



Performance monitoring framework for industry training organisations

This framework sets out what, why and how we monitor training-related activity by ITOs. The monitoring uses information provided in the Industry Training Register and the Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Tool.

Why do we want a monitoring framework?

We are responsible for investing government funding in industry training on behalf of New Zealanders. It is important that the money is invested wisely, and the outcomes of the training reflect the level of investment.

A monitoring framework provides a transparent and structured view of what information we monitor and why.

How regularly will we monitor activity?

Regular monitoring

We provide reports twice a month, which show activity against the educational performance indicators and standard training measures delivered on a monthly basis.

We also monitor an ITO's total delivery against our financial forecast models. Snapshots of delivery and a subsequent forecast are refreshed monthly.

Proactive monitoring

Proactive monitoring may be initiated by the TEC at any time. Proactive monitoring against a range of activity helps contribute to improved performance and delivery.

What will we do with the information?

The outcomes of monitoring inform conversations between investment managers the TEC and the ITOs, with a view to improving activities and outcomes where appropriate. The outcomes also inform Investment Plan rounds, in-year Plan amendments, and contribute to operational policy changes such as funding conditions.

What will be monitored and why?

We will monitor a range of activity that links to funding or performance. The activity may relate specifically to learners or to training programmes.

Please refer to the Appendix for details of the what, the why, and the how.

Appendix – Performance monitoring: what, why, and how

Regular monitoring

| What | Why | How | Desired outcome |
|---|---|---|---|
| Delivery volumes and offsets | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Allows ITOs and TEC to monitor volume delivery and offsets during the year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Two-monthly reports uploaded to Workspace2 | ITOs and TEC can make investment requests and decisions with latest information |
| Educational performance Indicators (EPI) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Allows ITOs and TEC to monitor EPIs during the year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Two-monthly reports uploaded to Workspace2 | ITOs and TEC can make investment requests and decisions with latest information |
| Parity of achievement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Boosting achievement for Māori and Pasifika is one of the six priorities of the Tertiary Education Strategy › Improved achievement for Māori and Pasifika should reduce (and ultimately eradicate) the disparity in education and wider socio-economic outcomes for these groups | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Use the Investment Plan and two-monthly reports to inform conversations between investment managers and ITOs › Compare actual performance of Māori and Pasifika learners at level 4 and above against non-Māori and non-Pasifika learners at the same levels | Māori and Pasifika learners ITOs must have parity of achievement with non-Māori and non-Pasifika at level 4 and above, without compromising achievement rates of non-Māori and non-Pasifika |
| Literacy and numeracy assessment tool usage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › All learners enrolled in programmes leading to a level 1 or 2 qualification must be assessed using the Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Tool as required by TEC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Regular reports uploaded to Workspace2 › Regular discussions between the TEC and ITOs where usage is less desirable | We expect all trainees without prior qualifications, enrolled at any level, will have their literacy and numeracy needs assessed and appropriate support provided |
| TEC funding forecast | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Enables TEC to monitor expected delivery volumes by year-end › Provides information as to whether an increase or decrease in funding is warranted | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Monthly TEC funding model is refreshed using an ITO's historical patterns of delivery › Model is based on an ITO's most favourable year or average of years | Funding increases or decreases are supported by evidence of growth or decline |

Proactive and on demand monitoring

| What | Why | How | Desired outcome |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Mix of provision versus delivery | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Monitoring commitments versus delivery (by NZQF level and apprentice/trainee split) will identify areas that may need reprioritising | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Use the MoPs and delivery information to inform conversations between investment managers and ITOs | There will be minimal disparity between what was committed to in the mix of provision and what is delivered |

| What | Why | How | Desired outcome |
|--|---|--|--|
| Zero credits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Achieving credits indicates a commitment to training and positive use of funding › Many trainees and apprentices are funded year on year and are achieving no credits, which could indicate the learner is either no longer training or even employed › Learners achieving credits helps ITOs to achieve the under-achievement threshold of 80% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Review number of trainees that have been eligible for funding for the last 12 calendar months › Calculate the proportion of those that have achieved no credits and between 1 and 9 credits | The proportion of learners eligible for funding for 12 months and achieving no credits will be minimal and on par with the sector average |
| Performance of top 10 programmes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › The top 10 programmes (by funding delivery) reflect the greatest investment by TEC and these programmes should therefore be performing well › If credit achievement is good, but cohort programme completion is poor, it suggests that employers do not support their staff completing full qualifications › We will consider divestment of poor performing programmes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Calculate credit achievement and programme completion for each ITOs' programmes for each of the last 3 years, and a 3-year average › Cohort programme completion will be used once there is enough data using the new methodology to inform conversations | Programmes will have credit achievement and programme completion rates above 50% |
| STM delivery and learner numbers after data finalisation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › We use finalised data to calculate funding and performance, including the under-achievement offset › Any significant changes to data once finalised means we are not using accurate data to calculate funding and performance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Data comparisons will be done between finalised data and data at a point after finalisation | Data discrepancies will be negligible once data has been finalised |
| Visits to apprentices | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › As part of the Code of Good Practice for New Zealand Apprenticeships, we expect ITOs to provide support to apprentices, which should include visits to apprentices › There may be a link between a lack of visits and lower credit achievement › While there is no minimum number of visits, we would expect field staff to be out supporting apprentices and their employers and for these to be reported in the ITR | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Use information in the ITR to note number of visits and when these occur › Confirm visits through audits by talking to ITOs, employers and apprentices | ITOs will provide pastoral support, including visits, relevant to the apprentice's training |
| Completeness and accuracy of data in the ITR | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Information needs to be complete, accurate, and clear so that good investment and operational decisions can be made | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Review data in the ITR to check for any discrepancies or unusual information | Information such as learner demographics and prior qualifications must be completed where known, and programme names should be meaningful and recognisable |