria, however, all applicants should be interviewed by Tectra as a part of the admission process.

For a sample of 50 students we requested and inspected evidence of the interviews and admission decisions made by Tectra. As a result we were provided with interview forms for 3 students (all from Agriculture Introductory Skills programme) and application forms for 9 students (8 from Certificate in Wool Technology and 1 from Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool). However, these documents have been completed by applicants only and do not explicitly assess applicants' eligibility or appropriateness to enter the programme, therefore cannot be considered as sufficient evidence of Tectra's admission decision.

We also interviewed the students to obtain their feedback on the admission process and only 5 out of 8 contacted students confirmed that they have been interviewed by Tectra, noting that the process was informal.

Therefore, we don't have sufficient documented evidence to support Tectra's admission decision for selected students.

### 2.3 Enrolment of SAC funded students

SAC funding requirements specify that student's enrolment with education providers should be formally confirmed by offer of enrolment, evidence of tuition fees payment, and confirmation of enrolment or study contract. However, per our discussion with Tectra, the only document confirming student's enrolment with Tectra is an Enrolment form completed and signed by the student and student profile record in the WiseNet system.

We were able to obtain and inspect Enrolment forms and WiseNet printouts for 46 students out of 50 selected. Per review of these documents the following inconsistencies were noted:

- Missing forms replaced by the new backdated forms (1 for Shearing and 2 for Wool Handling). Tectra explained this by the fact that they couldn't locate the forms requested and, therefore, asked some of the students to sign the new forms.

- Forms without indication of the programme selected (2 forms for Shearing programme) or indicating more than one programme (1 for Wool Handling and 1 for Shearing). Tectra explained this by the fact that programme level and, therefore, start and end dates are defined by the trainer later in the process.

- Forms signed before the student ID was confirmed (2 Agriculture and 4 Wool Harvesting), and forms not specifying programmes start and end dates (9 forms for Agriculture programme).

No enrolment documents were provided for 4 students enrolled in Certificates in Wool Technology, Wool Handling and Wool Harvesting.

If tuition fees are required, most of the students apply for a student loan and fees are paid to Tectra through the account managed by the Public Trust. We were able to see sufficient evidence of tuition fees payments by 7 students enrolled in Certificate in Wool Technology, some evidence of payments by 2 students, and no information about tuition fees for 31 students. No tuition fees were required for the Agriculture Introductory skills programme (10 students from our sample).

### 2.4 Attendance records of SAC funded students

Education providers are required to keep records of funded students' attendance to demonstrate their valid enrolment status. Per discussion with Tectra students' attendance records are maintained by tutors using paper based Course Record Forms.

For a sample of 50 students we requested and inspected their attendance records. We were provided with the documents confirming course attendance for 33 students, noting that the dates of attendance were either on the date of or before the date of students' enrolment. One student didn't have any record of attendance, because he was withdrawn from the course and one student was recorded as an instructor in his records of course attendance.

Per results of our interviews only 5 out of 8 contacted students confirmed that they were required to attend their courses and that attendance was recorded.

We were not able to find sufficient documented evidence of the course attendance for 16 students, including 3 students from Certificate in Wool Technology, 4 from Shearing and 9 from the Wool Handling programme.

### 2.5 Submission of work and assessments supporting qualification for SAC funded students

To obtain the qualification each student is required to achieve specific unit standards (US) attached to the qualification. This includes submission of required assignments, completing theoretical and practical assessments and confirming the required number of hours of practice.

For a sample of 50 students we requested and inspected documents confirming completion of their assignments, assessments and practice throughout their study with Tectra. As a result we were provided with reasonable evidence of completing assignments, assessments and practical hours for 27 students.

For the remaining 23 students we were provided with inconsistent or insufficient evidence of their work completion and assessments to support achievement of qualification, noting that not all these 23 students have achieved their qualification.

This includes completion of all assessments in 3-4 days with no other evidence supporting achievements (3 students); lack of documents supporting achievement of specific Unit Standards (3 students from Agriculture, Wool Handling and Wool Harvesting programmes).

We noted 12 students (11 of them have achieved the qualification) whose achievements and qualifications granted were supported either by verification script only or by verification script and some other documents. It should be noted that verification scripts should be used only in cases when typical evidence (assessment forms, work books, etc.) is lost or misplaced. These students included 1 student from Certificate in Wool Technology, 6 from Shearing, 3 from Wool Handling and 2 from Wool Harvesting programmes.

Therefore, we were not able to find sufficient documented evidence confirming completion of assignments, assessments and practical hours required to support the achievement of qualification by 11 students.

### 3. Subcontracting arrangements between PRITO and Tectra

Tectra was subcontracted by PRITO to deliver industry training, act as modern apprenticeship Co-Ordinators and undertake assessments of PRITO students using the tools provided by PRITO, including the TIM student management system.

According to the subcontracting arrangements Tectra's responsibilities included ensuring that trainees meet validity criteria, delivery of training and assessments as required by the training programme, meeting with trainees every 3 months (but every 6 months as minimum) and setting objectives and goals to achieve over the next 6 months.

Tectra was responsible for sending training agreements to the PRITO Service Centre on a monthly basis, recording trainee results directly in TIM within a month of the result being achieved, ensuring all individual training plans for modern apprentices are forwarded to PRITO Service Centre on a quarterly basis, and ensuring modern apprentice visits are recorded in the TIM system.

Tectra was paid for the delivery of services by PRITO on a monthly basis and, therefore, didn't claim funding for the subcontracted students from TEC.

In March 2014 PRITO suggested some changes in the subcontracting arrangements, which were not accepted by Tectra. Since that period Tectra don't have access to the PRITO TIM system and perform Modern Apprenticeship Coordination only.

Following this, in August 2014 PRITO have raised concerns in relation to the quality of services provided to them under the subcontracting arrangements by Tectra. These included questioning the integrity of enrolment, eligibility of students and appropriateness of attendance, completion and qualification in relation to 176 subcontracted students.

In response to this, Tectra performed an internal review of the 176 questioned students. The results of their own investigation indicated that 1 student was included in the PRITO list by mistake as a duplicate, 150 students had sufficient and appropriate evidence supporting their enrolment, attendance, completion and qualification results.  Only 25 students' records were recognised as inconsistent.

According to the information made available to us, there was no further discussion of these concerns between Tectra and PRITO. While the purpose of this review didn't include validation of PRITO's concerns in relation to the specific students, our sample testing of Tectra's compliance with MAC and SAC funding requirements identified a number of issues which are consistent with the concerns raised by PRITO.

## *Overall comments*

Based on the procedures performed, including interviews with Tectra's employees, selected students and apprentices and testing of documentation provided, we noted several cases of non-compliance with SAC and MAC funding requirements. Details are provided further in this report.

However, we were not able to identify any patterns or common issues by programme or year of study. Instances of non-compliance identified by our sample testing could be explained by the weaknesses in the processes and controls employed by Tectra to support its record keeping processes.

We have not performed any estimation of the amount of possible overfunding caused by these cases of non-compliance.

## *Acknowledgment*

We would like to thank the Tectra team for their cooperation and support during our engagement. If you have any questions regarding this engagement, please do not hesitate to contact me.

07 April 2015

_____        _____

David Nalder                              Date
Partner
Wellington
PricewaterhouseCoopers

# 2. Detailed observations

## a. MAC funding requirements

| TEC MAC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[1] | Non-Compliant[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Validity of trainees for whom Tectra is claiming brokerage funding** | | | | |
| We tested a sample of 30 Modern Apprentices (refer Appendix A for sample details)  in accordance with the specified procedures in this table and obtained the following results: | | | | |
| a)  Tectra must verify learner full legal name, date of birth, gender, citizenship or residency status (Rule ENR028) and must record sightings of documents of identity, date of birth, citizenship and residency (the person who sighted the documents must sign and date the learner's enrolment record) (Rule ENR031) | • Conducted interviews with selected modern apprentices (by phone)<br><br>• Obtained and inspected copies of modern apprentices' identification documents provided by Tectra, including passport, driver license, birth certificate | • We were able to contact by phone 8 out of 30 selected apprentices, all of them confirmed their names; the remaining 22 apprentices either didn't answer the phone, or phone number was not located, or belonged to a different person<br><br>• For 18 apprentices (60%) we obtained copies of their ID documents (Passport, or Birth Certificate, or Driver License, or 18+ card) which provided evidence of Tectra's sighting the originals. For the remaining 12 apprentices  (40%) we noted the following exceptions:<br><br>  • 5 apprentices with ID documents which didn't indicate that the originals have been sighted by Tectra;<br><br>  • 2 apprentices with NSI numbers only; and<br><br>  • 5 apprentices with screenshots from AgITO TIMS system. Per Tectra's comments in cases when apprentices have been verified by AgITO, Tectra rely on this verification and do not check it independently. | N/A[3]<br><br><br><br><br>60% | N/A<br><br><br><br><br>40% |

[1] Percentage of a selected sample which is considered to be compliant with the specified funding requirements based on the documents reviewed
[2] Percentage of a selected sample which is considered to be non-compliant or not fully compliant with the specified funding requirements based on the documents reviewed (missing or inconsistent documents)
[3] N/A – cannot assess compliance due to the nature of evidence available or absence of formal requirements
PwC
Focused review of Tectra Limited PTE

| TEC MAC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[1] | Non-Compliant[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | In summary we have 6 apprentices out of 30 selected for whom we were not able to fully confirm their identity (no copy of ID document and no phone interview). | | |
| b) Apprentice must have a signed Industry Training Agreement with employer which leads to achievement of level 3 or 4 qualifications of the NZ Qualification Framework and has been approved by TEC and registered with the relevant ITO | Obtained and inspected copies of apprentices' Industry Training Agreement and Modern Apprenticeship Agreement with employer, checked that it was signed by apprentice and employer; checked that it was registered with the relevant ITO. Checked the agreements' dates (Modern Apprenticeship programme start and end dates) and reconciled them to the dates in the Brokerage report. | Per discussion with Tectra apprentices sign with employer 2 agreements – Training Agreement and Modern Apprenticeship Agreement.<br><br>We obtained Training and Modern Apprenticeship Agreements for all 30 selected apprentices. However, 15 out of 30 inspected Training Agreements (50%) have Modern Apprenticeship programme start and end dates not corresponding with the dates from the Brokerage report provided to us.<br><br>In 3 cases this was explained by the system problem (ITR and TIMS) which was reported to TEC, but not solved; and 8 cases were explained by the change in the programme name and that PRITO do not require new agreements in this case (same programme, same level). We also noted 2 agreements which were signed by employer after the start date of the apprenticeship programme.<br><br>Similar to Training Agreements we noted 18 MAC agreements (60%) with inconsistencies, in particular:<br><br>• 15 MAC agreements which programme start and end dates did not correspond with information in the Brokerage report;<br>• 2 apprentices changed employers, but didn't sign new MAC agreements with new employers (as per Tectra, PRITO do not require new MAC agreements in the case of changes of employer, only employer transfer forms);<br>• 1 MAC agreement didn't have a front page, so we were not able to confirm the MA programme name and start and end dates. | 50%<br><br><br><br>40% | 50%<br><br><br><br>60% |

| TEC MAC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[1] | Non-Compliant[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| c) Apprentice must be employed in the occupation for which he/she is training | Checked that selected apprentices have been employed in the shearing industry | For all 30 selected apprentices we inspected their Training Agreements with employers and confirmed that all employers were from the shearing industry.<br><br>*Note: According to the phone interviews one apprentice didn't confirm that he was employed in the industry. According to Tectra's records this apprentice was employed in the shearing industry. We cannot verify this inconsistency.* | 100% | - |
| d) Apprentice must have assigned NZ NSN | Checked that selected apprentices have been assigned with NSN | For all 30 selected apprentices we confirmed that they have been assigned with NSNs | 100% | - |
| e) Apprentice should be enrolled with the Co-Ordinator | Obtained and inspected evidence of modern apprentices' enrolment with Tectra | Upon completion of enrolment Tectra send letters to apprentices and employers to confirm acceptance in the Tectra Modern Apprenticeship scheme. We obtained and inspected confirmation letters for 24 out of 30 selected apprentices, however 1 letter was for the older (withdrawn) programme and therefore not relevant; for the remaining 6 apprentices the only evidence of enrolment was a print out of an apprentice file from Tectra's WiseNet system. Therefore, in 7 cases (23%) we didn't sight formal (documented) confirmation of apprentices' enrolment with Tectra. | 77% | 23% |
| f) Apprentice must have signed an Individual Training Plan which is also signed by their Employer and Co-Ordinator | Obtained and inspected modern apprentices' Individual Training Plans; checked that the plans have been signed by Employer and Co-Ordinator | For all selected 30 apprentices we obtained and inspected their Individual Training Plans; however 1 plan had missing pages and we couldn't confirm the dates of the Modern Apprenticeship programme; and 2 plans provided to us related to the old programmes, not the current one. All plans were signed by the apprentice, employer and Tectra Co-Ordinator. | 90% | 10% |
| g) Individual training plan provides information on training progress and should: | For a sample apprentices selected for testing obtained and inspected their Individual Training Plans, checking the following: | For a sample of 30 Modern Apprentices we obtained and inspected their Individual Training Plans. The following results were achieved: | | |

| TEC MAC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[1] | Non-Compliant[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| • Comply with TEC's specifications and outline the training process (on-job and off-job training and assessments)<br>• Identify the approved National Certificate(s) at level 3 or 4 on the NZQG to be achieved<br>• Record progress against the milestones and achievement targets for the training period specified in the plan<br>• Is updated each quarter, with any amendments being agreed in writing with the Co-ordinator Modern Apprentice and the Employer | • The plan complied with TEC's specification (number of total hours, split between on-job and off-job trainings, assessments) | • Plans did not provide a split of required hours between on the job and off the job training; there were templates for recording achievement of the key milestones (unit standards), but these have not been used as per the sample we tested | - | 100% |
| | • It identified approved National Certificate(s) level 3 or 4 | • Information on the National Certificate was provided in Section 2 of the Plan (Modern Apprenticeship content) | 100% | - |
| | • Contained records of progress, milestones, updates, issues and follow up actions | • Inspected plans didn't contain any records of actual progress against the key milestones (unit standards). Records of progress were documented in the apprentices' quarterly Activity Plans, refer (i) below for test results | - | 100% |
| | • Signed by the Employer and Co-Ordinator, including any amendments in it | • All inspected plans were signed by the apprentice, employer and Tectra Co-Ordinator; however, 3 plans were considered as not relevant (for details refer (f) above) | 90% | 10% |
| | Conducted interviews with: | Discussed with Tectra employees and modern apprentices the process of training and progression against training plans. The following results were obtained: | N/A | N/A |
| | • Apprentices to discuss their training plans and the training process (how they progressed against their milestones and targets), record keeping and plan update procedures. | • Each apprentice discusses with the Co-Ordinator (Tectra) his/her goals which are documented in a quarterly Activity Plan. The Co-Ordinator meets with apprentices on a quarterly basis to discuss and document his/her progress against the goals documented in the plan. | | |
| | • Tectra employees to discuss the process/system they used to keep records of the training progress for each apprentice. | • Co-Ordinators meet with their apprentice face-to-face when possible, but due to the nature of the shearing industry, apprentices often have to travel across the country, therefore, quarterly discussions may be performed over the phone. This information was confirmed with the interviewed apprentices. Quarterly | | |

| TEC MAC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[1] | Non-Compliant[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | plans and records of progression should be signed by the apprentice, employer and Co-Ordinator (refer (i) below for test results). Quarterly plans and records of progression are prepared in hard copy and kept on student file at Tectra. | | |
| i) The Co-Ordinator must visit the Co-ordinator's Modern Apprentice and the Employer at least once every quarter, at approximately three monthly intervals, to review and update the Individual Training Plan and review progress with the Co-ordinator Modern Apprentice's completion of the Modern Apprenticeship. | • Discussed with Tectra employees the process of providing mentoring services, including face-to-face visits and keeping records/evidence of these visits | • Per discussion with Tectra mentoring is performed through regular (quarterly) meetings between Co-Ordinators and their apprentices. During these meetings they discuss and set up quarterly objectives which are documented in apprentice's quarterly Activity Plans. The same plan is used for documentation and review of apprentices' progress against the objectives. Activity plans and review of achievement/ progression should be signed by the apprentice, employer and Co-Ordinator. Co-Ordinators should meet with their apprentices face to face every quarter, however, due to the specifics of the shearing industry apprentices often have to travel across the country, therefore, quarterly discussions between Co-Ordinators and apprentices may be performed by phone. In cases when the Co-Ordinator cannot reach out to the apprentices for more than a quarter, this apprentice should be put on hold .There is no formal evidence of face to face meetings between Co-Ordinators and apprentices apart from the signed quarterly activity plans. | N/A | N/A |
| | • Checked records of face-to-face visits in the apprentices' Individual Training Plans to ensure these were conducted at least 4 times a year | • We obtained and inspected copies of the apprentices' quarterly Activity Plans and checked them for evidence of review and sign off from apprentices, employers and Co-Ordinators. We noted that for 15 (50%) apprentices out of 30 selected for testing their quarterly plans were either not up to date (recent plans were missing) or there was no evidence of Co-Ordinator review of the apprentice's progress. | 50% | 50% |

| TEC MAC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[1] | Non-Compliant[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • Confirmed through interviews with selected apprentices that Co-ordinator visits have taken place and have been face-to-face | • We were able to contact 8 apprentices (as per (a) above). Per conducted interviews 5 out of 8 apprentices confirmed that they had face-to-face meetings with Co-Ordinators every couple of months; 3 apprentices didn't provide any information; the remaining 22 people we were not able to contact. | N/A | N/A |
| | • Follow up with Tectra on any issues/questions noted. | • We followed up with Tectra on the findings and added their comments where appropriate. | N/A | N/A |

# 2. Detailed observations

## b. SAC funding requirements

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[4] | Non-Compliant[5] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Student admission and enrolment processes** | | | | |
| For a sample of 50 SAC funded students enrolled with Tectra (refer Appendix B for sample details)  we performed the procedures specified in this table and obtained the following results: | | | | |
| a)  Tectra must verify learner (EFTS greater than 0.03) full legal name, date of birth, gender, citizenship or residency status (Rule ENR028) and must record sightings of documents of identity, date of birth, citizenship and residency (the person who sighted the documents must sign and date the learner's enrolment record) (Rule ENR031) | Checked that student identity and citizenship have been verified by Tectra (copies of sighted documents are provided). | For 50 selected students we obtained and inspected documents confirming their identity and checked that there was evidence of Tectra sighting the original document.<br><br>We were provided with ID documents for 47 out of 50 selected students; and for 3 students (all enrolled in Certificate in Wool Technology) no ID documents were provided to us. 20 out of 47 provided ID documents didn't have evidence of Tectra's sighting the original documents.<br><br>In summary, there were 23 students (46%) whose identity hasn't been properly verified by Tectra (no ID provided or no evidence of ID sighting). | 54% | 46% |
| b)  Tectra must keep admission records that (Rule ENR026)  confirm whether they have admitted, re-admitted or not admitted each learner; | Checked that there were formal admission criteria and documented admission decision confirming that Tectra has checked students' eligibility for entering the programme and that admission/ entering criteria have been met. | Based on our discussions with Tectra employees there were no formal admission criteria. Usually the admission process included an interview with a prospective student. The applicant completed the application form and/or interview form (questionnaire).  Tectra did not document the admission decision. | - | 100% |

---

[4] Percentage of a selected sample which is considered to be compliant with the specified funding requirements based on the documents reviewed
[5] Percentage of a selected sample which is considered to be non-compliant or not fully compliant with the specified funding requirements based on the documents reviewed (missing or inconsistent documents)

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[4] | Non-Compliant[5] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Student admission and enrolment processes** | | | | |
| and are an auditable record of admission decisions with relevant documentation until the period has passed in which learners may appeal against an admission decision.<br><br>And confirms the learner's eligibility to study | | For the sample of 50 students we were provided with Interview Forms completed by 3 applicants (all for Agriculture Introductory Skills qualification); Application forms completed by 9 applicants (note that these forms do not assess directly students' eligibility and appropriateness to enter the programme); and for the remaining 38 students there were no formal records confirming that applicants have been evaluated against any admission criteria before entering the programme.<br><br>In summary, there were no sufficient and relevant documents confirming Tectra's admission decisions in relation to 50 students selected for testing. | | |
| c) Tectra must access the National Student Index (NSI) and for each student assign NSN and create NSI or update NSI (Rule ENR036). | Confirmed that enrolled students have NSNs | All 50 students selected for testing had NSNs. | 100% | - |
| d) Tectra must (Rule ENR042) make a formal offer to enrol the learner on a course or programme of study; the learner must formally accept the offer by signing it; and Tectra must record the enrolment<br><br>and<br><br>Tectra may make an enrolment offer in writing or electronically (Rule | • Checked that students had formal offer of enrolment issued and signed by Tectra<br><br>• Checked that enrolment forms have been prepared and signed by the students and Tectra | • No offer of enrolment is prepared by Tectra, therefore no offers of enrolments were provided for 50 selected students<br><br>• We were provided with enrolment forms for 46 out of 50 selected students, however, 23 of them were inconsistent, in particular:<br><br>(i) Enrolment forms for 2 students didn't specify the programmes selected<br><br>(ii) Enrolment forms for another 2 students specified multiple programmes selected<br><br>(iii) Enrolment forms for 6 students were dated either before ID had been confirmed or after the start date of the programme (as per WiseNet programmes dates) | -<br><br><br><br><br><br>46% | 100%<br><br><br><br><br><br>54% |

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[4] | Non-Compliant[5] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Student admission and enrolment processes** | | | | |
| ENR051) and must sign learners' enrolment forms, on paper or electronically, to declare the documentation is accurate and complete (Rule ENR055). | | (iv) Enrolment forms for 10 students without indication of programmes start and end dates

(v) 3 missing enrolment forms were replaced by the new forms which were backdated. Tectra explained this by the fact that they couldn't locate the forms requested and, therefore, asked some of the students to sign the new forms.

In summary, we obtained only 23 enrolment forms (46%) which confirmed students' enrolment in the selected programme, including its start and end dates. However, none of them have been formally signed by Tectra.

We discussed these observations with Tectra and obtained the following comments:

*(i)- (ii) The trainee when completing the Enrolment form should only indicate the qualification that they are enrolling in at that time, but many trainees tick multiple boxes, or no boxes as they are unsure of what level they are at. A "pre-assessment" is done by the trainer and is followed by a verbal conversation with the trainee. Once it is established and agreed what level the trainee is to be enrolled in, the trainer will indicate this on the back of the Course Record Form, this is the Level that the trainee will be enrolled in.*

*(iii) Students are not enrolled into a qualification until Tectra have received appropriate ID. A student will be entered into WiseNet as "pending". The Regional Training Manger (RTM) and the National Operations Manager are informed of the reason for the "pending" enrolment and the RTM will follow up with the trainee. The paper copy of the enrolment form is put into the Incomplete Enrolments folder, which is checked every Friday and reported to the RTM and National Operations Manager. As some of these involve the trainee applying for a Birth Certificate (which the RTM will assist them with), they can take weeks or even* | | |

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[4] | Non-Compliant[5] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Student admission and enrolment processes** | | | | |
| | | *months before ID is received and they are then changed in WiseNet from pending to active. The trainee is enrolled as at the date the ID is received (as per advice from TEC helpdesk earlier this year). If the appropriate ID is not received the trainee will not become an "active" trainee and therefore will not attract government funding.* | | |
| | | *(iv) Date of enrolment may change if the enrolment is "pending" as described above in (iii). Also the finish date of the qualification may change if the trainee has completed the qualification early (after being assessed as competent before the qualification end date) or later (if an extension was given). Each course that is part of the qualification may have the end date changed if the trainee completes that course before the end date of the qualification (this is common in many programmes as the courses/Unit standards can be completed at various times throughout the programme, and also trainees will become "competent" in practical assessments at different times). The course end date will change for each of these, but the qualification end date will remain the same, unless the trainee completes early, or later as described above.* | | |
| e) Tectra must confirm a learner's enrolment by one the issue of a receipt for payment for fees/course costs; or issue of a student identification card; or a letter with details of the learner's courses and must validate learners' signed enrolment forms by countersigning them (Rule ENR058). | • Checked that there was documented evidence of the tuition fees (if applicable) payment by a student | • In 7 out of 50 cases there was evidence provided to us confirming the tuition fees payments (all Certificate in Wool Technology); in 2 cases fee acknowledgement or the application for student trust account were provided, but no confirmation of payments; in 10 cases payments were not required (Agriculture (Introductory skills)); and in 31 cases no information about payments required/ made was provided to us. In summary, there were 33 (66%) cases when we didn't obtain sufficient evidence to confirm fees payments. | 33% <br><br><br><br><br><br><br> - | 66% <br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br> 100% |

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[4] | Non-Compliant[5] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Student admission and enrolment processes** | | | | |
| | • Checked that students received documented confirmation of enrolment (receipt for payment for fees/course costs; or a student identification card; or a letter with details of the learner's courses) and enrolment contract signed by the student and Tectra. | • No formal confirmation of enrolment is provided to students and no enrolment contract is prepared. | | |
| f) Tectra must record any changes to enrolment, including withdrawal. | Checked for withdrawn students that there were relevant records confirming withdrawals. | There were 2 withdrawn students out of 50 selected; the indication of withdrawal was in the form of email or comment on the student assessment document. | 100% | - |

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[6] | Non-Compliant[7] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Process around student attendance in programme and qualification completion** | | | | |
| For a sample of 50 SAC funded students enrolled with Tectra (refer Appendix B for sample details)  we performed the procedures specified in this table and obtained the following results: | | | | |
| g) Tectra must record the following details of each learner's programme of study (Rule ENR089):<br>• Confirmation of the learner's application, admission, enrolment contract and payment of tuition fees and associated costs<br>• The qualification(s) in which the learner is enrolled for the current and previous teaching periods<br>• The courses in which the learner is enrolled for the current and previous enrolment periods<br>• The programme or major in which the learner is enrolled, if relevant. | • Checked that there were records confirming the student's application, enrolment and payment in a student management system<br><br>• Checked that there were records of courses/ programmes in which the student was enrolled; including start and end dates of the teaching period. | • Confirmation of the student's application, enrolment and payments are kept in hard copy on programmes' files. Subsequently this information is entered into the WiseNet system, for results of our testing refer (d) – (e) above<br><br>• Programmes in which students enrolled for are recorded in WiseNet system, this includes unit standards required and start and end dates. We noted that in some cases programme start/end dates in WiseNet were different from the dates specified in the Enrolment forms (refer (d) above); for one student we didn't obtain information from WiseNet regarding his programme start/end dates. In summary, we noted 3 students with inconsistent programmes records in WiseNet. | Refer (d) – (e) above<br><br><br>94% | Refer (d) – (e) above<br><br><br>6% |

---

[6] Percentage of a selected sample which is considered to be compliant with the specified funding requirements based on the documents reviewed
[7] Percentage of a selected sample which is considered to be non-compliant or not fully compliant with the specified funding requirements based on the documents reviewed (missing or inconsistent documents)

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[6] | Non-Compliant[7] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Process around student attendance in programme and qualification completion** | | | | |
| • The enrolment period for which the learner is enrolled, including the start and end dates of the teaching period | | | | |
| h) Tectra must record attendance or submission of work to demonstrate the valid enrolment status of each learner in relation to whom Student Achievement Component funding is claimed. | Checked that there were records of student attendance of the course. | Student attendance is recorded in the Course Record Form (hard copy document), each student signs off on his/her attendance; this document is kept on a programme file. For 50 students selected for testing the following results were obtained:<br><br>(i) For 15 students no records confirming their attendance were provided;<br><br>(ii) For 1 student no records confirming her attendance were provided because she didn't attend the course and as a result subsequently has been withdrawn from the programme;<br><br>(iii) For 33 students we were provided with evidence of their course attendance; however, their attendance was recorded either on the date of enrolment or before the date of enrolment;<br><br>(iv) One student attended several courses, but was recorded as an instructor rather than a student.<br><br>In summary, we noted 16 students (32%) with inconsistent attendance records ((i) and (iv) above).<br><br>We discussed these results with Tectra and obtained the following comments:<br><br>*(iii) In many cases the date of enrolment will be the first day of the trainees' attendance at the block course. While training and even course work may be done before this time, it is not possible for us to enrol the student until we have received an enrolment form and the appropriate ID.* | 68% | 32% |

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[6] | Non-Compliant[7] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Process around student attendance in programme and qualification completion** | | | | |
| | | *Also, the course folder can take between 2 and 6 weeks to be processed onto WiseNet after a course is completed (due to many factors including marking/checking, follow up and administration). During busy periods there may be a backlog of work. If a course folder is not processed in a current SDR year, it must be included in the next SDR period. This means that some courses in Nov/Dec may not be enrolled until January the following year.* | | |
| | | *(iv) This is not normal practice. This student was enrolled as Level 3 Wool Pressing trainee. He was identified as a potential trainer for Tectra as he had experience in the Wool Harvesting industry, but did not have the necessary qualifications. Trainees are transient workers – and we take every opportunity to engage with them as we can across our network of training managers. In some cases for senior, self-employed trainees, where we identify them as trainer candidates, we will offer them the opportunity to assist qualified trainers on courses. This gives them some income while not working, allows us to progress their training and assessments (with the trainer) and allows us to watch the person work with our trainees. We also use Tutor Workshops (run twice a year for all Tectra tutors) for continuing training and professional development. These (potential/2IC) Tutors in training are provided further training against their qualifications and can be assessed at both courses. The fourth dimension to successful training ((1) academic training, (2) practical training, (3) making a living from the skill) is teaching others.* | | |
| i) Tectra must record learner results and report on result information as follows (Rule ENR091): | Checked that there is evidence of students' submission of work. | Usually students submit their assignments for assessment by tutors to achieve the required unit standards, these assignments and assessments include a theoretical part, practical part and work record card (confirming the required number of hours of practice). | 54% | 46% |

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[6] | Non-Compliant[7] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Process around student attendance in programme and qualification completion** | | | | |
| • The main assessment results of courses and/or qualifications for the enrolment period<br><br>• Information required for reporting to the Ministry of Education and the Tertiary Education Commission in the Single Data Return<br><br>• Information required by StudyLink for learners who apply for student allowances and loans. | | In case of extramural study, only extramural assignments prepared by students are marked by the tutor. There is also a verification script indicating student achievement of unit standards, but this document should be used only when typical evidence (as mentioned above) is misplaced or lost.<br><br>We were provided with reasonable evidence of work and assignments submission and assessments for 27 students (54%). However, we also noted the following inconsistencies for the remaining 21 students :<br><br>• 3 students whose assessments have been performed in a short period of time (3-4 days) and no other evidence of assignments/assessments were provided to us (Note that only 1 of them has achieved the qualification);<br><br>• 1 student whose assessment forms were dated before the date of enrolment;<br><br>• 2 students who were recorded in one year of study, however, all their assignments/ assessments were dated in previous year and no evidence of work submission in the current year was provided to us;<br><br>• 17 students with insufficient evidence to confirm their achievement of unit standards and/or qualification (not all documents were provided, or only verification scripts were provided; note that scripts should be used only in cases when typical evidence is lost or misplaced).<br><br>We discussed with Tectra use of verification scripts to confirm student admissions/ assessments and obtained the following comments:<br><br>*The script is used when the Work Record Card is misplaced and this happens often due the nature of the trainee being responsible for maintaining this document for 6-9 months or longer. The script allows the RTM to sign off that the* | | |

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations | Compliant[6] | Non-Compliant[7] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Process around student attendance in programme and qualification completion** | | | | |
| | Checked that there are records of students' submission of work and results of assessments (in accordance with required Unit Standards) supporting student qualification completion. | *trainee has achieved the level required for each unit standard and the elements required for competency as listed for each unit standard.*<br><br>*Scripts are only completed on the basis that sufficient proof can be garnered by the Training Manager of proficiency (understand these Managers know their trainees very well and over a long period of time).*<br><br>Out of 50 students selected for testing, 25 have completed their qualification and for 11 of them we were not able to find sufficient documented evidence of the required work submission and assessments to support these qualifications (e.g. no proof of achievement of all unit standards required for the qualification, or only verification scripts provided). | 56% | 44% |

| TEC funding requirements | Procedures performed | Observations |
|---|---|---|
| **3. Interviews with the students** | | |
| N/A | We performed the following procedures in relation to 50 students selected for testing:<br><br>• Contacted the student (either by phone or by email)<br><br>• Verbally confirmed the identity of students<br><br>• Verbally confirmed that students had studied at Tectra (checked programme name, year of study)<br><br>• Confirmed the period of study<br><br>• Checked if there was an admission process (eg interview) before enrolment<br><br>• Checked if attendance was required<br><br>• Checked if student has been assessed during the study<br><br>• Asked for any feedback on Tectra. | We obtained contact phone numbers for 50 SAC students selected for testing and tried to contact them, as a result the following was achieved:<br><br>• We were able to contact 17 students out of 50 (by phone); the remaining 33 students were not able to be contacted or their phone number belongs to different person at the moment<br><br>• All 17 contacted students verbally confirmed their identity<br><br>• 11 out of 17 students confirmed that they studied at Tectra (including year of study and programme name); 5 students didn't confirm, because they were busy and couldn't talk; 1 person indicated that he worked for Tectra but had not studied there.<br><br>• 4 students indicated that their courses lasted from 4 days up to several weeks; 6 students indicated that they studied from 1 up to 2 years<br><br>• 5 students confirmed that they had interviews with regional managers (face to face or by phone) as a part of the admission process; other students didn't have interviews<br><br>• Only 4 students confirmed that attendance was required<br><br>• 10 students confirmed that they have been assessed during their study (assignments, practical assessments, work card review)<br><br>• 10 students provided positive feedback on their experience with Tectra (all students who decided to provide a feedback). |

# *Appendix A*

# *MAC funding sample*

## *Sample selection*

A sample of apprentices for MAC funding requirements testing was selected from the Modern Apprenticeships Volumes (Brokerage) reports provided by TEC showing Apprentices that participated in the programme throughout the period 2012 – 2014. We agreed with TEC that we would sample 10 students for each year. Therefore we selected 30 apprentices for testing covering the period 2012 – 2014.

| # | Master NSN | Programme | Participation start date | Participation expected end date | Enrolment status (as at 10 Oct 2014) | Industry | Region |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Withheld under s9(2)(a) of OIA | NC in Wool Harvesting (Wool Handler) - (Level 3) | 22/12/2013 | 22/12/2014 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Tasman Region |
| 2 | | NC in Wool Harvesting (Wool Handler) -  (Level 4) | 16/12/2013 | 16/11/2014 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Canterbury Region |
| 3 | | MA = Wool Handling (Level 3) | 30/09/2013 | 30/07/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Hawke's Bay Region |
| 4 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 29/08/2012 | 29/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Bay of Plenty Region |
| 5 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 29/08/2012 | 29/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Bay of Plenty Region |
| 6 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 10/10/2012 | 10/01/2016 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 7 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 23/09/2013 | 23/12/2016 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Wellington Region |
| 8 | | MA = Wool Handling (Level 3) | 28/11/2012 | 28/09/2014 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 9 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 30/08/2012 | 30/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 10 | | MA = Wool Handling (Level 3) | 21/12/2012 | 21/10/2014 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Otago Region |
| 11 | | NC in Wool Harvesting (Wool Handler) - (Level 3) | 21/12/2013 | 21/12/2014 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Tasman Region |
| 12 | | Wool Harvesting (Wool Handler) :  (NC) | 07/09/2012 | 07/08/2013 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Otago Region |

| # | Master NSN | Programme | Participation start date | Participation expected end date | Enrolment status (as at 10 Oct 2014) | Industry | Region |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Withheld under s9(2)(a) of OIA | MA = Wool Handling (Level 3) | 19/11/2012 | 19/09/2014 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Canterbury Region |
| 14 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 4) | 08/11/2013 | 08/02/2019 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Canterbury Region |
| 15 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 17/12/2013 | 17/03/2017 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Canterbury Region |
| 16 | | MA = Wool Handling (Level 3) | 09/09/2013 | 09/07/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 17 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 28/11/2012 | 28/02/2016 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Waikato Region |
| 18 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 30/11/2012 | 29/02/2016 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Waikato Region |
| 19 | | MA = Wool Handling (Level 4) | 20/12/2013 | 20/08/2016 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 20 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 30/08/2012 | 30/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Otago Region |
| 21 | | MA = Wool Handling (Level 3) | 10/09/2012 | 10/07/2014 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Hawke's Bay Region |
| | | MA in Wool Handling (Level 3) | 29/08/2011 | 29/08/2013 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Hawke's Bay Region |
| 22 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 27/08/2012 | 27/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Otago Region |
| | | MA in Wool Harvesting (Machine Shearing - Crossbred) Level 3 | 05/09/2011 | 05/12/2014 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Otago Region |
| 23 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 27/08/2012 | 27/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| | | MA in Wool Harvesting (Machine Shearing - Crossbred) Level 3 | 02/07/2011 | 02/10/2014 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 24 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 24/08/2012 | 24/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Wellington Region |
| | | MA in Wool Harvesting (Machine Shearing - Crossbred) Level 3 | 28/06/2011 | 28/09/2014 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Wellington Region |

| # | Master NSN | Programme | Participation start date | Participation expected end date | Enrolment status (as at 10 Oct 2014) | Industry | Region |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | Withheld under s9(2)(a) of OIA | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 29/08/2012 | 29/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| | | MA in Wool Harvesting (Machine Shearing - Crossbred) Level 3 | 28/06/2011 | 28/09/2014 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| | | | 15/03/2012 | 15/06/2015 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 26 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 28/08/2012 | 28/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Otago Region |
| | | MA in Wool Harvesting (Machine Shearing - Crossbred) Level 3 | 30/06/2011 | 30/09/2014 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Otago Region |
| 27 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 27/08/2012 | 27/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Waikato Region |
| | | MA in Wool Harvesting (Machine Shearing - Crossbred) Level 3 | 06/12/2011 | 06/03/2015 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Waikato Region |
| 28 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 28/08/2012 | 28/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| | | MA in Wool Harvesting (Machine Shearing - Crossbred) Level 3 | 19/07/2011 | 19/10/2014 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 29 | | MA = Wool Handling (Level 3) | 25/10/2012 | 25/08/2014 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Manawatu-Wanganui Region |
| 30 | | MA = Machine Shearing - Crossbred (Level 3) | 29/08/2012 | 29/11/2015 | ACTIVE | Shearing Services | Southland Region |
| | | MA in Wool Harvesting (Machine Shearing - Crossbred) Level 3 | 29/03/2012 | 29/06/2015 | WITHDRAWN | Shearing Services | Southland Region |

# *Appendix B*

# *SAC funding sample*

## *Sample selection*

A sample of students for SAC funding requirements testing was selected from the report provided by TEC and showing students (FTSEs) enrolled in the following 11 programmes/ qualifications throughout the period 2012 – 2014. We agreed with TEC that we would sample 10 students per each group of programmes. We also considered 'suspicious' students' enrolment records, e.g. student enrolments equating to more than one FTSE per year; prior/subsequent enrolments in different institutions/ areas. Therefore we have selected 50 students for testing as per table below:

| # | Qualification/ Programme Name | Programme Groups | Sample size |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | Agriculture | 10 |
| 2 | Certificate in Wool Technology | Wool Technology | 10 |
| 3 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 3) | Shearing | 10 |
| 4 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 4) | | |
| 5 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Fine Wool) (Level 3) | | |
| 6 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Fine Wool) (Level 4) | | |
| 7 | Wool Handling (Wool Pressing) (Level 3) | Wool handling | 10 |
| 8 | Wool Handling with an optional strand in Grading Wool (Level 3 or 4 depending on strand) | | |
| 9 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | Wool Harvesting | 10 |
| 10 | Wool Harvesting (Junior Shearer) (Level 2) | | |
| 11 | Wool Harvesting (Wool Handler) (Level 4) | | |
| **Total** | | | **50** |

| # | Programme Name | NSN | FTSE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| 1 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | Withheld under s9(2)(a) of OIA | | 0.3584 | |
| 2 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | 0.3584 | |
| 3 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | 0.2985 | |
| 4 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | 0.3584 | |
| 5 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | 0.2834 | |
| 6 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | | 0.3584 |
| 7 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | | 0.3584 |
| 8 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | | 0.3584 |
| 9 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | | 0.3584 |
| 10 | Agriculture (Introductory Skills) | | | 0.3001 | |
| 11 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | 0.6332 | | |
| 12 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | | 0.4992 | |
| 13 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | | 0.9992 | |
| 14 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | 0.44 | | |
| 15 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | | 0.48 | |
| 16 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | | 0.487 | |
| 17 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | | 0.4992 | |
| 18 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | | | 0.48 |

| # | Programme Name | NSN | FTSE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| 19 | Certificate in Wool Technology | Withheld under s9(2)(a) of OIA | 0.5237 | | |
| 20 | Certificate in Wool Technology | | 0.3344 | | |
| 21 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 4) | | 1.0661 | | |
| 22 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 4) | | 1.0339 | | |
| 23 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 3) | | | 0.4392 | |
| 24 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 4) | | | 0.1936 | |
| 25 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 3) | | | 0.435 | |
| 26 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 3) | | 0.958 | | |
| 27 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 4) | | | 0.6636 | |
| 28 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 3) | | | 0.7372 | |
| 29 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 3) | | 0.958 | | |
| 30 | Shearing (Machine Shearing Crossbred Wool) (Level 4) | | | 0.624 | |
| 31 | Wool Handling with an optional strand in Grading Wool (Level 3 or 4 depending on strand) | | | | 0.2105 |
| 32 | Wool Handling with an optional strand in Grading Wool (Level 3 or 4 depending on strand) | | 0.3789 | | |
| 33 | Wool Handling (Wool Pressing) (Level 3) | | 0.35 | | |
| 34 | Wool Handling with an optional strand in Grading Wool (Level 3 or 4 depending on strand) | | 0.4728 | | |
| 35 | Wool Handling (Wool Pressing) (Level 3) | | | | 0.35 |
| 36 | Wool Handling with an optional strand in Grading Wool (Level 3 or 4 depending on strand) | | 0.393 | | |
| 37 | Wool Handling with an optional strand in Grading Wool (Level 3 or 4 depending on strand) | | 0.5918 | | |

| #  | Programme Name | NSN | FTSE | | |
|----|----------------|-----|------|------|------|
|    |                |     | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| 38 | Wool Handling with an optional strand in Grading Wool (Level 3 or 4 depending on strand) | Withheld under s9(2)(a) of OIA | | | 0.4102 |
| 39 | Wool Handling (Wool Pressing) (Level 3) | | | 0.3104 | |
| 40 | Wool Handling with an optional strand in Grading Wool (Level 3 or 4 depending on strand) | | 0.5918 | | |
| 41 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | | 0.3167 |
| 42 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | | 0.4752 |
| 43 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | | 0.3282 |
| 44 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | | 0.4752 |
| 45 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | | 0.4752 |
| 46 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | | 0.4752 |
| 47 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | | 0.4752 |
| 48 | Wool Harvesting (Wool Handler) (Level 4) | | | 0.4126 | |
| 49 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | 0.4035 | |
| 50 | Wool Harvesting (Entry) (Level 2) | | | 0.1248 | |

For more information go to pwc.co.nz

PwC
Focused review of Tectra Limited PTE