



## Understanding how your application was scored

This document provides you with information about how applications were assessed for the 2016 Student Achievement Component (SAC) levels 3 and 4 competitive pilot. It breaks down application scores against each component within the assessment framework. This will help you understand how your individual qualifications were assessed and scored.

We ran a competitive process to allocate up to \$35 million of the SAC levels 3 and 4 funding. This process allocated funding for provision of qualifications at levels 3 and 4 on the NZQF in the fields of agriculture, horticulture and viticulture for 2017 and 2018. The SAC levels 3 and 4 competitive pilot aims were to:

- › promote greater competition across tertiary education providers and direct investment towards higher quality delivery at qualification levels 3 and 4
- › drive increased tertiary education sector responsiveness to industry needs at qualification levels 3 and 4;
- › improve outcomes for students by strengthening pathways from qualification levels 3 and 4 into higher-level education or employment
- › provide more certainty that funding rates accurately reflect the costs of delivery at qualification levels 3 and 4.

### The assessment process

A two-stage process was used to assess all eligible applications, as outlined in the Request for Funding Applications (RFA) document.

#### Stage one – quality assessment

Each eligible application was assessed for quality and scored on a 100 point scale. To determine this score we considered the information provided in the narrative section (Part A) of each application, as well as TEC-held TEO-level and qualification-level performance information. This performance information included relevant educational performance indicators and participation rates for Māori and Pasifika.

Application narrative sections were assessed and moderated by a team of our staff. TEC-held performance information was collated and assessed as outlined later in this document.

Applications that met a quality threshold then progressed to the second stage of assessment.

#### Stage two – value for money

The Review Panel (the Panel) considered the results of the assessment process, established the quality threshold and then considered the value for money of all provision above the quality threshold.

To do this we considered both the quality and price of all proposed provision. This did not mean we purchased the lowest priced provision, but instead considered the relatively of both quality and price. For example, the lowest-priced delivery for any particular type of learning might not be the best value for money, if the higher-

priced delivery results in better outcomes for learners. Likewise, the highest-quality delivery might not be the best value for money if it is significantly more expensive but not significantly better in quality than other delivery.

In addition to the results of the assessment process, the Panel also considered:

1. Regional and national learner needs (for example, population demographics).
2. The network of regional and national tertiary education provision (including education provision by ITOs) to ensure an adequate amount of provision (including prisoner education) and a range of learner pathways into higher education and employment are available.
3. How the proposed provision meets national and/or regional labour market demand.
4. TEC and NZQA information about the applicant's financial viability, audit findings, accreditation, compliance with funding conditions, and organisational capability and capacity (note that preference was given to applicants with a NZQA EER Category One rating).
5. Alignment with the applicant's mission and role, and place within the regional and national tertiary system.
6. For prisoner education only, the Department of Corrections advice about education and training provision delivered in prisons, prison facilities and resourcing, and performance information.

The Panel then made funding recommendations to the TEC Board of Commissioners for their approval.

# Summary of quality assessment

Applications were scored against three quality dimensions. Each of the three quality dimensions further comprised a number of qualitative (narrative) and quantitative component scores. The quality dimensions and components are set out in the detailed assessment framework below.

## Detailed quality assessment framework for 2016 SAC levels 3 and 4 competitive pilot

Quality dimensions	Components	Component score (max)	Dimension score (max)
<b>1. Capability in providing skills for industry</b>	<b>Narrative – total</b>	<b>25</b>	
The Applicant demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>its connection to industry and employers,</li> <li>its ability to forecast and respond to current and future education and training needs in the primary sector, and</li> <li>how the provision pathways students to higher-level education (including industry training) or skilled employment.</li> </ul>	- <i>connection with industry and employers</i>	8	
	- <i>ability to forecast and respond to education needs in primary sector</i>	8	
	- <i>pathways to higher-level education or skilled employment</i>	9	
	<b>Progression - TEO level</b>	<b>8</b>	
	<b>Progression - Qual level</b>	<b>4</b>	
	<b>Delivery volume - under/over delivery</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>2. Capability in delivering high-quality provision</b>	<b>Narrative</b>	<b>10</b>	
The Applicant demonstrates the capability, experience, skills and organisational capacity to apply pedagogical best practice to deliver high-quality learning and to ensure students successfully complete their courses.	<b>Course completion - TEO level</b>	<b>10</b>	
	<b>Course completion - Qual level</b>	<b>6</b>	
	<b>Retention - TEO level</b>	<b>8</b>	
	<b>Retention - Qual level</b>	<b>4</b>	
	<b>EER rating</b>	<b>2</b>	
			<b>40</b>
<b>3. Experience targeting and supporting students</b>	<b>Narrative – total</b>	<b>14</b>	
The Applicant demonstrates how it ensures students are adequately informed about primary sector employment requirements and opportunities. The Applicant demonstrates how it works with local communities and Iwi to attract, support and retain students within the primary sector focus areas for the competitive process, particularly students in priority groups identified in the Tertiary Education Strategy 2014-19.	- <i>engagement with schools and other prospective groups to inform students about primary sector employment</i>	8	
	- <i>Links with Iwi and community groups</i>	6	
	<b>Participation (Māori &amp; Pasifika) - TEO level</b>	<b>6</b>	
			<b>20</b>
<b>Total quality score:</b>			<b>100</b>

## The quality threshold

All applications (by individual qualification) had to meet a minimum quality threshold to be considered for the second stage 'Value for Money' assessment. The Panel established the minimum quality threshold at 50/100 as this was considered to be the best proxy for quality provision to be funded.

The Panel reviewed all provision above this threshold by region. This assessment included the availability of the various type of provision within the region, relative to the national and /or regional industry demand.

## How component scores were calculated

Each of the components was scored on a quartile basis except for the External Evaluation and Review (EER) rating and the delivery volume component.

For the EER component, two points were awarded for a Category One rating and no points for a Category Two rating.

For delivery volume component, delivery volumes below 95% were awarded no points, volumes in the 95–99% range were awarded one point and volumes over 99% were awarded three points.

For all other components applications were ranked and assigned a number of points determined by the quarter they fell into.

As the majority of the scoring was on a comparative basis, most scores awarded were relative to other TEOs that applied.

Where there was no performance information available, the applicant scored zero in that component. Zeros that were the result of no available performance information did not affect the setting of the quartile ranges.

TEOs with low scores for any given component were still able to meet the minimum quality threshold where they demonstrated high performance in other areas of the framework.

## Performance data hierarchy

Preference was given to 2015 data before 2014 data in accordance with the following fund hierarchy:

1. SAC at levels 3-4 – in the focus areas
2. SAC at levels 3-4 – any other provision
3. SAC at levels 5-6
4. YG at level 3
5. SAC at levels 1-2, or
6. YG at levels 1-2.

# Assessment of narrative components

Assessment of the narrative section of applications (Part A of the application form) accounted for 49/100 points across all three quality dimensions. Application narrative sections were assessed and moderated by a team of our staff.

The narrative section was scored against the following components:

Quality dimension	Narrative components	Max score
1. Capability in providing skills for industry	Connections with industry and employers	8
	Ability to forecast and respond to education needs in primary sector	8
	Pathways to higher-level education or skilled employment	9
2. Capability in delivering high-quality provision	Narrative, capability in delivering high-quality provision	10
3. Experience targeting and supporting students	Engagement with schools and other prospective groups to inform students about primary sector employment	8
	Links with Iwi and community groups	6

An application's score for each component was determined by its quartile ranking, as follows:

Quarter	Score /6	Score /8	Score /9	Score /10
Quarter one: Low or no confidence	0	0	0	0
Quarter two: Limited confidence	2	2	3	3
Quarter three: Confident	4	5	6	7
Quarter four: Highly confident	6	8	9	10

# Assessment of quantitative components

Assessment of the quantitative components (Part B of the application form) accounted for 51/100 points across all three quality dimensions. This section details how the quantitative components were scored.

## Quality dimension one: Capability in providing skills for industry

Components of quality dimension one	Component score
Narrative component	25
Progression – TEO level	8
Progression – qualification level	4
Delivery volume – under/over-delivery	3
Overall quality dimension score	40

### Component: Progression at TEO level

Quarter	Component score	Range <sup>1</sup>	
First	0	0.0%	7.9%
Second	2	7.9%	16.6%
Third	5	16.6%	24.4%
Fourth	8	24.4%	100.0%

### Component: Progression at qualification level

Quarter	Component score	Range	
First	0	0.0%	0.0%
Second	1	0.0%	10.0%
Third	2	10.0%	33.3%
Fourth	4	33.3%	100.0%

### Component: Delivery volume

Volume	Component score
<95%	0
95-99%	1
>99%	3

---

<sup>1</sup> The 'Range' is the upper and lower thresholds for each quarter for each of the metrics.

## Quality dimension two: Capability in delivering high quality provision.

Components of quality dimension two	Component score
Narrative component	10
Course completion – TEO level	10
Course completion – qualification level	6
Retention – TEO level	8
Retention – qualification level	4
EER rating	2
<b>Overall quality dimension score</b>	<b>40</b>

### Component: Course completion rate at the TEO level

Quarter	Component score	Range	
First	0	0.0%	70.3%
Second	3	70.3%	76.0%
Third	7	76.0%	85.4%
Fourth	10	85.4%	100.0%

### Component: Retention – TEO level

Quarter	Component score	Range	
First	0	0.0%	53.4%
Second	2	53.4%	62.8%
Third	5	62.8%	81.0%
Fourth	8	81.0%	100.0%

### Component: Course completion rate at the qualification level

Quarter	Component score	Range	
First	0	0.0%	70.9%
Second	2	70.9%	82.5%
Third	4	82.5%	93.9%
Fourth	6	93.9%	100.0%

### Component: Retention – qualification level

Quarter	Component score	Range	
First	0	0.0%	52.4%
Second	1	52.4%	73.1%
Third	2	73.1%	90.0%
Fourth	4	90.0%	100.0%

### Component: EER level

EER rating	Component score
Category Two	0
Category One	2

## Quality dimension three: Experience targeting and supporting students

Components of quality dimension	Component scores
Narrative component	14
Participation of Māori or Pasifika at TEO level	6
Overall quality dimension score	20

The components used for this quality dimension were all at the TEO level and included Māori or Pasifika participation (whichever was highest) in comparison to the demographics of the respective regions.

### Component: Participation of Māori or Pasifika at TEO level

Participation data was used to derive an indicator for how well TEOs target priority learners within their region, taking into account regional demographical differences in terms of Māori and Pasifika populations. This was done by applying the following steps:

**Step 1:** Determine the regional population, using the delivery site information provided in each TEO's application (a weighted average was used where a TEO had multiple delivery sites) relative to the territorial local authority information in the 2013 Census data for demographic cultural diversity.

**Step 2:** The TEO-level 2015 participation rate was determined based on the hierarchy of funds outlined on page 4 (i.e. SAC levels 3 and 4 in focus areas > SAC levels 3 and 4 in any other areas > SAC levels 5 and 6 > Youth Guarantee level 3 > SAC levels 1 and 2 > Youth Guarantee levels 1 and 2).

**Step 3:** The TEO-level 2015 participation rate was then divided by the regional population percentage to compare a TEO's Māori and Pasifika participation to the regional population, e.g. if 10% of a region identified as Māori and a TEO had a 20% Māori participation rate, the TEO would be 200% of the regional average.

**Step 4:** The percentages were then ranked and quartered and the relevant component score applied for both Māori and Pasifika.

**Step 5:** The highest component score for either Māori or Pasifika participation was used.

### Component: Māori participation compared to regional demographics

Quarter	Component score	Range
First	0	0.0% 77.8%
Second	2	77.8% 165.2%
Third	4	165.2% 214.9%
Fourth	6	214.9% 310.5%

### Component: Pasifika participation compared to regional demographics

Quarter	Component score	Range
First	0	0.0% 5.0%
Second	2	5.0% 65.2%
Third	4	65.2% 132.0%
Fourth	6	132.0% 357.8%



We ensure New Zealand's future success.