

Lincoln-Telford  
(A division of Lincoln  
University)  
Report to the Tertiary  
Education Commission

# Contents

<b>1. Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
Background	3
Key findings	4
Under-delivery of learning hours	4
Student funded and awarded qualification without attending programme	5
Other matters	6
<b>2. Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
Background	7
Scope of this Report	8
Limitations of this Report	9
<b>3. Compliance with TEC funding requirements</b>	<b>11</b>
Programme Alignment with Approval and Funding Requirements	11
Updating STEO	12
Approval of changes through the Academic Board	13
Duration and Learning Hours Analysis	15
Other matters	24
<b>4. Subcontracting arrangements (Delivery Partners)</b>	<b>25</b>
9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)	27
9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)	29
<b>5. Review of Enrolment Records</b>	<b>30</b>
Student Enrolments and Reporting of Course Completion	30
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b>35</b>

# 1. Executive Summary

## Background

- 1.1. In November 2015 the Tertiary Education Commission (“**TEC**”) engaged Deloitte to undertake a review of Telford, a division of Lincoln University (“**Lincoln-Telford Division**” or “**LTD**”). Our review initially focussed on five programmes that were delivered by LTD during 2014 and 2015. These programmes were spread across a range of delivery styles and were selected based on the amount of EFTS that had been consumed during the timeframe.
- 1.2. The scope of this engagement was to:
  - Review the approved programme documents and analyse the delivery of these programmes, which included considering whether the programme was delivered in compliance with approved programme documentation, and calculating the teaching and self-directed learning hours that were actually delivered to students;
  - Reconcile the teaching hours entered into STEO with the latest version of the programme documents and ensure that any changes to the delivery of programmes were supported by academic board minutes;
  - Verify the existence of a random sample of students, including the legitimacy of enrolment and eligibility of those students to enrol in the programmes;
  - Identify any subcontracting relationships that were in place and, if such relationships were identified, understand the relationship between the parties and gain an insight of the TEOs oversight of these activities; and
  - Ensure that LTD’s internal quality assurance and control processes regarding these programmes were robust and fit for purpose.
- 1.3. On 15 February 2016 we provided TEC with a verbal update summarising our preliminary findings. At that stage, the matters we raised were an assessed under-delivery of the learning hours provided to students that were enrolled in the:
  - Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture (Level 2); and
  - Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (Level 3).
- 1.4. We also advised TEC that one student that we had interviewed, who was recorded in LTD’s Single Data Return (“**SDR**”) as enrolled in the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture, stated that he did not attend the programme at all. Funding had been claimed for this student and LTD’s Academic Committee minutes recorded that he had been awarded with the qualification.
- 1.5. Following this update, TEC engaged us to expand our work and conduct an investigation of the delivery of the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture between 2010 and 2015. We were also instructed to investigate the delivery of an additional five programmes during the six year time period from 2010 to 2015. Given the issues identified during our initial engagement, part of our

focus was on programmes that were delivered by third parties during this timeframe. In total, TEC selected ten programmes for us to either review or investigate during the course of our engagement:

- Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture (Level 2)
- Telford Certificate in Agriculture (Level 3)
- Telford Certificate in Apiculture Knowledge (Level 3)
- Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy) (Level 3)
- Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (Level 3)
- National Certificate in Agriculture (Animal Feeding and Pastures) (Level 3)
- National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3)
- National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture) (Level 3)
- Diploma in Agriculture (Level 5)
- Diploma in Farm Management (Level 5)

1.6. We would like to record that LTD has engaged with us constructively throughout this process and has taken the opportunity to proactively improve some of its processes in response to our findings. In particular, we note that the Director of LTD and Director, Student Administration have engaged openly with us during the course of our investigation.

1.7. We have been provided with comprehensive responses to all of the matters that we have raised. We also note that LTD has proactively commenced a number of initiatives in response to both issues that we have identified and issues it has identified independently.

## Key findings

1.8. Our key findings primarily relate to the delivery of four programmes by some of LTD's delivery partners.

### Under-delivery of learning hours

1.9. Our most significant finding is an apparent under-delivery of learning hours to students across four of the programmes that were within the scope of our engagement. These programmes were the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture, Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices), National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture) and National Certificate in Horticulture. We note that these programmes are delivered by three of LTD's delivery partners.

1.10. We did not identify an under-delivery of learning hours in respect of the remaining six programmes that TEC selected.

1.11. The table below summarises our preliminary assessment of the actual hours that were delivered to students in the four programmes where we assessed an under-delivery of learning hours.

1.12. Our assessment is based on what we consider to be the maximum learning hours that have been delivered to students, and also includes an allowance for unscheduled contact time with the tutors:

**Table 1: Assessment – delivery of learning hours for four programmes**

Programme	Delivery partner	STEO (TEC) Learning hours	Assessed delivery	Percentage delivered
Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices)	Farm:Skills <i>Owned and governed by Lincoln University and Te Tumu Paeroa<sup>1</sup></i>	Teaching: 50.4 Self-directed: 360 Work Exp.: 190.8 <b>Total hours: 601.2</b>	Teaching: 78 Self-directed: 63 Work Exp.: 190.8 <b>Total hours: 331.8</b>	<b>55.19%</b>
National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture)	9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)	Teaching: 242 Self-directed: 333 Work Exp.: 185 <b>Total hours: 760</b>	Teaching: 206 Self-directed: 104 Work Exp.: 185 <b>Total hours: 495</b>	<b>65.13%</b>
National Certificate in Horticulture <sup>2</sup>	9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)	Teaching: 504 Self-directed: 308 Work Exp.: 252 <b>Total hours: 1,064</b>	Teaching: 235 Self-directed: 500 Work Exp.: - <b>Total hours: 735</b>	<b>69.08%</b>
Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture	9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)	Teaching: 210 Self-directed: 110 Work Exp.: 80 <b>Total hours: 400</b>	Teaching: 122.5 Self-directed: 21 Work Exp.: 262.5* <b>Total hours: 406*</b>	58.33% 19.10% 328.13% <b>100.02%*</b>

1.13. The Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture has been included in Table 1 because the actual delivery of the programme is not consistent with the hours that were recorded in STEO (there is a much greater emphasis on work experience learning). Additionally, only approximately 60% of students complete the work experience component of the course, which means that the remainder of students (40%) complete the programme within three weeks of commencing study.

1.14. We recommend that TEC considers whether LTD has been overfunded for the delivery of the programmes recorded in Table 1.

### Student funded and awarded qualification without attending programme

1.15. We interviewed 97 randomly selected students that had been enrolled across all of the programmes that were within the scope of our engagement. One student stated during his interview that he had enrolled in the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture, but did not attend the programme as he got a job **Section 9(2)(a)**

1.16. That student was recorded in LTD's SDR for the 2015 calendar year. This means that LTD received SAC funding for this student's enrolment. We also note that the student had been recorded in **9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)** course completion records as completing the unit standards required under the programme, and had ultimately been awarded the qualification.

1.17. LTD and **9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)** independently investigated how this had occurred. In summary, one of **9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)** administration staff had copied the completion results for a cohort into this

<sup>1</sup> <http://farmskills.co.nz/about-us/>

<sup>2</sup> The National Certificate in Horticulture can be delivered as either a full-time or part-time programme. Further details are outlined in Table 4

student's records. This completion sheet was subsequently sent to LTD, which resulted in the qualification being awarded.

- 1.18. We raised this matter with LTD, which immediately commenced an independent investigation into this issue. LTD and 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) reviewed the completion sheets for 60 other students to determine whether this had occurred on other occasions and found that the issue was limited to this one student. We have been informed that LTD spoke to the student on 6 May 2016 and the student considered that he had not been awarded the qualification and that LTD's records have been corrected accordingly.
- 1.19. We recommend that TEC considers whether LTD was overfunded for the delivery of the EFTS to this student during 2015.

### Other matters

1.20. Overall, we were satisfied that in the sample we selected, the underlying student records support the 2014 and 2015 enrolment data for the initial five programmes that we reviewed. We did not undertake an enrolment review in respect of the five additional programmes that were selected for our investigation, as no issues had been identified during our earlier work.

1.21. Based on our work performed, we have the following recommendations:

- A greater degree of oversight to be undertaken by LTD over delivery partners that are delivering courses to students. We highlight this due to the key findings discussed above and because we have reviewed a document titled "*Future funding of Lincoln University's Telford Division*", which recorded that 432 of LTD's 800 EFTS (54% of total EFTS) were budgeted to be delivered through "Delivery Partners" during 2015.

We note that LTD has proactively commenced a number of initiatives to strengthen its processes around the monitoring of its delivery partners. We discuss some of these changes in further detail below.

- Ensuring that STEO is updated on a timely basis to reflect the changes in the teaching, self-directed and work experience hours for each programme. We note that LTD identified some discrepancies between the hours recorded in STEO and hours recorded in programme documents prior to our onsite review.

We also note that LTD has proactively taken the opportunity to improve its processes through the addition of summary sheets for each qualification, which record the learning hours for the programme to mitigate the risk of discrepancies in the future.

## 2. Introduction

### Background

- 2.1 Telford Rural Polytechnic merged with Lincoln University on 1 January 2011. LTD now operates as a division of Lincoln University, which is recorded as a University in the Education Act 1989. The Telford campus of Lincoln University is located in Balclutha, South Otago, and is based on a 921 hectare commercial farm. LTD's website records that it delivers certificates and diplomas in practical land-based subjects, including programmes related to agriculture, equine, forestry, horticulture and apiculture<sup>3</sup>.
- 2.2 TEC engaged Deloitte in November 2015 to review the delivery of five programmes delivered by LTD in 2014 & 2015. In March 2016, the review was escalated to an investigation, five further programmes were added and the scope extended back to 2010. Details of these programmes are included in the table below:

**Table 2: Programmes selected by TEC<sup>4</sup>**

#	Programme	EFTS (2010 - 2015)	Delivery Partner
1	Telford Certificate in Agriculture	335.00	Smedley Farm
2	Telford Certificate in Apiculture Knowledge	118.72	n/a
3	Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy)	129.21	Emerge Dairy Industry Training <sup>5</sup> / National Trade Academy / Whenua Kura
4	Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices)	107.15	Farm:skills Joint Venture
5	Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture	172.08	9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)
6	National Certificate in Agriculture (Level 3) Animal Feeding and Pastures	70.28	9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) <sup>6</sup> / EmERGE Dairy Industry Training / National Trade Academy
7	National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3)	126.21	9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) BHU / 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)
8	National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture) (Level 3)	99.11	9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)
9	Diploma in Agriculture	582.13	Darfield / Fruition / NorthTec / Taratahi / Aoraki
10	Diploma in Farm Management	165.75	n/a

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.telford.ac.nz>

<sup>4</sup> EFTS include 7006 (Lincoln University 2010 to 2015) and 8505 (Telford Rural Polytechnic, 2010 only)

<sup>5</sup> Previously through EmERGE Dairy Industry and Tectra Limited. This relationship has ceased.

<sup>6</sup> 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)

- 2.3 The programmes that TEC selected for our review were the:
- Telford Certificate in Agriculture;
  - Telford Certificate in Apiculture Knowledge;
  - Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy);
  - Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices); and
  - Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture.
- 2.4 Our work in this phase included assessing the delivery of each of these programmes during 2014 and 2015; and conducting an enrolment review of 15 randomly selected students that had been enrolled in each programme.
- 2.5 We provided TEC with a verbal briefing on 15 February 2016 which summarised the preliminary issues we had identified in respect of our original scope. Following this briefing, TEC expanded our engagement to an investigation of six programmes, which were the:
- Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture (expanded timeframe from above);
  - National Certificate in Agriculture (Level 3) Animal Feeding and Pastures;
  - National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3);
  - National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture);
  - Diploma in Agriculture; and
  - Diploma in Farm Management.
- 2.6 Our work included assessing the delivery of each of these programmes between 2010 and 2015. We note that we were not required to conduct an enrolment review for programmes selected for the investigation. This is because the prior work done during our review had not highlighted any material issues with LTD's enrolment records.
- 2.7 The first cohort enrolled in the Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) commenced study in April 2015. Accordingly, this programme was not included in the expanded scope of our investigation. Additionally, the remaining three programmes that were originally selected for our review that we did not find material issues with were not included in the investigation.

### Scope of this Report

- 2.8 TEC engaged Deloitte to undertake a review of five selected programmes at LTD. The purpose of this review was to establish whether the delivery of these programmes during 2014 and 2015 was compliant with the programme documentation; and verify the existence of randomly selected students studying the selected programmes during 2014 and 2015. This included:
- a) Reviewing the approved programme documents and analysing the delivery of these programmes, which included considering whether the programme was delivered in compliance with approved programme documentation, and calculating the teaching and self-directed learning hours that were actually delivered to students;
  - b) Reconciling the teaching hours entered into STEO with the latest version of the programme documents and ensuring that any changes to the delivery of programmes was supported by academic board minutes;
  - c) Verifying the existence of a random sample of students, including the legitimacy of enrolment and eligibility of those students to enrol in the programmes;

- d) Identifying any subcontracting relationships that were in place and, if such relationships were identified, understanding the relationship between the parties and gaining an insight of the TEOs oversight of these activities; and
  - e) Ensuring that LTD's internal quality assurance and control processes regarding these programmes were robust and fit for purpose.
- 2.9 The scope of our work was increased in March 2016 to include an assessment of the delivery of the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture and a further five programmes between 2010 and 2015.

### Limitations of this Report

- 2.10 The terms of this engagement and the scope of the work you have asked us to undertake do not comprise an audit or a review engagement, and the assurances associated with those reviews are not given. Our work did not constitute an assurance engagement in accordance with the requirements of the Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand, and was not designed to provide assurance accordingly under International or New Zealand Standards on Auditing or Assurance such as ISAE 3000. Accordingly, no assurance opinion or conclusion has been provided.
- 2.11 The financial and other information contained in this report have been provided by LTD, TEC, NZQA and various LTD students. Our investigation was based on enquiries, analytical review procedures, interviews and the exercise of judgement.
- 2.12 Our assessments are based on observations from our investigation undertaken in the time allocated. Assessments made by our team are matched against our expectations and good practice guidelines.
- 2.13 Because of the inherent limitations of any internal control structure, it is possible that errors or irregularities may occur and not be detected. Our procedures were not designed to detect all weaknesses in control procedures as they were not performed continuously throughout the period and the tests performed are on a sample basis.
- 2.14 Any projection of the evaluation of the control procedures to future periods is subject to the risk that the systems may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with them may deteriorate.
- 2.15 The matters raised in this report are only those which came to our attention during the course of performing our procedures and are not necessarily a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that exist or improvements that might be made. We cannot, in practice, examine every activity and procedure, nor can we be a substitute for management's responsibility to maintain adequate controls over all levels of operations and their responsibility to prevent and detect irregularities, including fraud. Accordingly, management should not rely on our report to identify all weaknesses that may exist in the systems and procedures under examination, or potential instances of non-compliance that may exist.
- 2.16 This report has been prepared for distribution to TEC. We disclaim any assumption of responsibility for any reliance on this report to any other persons or users, or for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared.
- 2.17 Suggestions for improvement should be assessed by management for their full commercial impact before they are implemented.

2.18 We provided a draft report to TEC on 1 June 2016. We received a response to the draft report from Lincoln Telford Division on 30 June 2016. We have carefully considered this response and made amendments to the draft report where necessary.

# 3. Compliance with TEC funding requirements

3.1 In this section we set out our findings on whether the programmes:

- a) Were taught in accordance with the programme documents and TEC’s funding requirements during the relevant timeframes<sup>7</sup> and
- b) Comply with the learning hours and weeks entered by LTD into the TEC database “STEO”.

## Programme Alignment with Approval and Funding Requirements

3.2 We set out at **Appendix B** both the required hours under the programme documents and the hours submitted by LTD into STEO, which is TEC’s database that funding calculations are based on. We completed the following analysis of this information:

- a) We identified any differences between the programme document hours and the hours submitted into STEO;
- b) If we identified a difference between the programme documents and STEO we then reviewed the programme documentation to identify whether the change in hours was approved by the Academic Board. We note that the Academic Programmes Committee makes recommendations to the Academic Board on matters that relate to programmes, which include the monitoring and review of current programmes to ensure compliance with the Committee on University Academic Programmes (“**CUAP**”) and TEC requirements<sup>8</sup>. The Academic Board is responsible for the establishment and disestablishment of academic programmes at the University, and for maintaining course prescriptions and programme schedules<sup>9</sup>; and
- c) We asked for the details of any changes that have been made to the programme documents during the relevant timeframes. We compared these changes to the current timetables at LTD to check whether there were any unapproved changes that had not been entered into STEO.

3.3 We found that in three of the five programmes that we initially reviewed there was a difference between STEO and the programme document. Additionally, there was a difference between STEO and the programme document for one of the programmes that was selected for our investigation. There was no evidence to suggest that this discrepancy had been discussed or approved by the Academic Board in the programme documents. A table that reconciles the learning hours recorded in the programme documents against the hours recorded in STEO is attached at **Appendix B**.

3.4 In most cases the discrepancies between STEO and the programme documents were minor.

---

<sup>7</sup> The relevant timeframes were 2014 and 2015 delivery for programmes that TEC selected for the review; and 2010 to 2015 for programmes that TEC selected for the investigation phase

<sup>8</sup> Lincoln University Policies and Procedures – Academic Programmes Committee, paras 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1

<sup>9</sup> Lincoln University Policies and Procedures – Academic Board, para 2.3 and 2.4

## Updating STEO

3.5 We requested the latest approved programme documents and any policies relating to the process of changing and updating the delivery of programmes from LTD on 1 December 2015. On 8 December, LTD provided us with a memorandum setting out two issues that it had independently identified in relation to maintaining STEO data. Specifically, this memorandum identified the following:

- a) **Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices)** - STEO incorrectly recorded 5 tutor contact hours per week, rather than a revised tutor contact time of 2.5 hours per week. In summary, it appears as though this error arose due to an administrative oversight that had occurred due to a paragraph in the body of the programme document not being updated. LTD advised TEC on 7 December 2015 that STEO had been updated to reflect the reduced teaching hours.

We discussed this matter with LTD and were advised that the administrative error arose because the document that goes through the academic approval process is the top page of the programme document, which had an incorrect summary of the course delivery copied from page 12 of the full document (being the previous hours that were delivered). The administration team relied on this incorrect summary when it loaded the hours into STEO.

We note that this issue was identified by LTD prior to the provision of documents to us, and that LTD is already in the process of adding a further cover sheet to its administration approval documents in order to prevent this type of an error reoccurring in the future. Accordingly, we are satisfied with LTD's explanation regarding this discrepancy.

- b) **Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy)** – At the beginning of 2014, Lincoln University enrolled students in this programme (version 1). The programme was subsequently revised and approved for delivery using the Whenua Kura initiative (version 2). Version 2 of the programme had a substantial increase in tutor contact time, from 150 to 270 hours.

Enrolments for version 2 of the programme commenced in June 2014; however, the final students in version 1 of the programme did not complete their study until 31 October 2015. Consequently, for the period between June 2014 and 31 October 2015, there were students enrolled in both versions of the programme. STEO only allows one set of data per programme. During the period of overlap, the STEO data was recorded using the version 1 hours (lower tutor contact time of the two versions).

LTD stated in its memorandum dated 8 December 2015 that *“[s]teps are now underway to revise the STEO data in accordance with the approved Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy) programme documentation (version 2)”*.

We are satisfied with LTD's explanation regarding this programme. We note that the hours entered into STEO were consistent with version 1 of the programme.

A copy of the memorandum is attached at **Appendix C**.

3.6 We also note that STEO did not reconcile with the latest versions of the programme documents we were provided with for:

- a) **Telford Certificate in Apiculture Knowledge** – the programme document, dated January 2012 (version 3.3), records that this is a 50 week programme, with two teaching hours and twelve self-directed learning hours required per week (i.e. 100 teaching hours and 600 self-directed hours total). However, STEO records one teaching hour and eleven self-directed

learning hours per week. Consequently, the total learning hours recorded in STEO are lower than in the programme document.

- b) **Telford Certificate in Agriculture** - there was a minor variance between the self-directed and work experience hours recorded in STEO and the programme document<sup>10</sup>, We note that this may have occurred due to the programme document's work experience hours per week being rounded to one decimal place (11.8), as opposed to STEO which appears to be rounded to the nearest whole number (12); and self-directed learning hours being rounded to one decimal place (2.6) as opposed to STEO which appears to be rounded to the nearest whole number (3).

TEC confirmed that the hours entered into STEO for the Telford Certificate in Agriculture were the whole numbers referred to above. Consequently, these minor discrepancies have contributed to the total learning hours recorded in STEO being greater than in the programme document.

- c) **National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3)** – the programme document, dated November 2009 records that this programme can be delivered full-time and part-time. We note that the full-time hours are most closely aligned with STEO and so we have relied on this duration when reconciling the learning hours against STEO.

The programme document records that this is a 28 week full-time programme, with 18 teaching hours and 10.8 self-directed learning hours and 8.6 work experience hours required per week. However, STEO records minor discrepancies in respect of the required self-directed (11) and work experience hours per week (9). We note that this may be due to rounding. As a consequence, the total learning hours in STEO are slightly greater than in the programme document.

3.7 We recommend that STEO is updated on a timely basis to reflect the changes in teaching, work experience and self-directed learning hours to ensure that TEC has access to accurate information regarding the breakdown of learning hours being delivered.

3.8 LTD has independently undertaken an initiative to improve its processes, which includes:

- a) Refreshing all of its course and programme specification sheets, using STEO terminology, which require sign off by programme leaders and heads of department;
- b) Instituting an annual procedure whereby changes proposed to courses are reviewed by the programme leader and signed off against an updated specification sheet, and then transmitted to the teaching and learning sub-committee of the Academic Board<sup>11</sup>; and
- c) Implementing a form that will be placed on top of course approvals, which summarises data that needs to be added to new courses, the student management system or STEO.

### Approval of changes through the Academic Board

3.9 As discussed above, there was a difference between the hours recorded in the programme document, and the hours submitted in STEO for four of the programmes we reviewed.

3.10 Lincoln University's Academic Board advises the Council, through the Vice-Chancellor on academic matters. This includes providing advice in relation to the establishment and

---

<sup>10</sup> The Telford Certificate in Agriculture (Level 3) Qualification Approval Document records "December 2009" on the front page, however records "November 2015" on the footer of the body of the document.

<sup>11</sup> LTD document – *Progress Report on Deloitte's Preliminary Findings, dated 13 May 2016*

disestablishment of programmes, and the revision of course or general academic regulations. Additionally, the introduction of new programmes, or significant amendments to existing programmes, must be approved and accredited by the NZ Vice-Chancellor's Committee and Committee on University Academic Programmes ("CUAP") on behalf of NZQA<sup>12</sup>.

- 3.11 Proposals that require a significant modification to an existing programme, for example, changing the structure of a qualification, are considered to be major amendments. Proposals containing major amendments, once approved by the Academic Board, must be submitted to Council and then to CUAP for approval<sup>13</sup>. In the case of these major amendments, a business plan must also be submitted to the Divisional Director.
- 3.12 We reviewed the programme approval documents, which include notes summarising the revision to the documents, to determine whether the discrepancies in learning hours had been approved by the Academic Board:
- a) **Telford Certificate in Agriculture** – The programme documentation refers to minor changes made to align the curriculum document and the delivery of the programme. These changes were approved by the Telford Division Teaching Committee on 16 January 2014. The learning hours that are recorded in this version of the programme document are the same as the current version. Subsequent reviews made regarding assessments (not altering learning hours) occurred in April 2014, September 2014 and November 2015<sup>14</sup>.
  - b) **Telford Certificate in Apiculture Knowledge** – The programme document refers to a re-documentation of the curriculum in 2010; it does not refer to a review of the learning hours delivered under the programme<sup>15</sup>.
  - c) **Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices)** – The programme was modified by the Academic Board on 19 November 2014. The difference in STEO arose due to an administrative error following this modification. LTD confirmed that the Academic Board approved a change to the programme document on 15 December 2015 (during the course of our engagement), revising the programme's learning hours.
  - d) **National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3)** – The programme document refers to a re-documentation of the curriculum in 2009; it does not refer to a review of the learning hours delivered under the programme. However, we note that the discrepancy between the programme document and STEO is minor and could be a rounding error<sup>16</sup>.
- 3.13 The Lincoln-Telford Division Teaching Committee ("LTDTTC") provides advice and oversight of the Division's domains, courses and programmes in order to contribute to the quality assurance and integrity of those courses and programmes for which the Division holds primary responsibility. LTDTTC is responsible for matters relating to students intending to enrol and currently enrolled in courses and programmes that the Lincoln-Telford Division offers. Functions of the LTDTTC include developing and evaluating content and structure of programmes and courses offered by LTD<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> Lincoln University Policies and Procedures – *Procedures to Introduce a New or Modify an Existing Programme*

<sup>13</sup> Lincoln University Policies and Procedures – *Procedures to Introduce a New or Modify an Existing Programme*

<sup>14</sup> Telford Certificate in Agriculture (Level 3) – Qualification Approval Document (November 2015) page 16

<sup>15</sup> Telford Certificate in Apiculture Knowledge – Qualification Approval Document (January 2012) page 11

<sup>16</sup> National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) – Qualification Approval Document (2010) page 12

<sup>17</sup> Lincoln-Telford Division Teaching Committee – *Terms of Reference (as at June 2015)*

## Duration and Learning Hours Analysis

- 3.14 We have been advised by TEC that an important part of the funding provided to Tertiary Education Providers is based on the total learning hours delivered to the student (approximately 1,200 hours per year for a full time course). This is reflected in rule SAC036.
- 3.15 The learning hours for the programmes that we investigated comprised teaching hours, self-directed hours and work-experience (or supervised practice) hours. Our work focussed on all of the components and relied primarily on course timetables, tutor interviews and randomly selected student interviews.
- 3.16 From the evidence we have gathered, we have assessed that the actual hours delivered to students for the following programmes either met, or exceeded the hours that are recorded in STEO during the period that we investigated each course for:
- Telford Certificate in Agriculture (Level 3)
  - Telford Certificate in Apiculture (Level 3)
  - Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy) (Level 3)
  - National Certificate in Agriculture (Level 3) Animal Feeding and Pastures
  - Lincoln Diploma in Agriculture
  - Lincoln Diploma in Farm Management
- 3.17 We have identified an apparent under-delivery of learning hours delivered to students studying the following programmes:

**Table 3: Preliminary assessment of learning hours delivered**

	Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) <sup>18</sup>	National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture)	National Certificate in Horticulture <sup>19</sup>	Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture
Credits	60	76	105	40
Level	3	3	3	2
EFTS delivered (2010 to 2015)	107.15	99.11	84.00 / 126.21	172.08
Weeks (excluding holiday weeks)	18	52	28	10
<b>Learning hours recorded in STEO</b>				
Teaching hours per week (total)	2.8 (50.4)	4.65 (242)	18 (504)	21 (210)
Self-directed hours per week (total)	20 (360)	6.4 (333)	11 (308)	11 (110)
Work-experience hours per week (total)	10.6 (190.8)	3.56 (185)	9 (252)	8 (80)
<b>Total learning hours required (STEO)</b>	<b>601.2</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>1,064</b>	<b>400</b>
<b>Learning hours delivered</b>				
- Scheduled classroom and tutorials	60	180	185	112.5
- Learning without tutor / WPA	63	104	500	21
- Work-exp. / supervised practice	190.8	185	-	262.5
- Additional allowance for unscheduled tutor contact	18	26	50	10
<b>Total learning hours delivered</b>	<b>331.8</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>406</b>
<b>Assessment of learning hours delivered to students</b>	<b>55.19%</b>	<b>65.13%</b>	<b>69.08%</b>	<b>100.02%</b>

3.18 We note that the self-directed component differs between each student, depending on a number of factors such as age, prior knowledge, motivation and experience. However, it is an important part of the total learning hours that the funding is based on. We have relied on the highest estimates provided by students when considering the level of self-directed study that students were required to undertake. This is a conservative approach, as it increases the volume of hours we have assessed as being delivered to students. We discuss each of these courses in more detail in the following paragraphs.

***Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture (Level 2)***

3.19 The Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture is described in a qualification approval document as a ten week full time “course” designed to provide students with the necessary training and skills so they can succeed in a vocational setting in the arboriculture sector<sup>20</sup>.

3.20 In summary, our assessment of the actual delivery of learning hours delivered under the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture (Level 2) is significantly different to the hours submitted in STEO. This is because there is a significantly greater emphasis on workplace learning. We also note that approximately 40% of students complete the programme within a three week period<sup>21</sup>,

<sup>18</sup> We have relied on the revised learning hours entered into STEO in December 2015

<sup>19</sup> These are the hours delivered under a part-time model. EFTS delivered cohorts only / total delivery by LTD

<sup>20</sup> Qualification Summary – Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture- updated October 2013 (Version 8 – 2010), page 10

<sup>21</sup> Most students estimated it was a 2 ½ week period. We have assessed delivery on the slightly higher basis of a three week period, which was stated by the tutor, class timetables and some student interviews for the purpose of our analysis.

whereas STEO and the approved programme documentation state it should be delivered during a ten week period.

3.21 We have assessed the delivery of the programme based on the following learning streams:

- a) All students enrolled in the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture are required to undertake a 2 ½ to 3 week block course that is delivered by a 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) tutor. Students usually described this as a full-time course that ran for between 13 to 15 days, with class usually starting by 8.30am and finishing before 5pm. These estimates are supported by the tutor's description of the block course, and the class timetables that were reviewed. Students advised that the first week usually involved predominantly theory work, and that the second and third weeks focussed on practical work.

For the purpose of our assessment, we have used the highest consistent estimates provided by students and the tutor, which was three full weeks of training. Accordingly, we calculated the teaching hours delivered under the Telford Certificate in Arboriculture as 112.5 hours (15 days x 7.5 hours).

- b) We were advised by a 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) tutor that they would "be hoping" that students undertook 2 hours of self-directed study per day during the three week intensive programme, which would be 10 hours per week. To get an understanding of what students were actually required to learn outside class, we also randomly interviewed 10 students who had been enrolled in the programme. The highest estimate provided by the students we spoke to put the level of outside learning at 4 hours per week. For the purpose of our assessment, we have conservatively applied the mid-point between the tutor's expectation and the student's experience, which is 7 hours per week during the three week block course (21 hours total).
- c) We were advised by the 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) Academic Manager and tutors that the final component of the Telford Certificate in Arboriculture is a 7 week work placement. We note that the duration of this work placement is much higher than the work experience hours that have been entered into STEO (approximately 2 weeks). The 7 week work place duration is also not consistent with the latest version of the programme document, which states that "[t]rainees must complete the equivalent of 2 weeks work experience"<sup>22</sup>.

We interviewed ten students to get an understanding of how the programme was delivered to them. Eight of these students advised us that they had not completed the work experience component of this programme.

We raised this matter with LTD prior to our preliminary briefing with TEC. LTD investigated the percentage of students that completed the work placement component of this programme. On 11 February 2016 LTD advised us that 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) had notified it that a "significant number of students in 2014 (38%) and 2015 (33%) years did not complete the work placement component of the programme after completing the block course component"<sup>23</sup>.

LTD also provided us with a spreadsheet that recorded which students had completed the work placement component of the programme. Our analysis of this spreadsheet shows that 60% of 2014 students and 62% of 2015 students were placed in a work placement<sup>24</sup>. The

---

<sup>22</sup> Telford Rural Polytechnic Qualification Approval Document: *Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture – Updated Oct 2013*, Page 23

<sup>23</sup> Email: RE: *Telford review – update*. Date 11 February 2016, 8:38am

<sup>24</sup> Analysis of spreadsheet 2014\_15\_FCA Placements 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) 20160210.xlsx

reasons given for not attending the work placements include being unable to find a suitable work place, arboriculture not being the desired career path and travel restrictions.

On 4 May 2016, 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) Academic Manager advised us that a student could technically complete all of the unit standards during the three week teaching block course (i.e. a student could complete all of the unit standards without undertaking a work placement). This is consistent with the approved programme document, which does not explicitly require evidence to be generated in the work placement component of the programme.

For the purposes of our assessment, we have assessed the hours delivered under the work placement as 7 weeks full time, which is 262.5 hours. However, it should be noted that this assessment only applies to approximately 60% of the students. We note that the programme document and STEO record a requirement of 80 work experience hours in total. Our assessment is significantly higher than this. This may reflect the fact that this programme has been delivered with a greater emphasis on workplace training than the programme document or STEO suggest was required.

We emphasise that the remaining 40% of students have not undertaken this work placement. Accordingly, this assessment is not reflective of the learning hours received by those students.

- d) We have also included an allowance of 1 hour per week for unscheduled tutor contact. This allowance reflects additional general tutor contact with students, and has been applied for the full duration of the programme.

3.22 LTD has already undertaken a number of steps to ensure that the work experience component of this programme is delivered and reported by 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) going forward. Changes that have been proactively made by LTD include: amending the results reporting template that is submitted to include a record of attendance for the teaching block course and work experience components; receiving reports from 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) recording students' work placement arrangements and amending LTD's student management system to include a requirement for the recording of the work experience component.

3.23 We also note that LTD is reviewing the split of the learning hours delivered to students under the Telford Certificate in Arboriculture. We understand that this will result in a lower amount of "teaching hours" to be delivered by tutors, which will be replaced by an equal amount of "work experience" hours.

3.24 Finally, we note that approximately 40% of students do not undertake a work placement when they study this programme. LTD has noted that the programme documentation does not require work placement and that the students in this cohort correctly received their certificates. LTD has updated the course assessments to now explicitly require evidence of work experience as part of this programme. However, the students who did not undertake any work placement completed the programme within three weeks rather than the ten weeks recorded in STEO.

3.25 The Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture is recorded in STEO as a 0.3334 EFTS qualification. We analysed LTD's SDR to determine whether a random sample of 20 students who had not completed the work placement had a reduced EFTS consumption, to reflect the fact that they had received their study in a compressed timeframe. Our analysis for these 20 random students showed that their consumed EFTS consumed was between 0.25 and 0.34 per student. The average consumption was 0.32 EFTS for each student. This indicates that LTD has not claimed a lower amount of EFTS for students who had not completed work placements.

- 3.26 TEC may wish to consider whether these students should have been funded at a lower amount to reflect the compressed delivery of the programme<sup>25</sup>.
- 3.27 Additionally, TEC should consider whether the remaining 60% of students have also been overfunded on the basis that the teaching and self-directed learning hours that were approved and submitted in STEO were under-delivered (44.85% delivered) and were replaced by work experience hours. As we noted, these work experience hours had no assessment component and there was no teacher supervision.

### **Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices)**

- 3.28 The Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) is an 18 week programme<sup>26</sup> that aims to develop practical skills required to work safely and productively in the primary industry and farm environment. The programme is delivered nationwide through Farm:Skills, which is a joint venture partnership between Lincoln University and the Maori Trustee, Te Tumu Paeroa.
- 3.29 Students are required to complete one compulsory module (Working in the Primary Industries) and then three elective modules, which can vary depending on the student's personal interests and electives that are available in the area the student is enrolled.
- 3.30 We have assessed the delivery of this programme as follows<sup>27</sup>:
- a) From our review of the timetable documents and student interviews, it appears as though each module is delivered over a two day course. The two days per module are often separated by a number of weeks, with students logging their relevant work experience in work diaries during the intervening time period. We have assessed the delivery of these learning hours as 60 hours, which are delivered during 8 full-time days. We note that this contact time would exceed the revised teaching hours that were entered into STEO in December 2015.
  - b) The largest component recorded in STEO for this programme is an expectation of 20 hours per week of self-directed learning. We spoke to tutors and students to get an understanding of what amount of self-directed learning was required by students for this programme. We were advised as follows:
    - i. A tutor we interviewed estimated that students would need to be completing approximately 5 hours per week of self-directed study, but that if too much emphasis was placed on this component then students would just “walk out”.
    - ii. We also spoke to ten randomly selected students who had enrolled in the programme. Most students we spoke to described nil or minimal levels of self-directed learning (15 minutes to 2 hours “homework” on average per week).

For the purpose of our assessment, we have applied the midpoint of the highest student's estimate (2 hours per week) and the tutor's estimate (5 hours per week), which is 3.5 hours per week. We note that this is significantly below the 20 hours per week that is recorded on STEO. We note that LTD has proactively implemented some changes regarding the level of self-directed learning delivered on this programme, which we discuss below.

---

<sup>25</sup> For example, applying Rule SAC045 during the 2014 calendar year

<sup>26</sup> Excluding holiday weeks

<sup>27</sup> When we commenced our work there was a discrepancy between STEO and the programme document. This was identified by LTD and updated (refer paragraph 3.5(a)). Because this is the first year of this programme's delivery, we have assessed it against the revised hours that were submitted to STEO in December 2015.

- c) STEO records a work experience component for the Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) of 191 hours. All of the students that we spoke to were employed on a farm at the time they were studying the programme and most mentioned the work diaries that were required to be completed. Accordingly, we have assumed that the work experience hours recorded in STEO have been delivered to the students while they were at their workplace.
  - d) We have also included an allowance of 1 hour per week for general tutor contact throughout the duration of the programme. We note that the tutor we spoke to advised that he generally leaves the students to their own devices if they are not doing courses, and that he would make contact 1 to 3 times per month depending on their needs and availability. The allowance we have included would cater for approximately 4 hours per month of unscheduled tutor contact time.
- 3.31 We note that the Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) is a new programme. The initial delivery to students commenced in April 2015. Prior to the commencement of our engagement, Lincoln University had already identified concerns from students and tutors in relation to the self-directed learning materials that were associated with this programme. The concerns raised with the learning materials included<sup>28</sup>:
- a) The number of pages in the workbooks presented a daunting prospect for learners;
  - b) Repetition across student workbooks; and
  - c) Layout of materials.
- 3.32 We were advised that, in assessing these concerns, Lincoln University took steps in 2015 to revise and reformat learning resources to improve student engagement, include self-directed components of learning in the student's work diaries and update the assessments. The first revised student workbooks were scheduled to be available for programmes starting in March 2016.
- 3.33 We discussed our assessment of the under-delivery of the self-directed component of this programme with LTD in February 2016. Following this, a proposal was submitted by LTD to rationalise and reorganise the content of the programme, which was approved by the Academic Board on 4 May 2016.
- 3.34 We note that the proposed revisions made to the self-directed learning materials, particularly the incorporation of self-directed learning into the student's work diaries may increase the level of self-directed learning that students engage in from March 2016 onwards.
- 3.35 We also note that LTD held a focus group discussion in April 2016 with all of the tutors that were involved in the delivery of this programme. This two day training session involved a focussed discussion on the revised self-directed learning materials.

### **National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture)**

- 3.36 The National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture) is a unit standard based qualification that is delivered through 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv). The programme document describes the qualification as a part time introductory certificate for people entering a career in the arboriculture sector<sup>29</sup>.
- 3.37 This programme is delivered through a series of block courses that range in duration from one to five days<sup>30</sup>. 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) Academic Manager described this programme as "vocational

<sup>28</sup> Email: Section 9(2)(a) Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (Level 3), 28 January 2016

<sup>29</sup> Course handbook – National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture) (Level 3), page 14

<sup>30</sup> Students commonly referred to one or two day courses; the five day course was the highest estimate by one student.

training” and advised us that it is usually delivered to students who are already employed in the arboriculture industry. It is common for students to complete the programme through their employer.

3.38 We discussed the delivery of this programme with 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) Academic Manager and were advised that the:

- Focus has never been on recording contact time with students. Rather, it has been based on outcomes and moderation, which are primarily ensuring that students are competent enough to complete the unit standards, 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) can advise when students were assessed, but cannot state how many training days each student attended;
- Students do not have a structured learning schedule and that a timetable for the entire duration of the programme, setting out contact hours, could not be provided; and
- Learning hours entered into STEO were an “accounting exercise” and may not reconcile with actual delivery. We were advised that little emphasis had been placed on the hours that were recorded in STEO. Rather, 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) focussed on ensuring that the students were competent enough to complete the unit standards.

3.39 It has been difficult to assess the learning hours that 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) has delivered to students who have studied the National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture). This is primarily because students are not visited by 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) on a structured basis (e.g. once a week or fortnight), which meant that students were not able to confidently estimate how many training days they attended in total.

3.40 We have assessed the delivery of this programme as follows:

- a) We interviewed ten randomly selected students in order to understand the frequency of the training days provided by 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) tutors. Most of the students estimated that tutors would visit them onsite once every two to three months and that each training block would usually last either one or two days. The students advised us that the training was very intermittent, and that the days scheduled were not consistent.

9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) Academic Manager was also not able to provide us with documents that evidenced the number of contact days that a student has with 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) tutors.

For the purpose of our assessment, we have assumed that 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) tutors provided two training days to each student every month. This means that we have assessed that approximately 180 learning hours are delivered to students during the training days (24 days x 7.5 hours per day). In our view, this is a conservative estimate, as most of the students described being in contact with tutors on a far less frequent basis.

- b) Students also referred to study undertaken outside the training days, which included completing some unit standards at home and studying papers before a training day. The highest estimates provided by students were “a couple” of hours per week. Accordingly, we have assumed that students were required to do 2 hours per week (104 hours total).
- c) Finally, students often referred to learning units on the job, and gaining the units while working. In our view, this appears to be work experience, as it is learning under the instruction of an employer. As most of the students were in full-time work we have assumed that all of the required work experience hours were delivered to students (185 hours total).

- d) We have also included a weekly allowance for general tutor contact. In our view, it is reasonable for this allowance to be set at 30 minutes per week. We consider that this is conservative, and is likely to overestimate the actual amount of unscheduled tutor contact. We have based this view on the comments made by students regarding the “intermittent” and “once every few months” contact with tutors. Accordingly, we have allowed for 26 hours, per student, of general contact with tutors outside the training days.

### *National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3)*

- 3.41 The National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) is a 105 credit qualification that was delivered through 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) and the Biological Husbandry Unit Organics Trust (“**BHU**”) during the period of our investigation scope.
- 3.42 LTD’s programme document states that the programme can be delivered either full time or part time. We note that the full time method of delivery aligns most closely with the hours that have been entered into STEO:

**Table 4: comparison of learning hours in programme document**

STEO	LTD Programme Document (full time)	LTD Programme Document (part time)
Duration: 1 year (28 weeks)	Duration: 1 year (28 weeks)	Duration: 2 years (100 weeks)
Teaching: 504	Teaching: 504	Teaching: 200
Self-directed: 308	Self-directed: 302.4	Self-directed: 850
Work Exp.: 252	Work Exp.: 240.8	Work Exp.: 0
<b>Total hours: 1,064</b>	<b>Total hours: 1,047.2</b>	<b>Total hours: 1,050</b>

### **9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) delivery**

- 3.43 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) delivered to two cohorts under the National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) during 2013 and 2014. These were held in:
- a) Northland – we discuss issues surrounding the delivery of this cohort at paragraph 4.23. In summary, 12 students enrolled in this cohort and none of them successfully completed<sup>31</sup>.
- b) Otago – delivered during 2013 and 2014, consumed 11 EFTS in total.
- 3.44 LTD provided us with a spreadsheet that records the number of EFTS each delivery partner has consumed in respect of the programmes that were within our scope<sup>32</sup>. This document records that 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) did not deliver the National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) between 2010 and 2012; or during 2015.
- 3.45 We investigated the Northland cohort and found that the issues in relation to the delivery of the programme in this instance were summarised in the Annual Programme Review, which we have attached at **Appendix D**. The Annual Programme Review is a four page summary of the Northland cohort that was delivered by 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) and includes a personal comment from 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) Academic Manager.

<sup>31</sup> 2014 Annual Programme Report – National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) (**Appendix D**). LTD advised us that 12 students enrolled in this cohort, rather than 23 students, which is recorded on this document.

<sup>32</sup> 030 TF EFTS consumption report.xlsx. Excel spreadsheet provided by LTD.

- 3.46 We attempted to call students that had enrolled in the Northland cohort; however, we were not able to successfully interview any students that had studied the programme for its duration.
- 3.47 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) delivery of this programme in Otago only consumed 11 EFTS in total during 2013 and 2014. We did not investigate the delivery of this cohort, as we focussed on the delivery by the Biological Husbandry Unit and 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv). These two providers have consumed significantly more EFTS during the timeframe of our investigation.

#### **Biological Husbandry Unit (BHU) delivery**

- 3.48 BHU deliver this programme in a full-time model, which involves at least 2 ½ half days of lectures per week, self-directed study and work experience. From our analysis, it is likely that the learning hours provided by BHU either met, or exceeded, the hours as set out in STEO.

#### **9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) delivery**

- 3.49 In contrast, 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) delivered this programme under a part time model, which has a greater emphasis on self-directed learning. We note that the part time model of delivery for this programme is described in the programme document. However, it is not contained in STEO. We have set out our comparison of the difference between the full time and part time models of delivery in table 4, below paragraph 3.42.
- 3.50 We have summarised our findings in respect of 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) delivery of the National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) as:

- a) The duration of the programme is approximately 11 months. During this time, students have a weekly session with the tutor, which is approximately 4.5 hours in length. We have reviewed 11 timetables provided to us for cohorts that studied during 2014 and 2015. The maximum number of these classes in a timetable was 38<sup>33</sup>. Accordingly, we have allowed for 171 hours of classroom time (38 days x 4.5 hours). We have also included an allowance of 14 hours to represent two additional full day field trips that some students referred to.
- b) The majority of the hours recorded in LTD's programme document for the part time delivery of this programme comprise self-directed study. The tutor that we interviewed on this point stated that there was a considerable amount of homework to be done and that this includes practical work, such as planting annuals and bedding plants. The students that we interviewed advised that the tutor expected 6 hours a week, but that the work would only take "a few" or "several" hours per week. However, we note that some of the students we spoke to had completed higher tertiary study, which may mean they could progress through content more quickly.

Given the students' previous tertiary study, we have conservatively increased our assessment of the self-directed hours required from "a few" hours to 10 hours per week. Additionally, we have assumed that self-directed study was completed by the students throughout the duration of the programme, including during holiday weeks. Accordingly, we have assessed the level of self-directed study required as 500 hours (50 weeks x 10 hours).

- c) We have also included an allowance of 1 hour per week for general, unscheduled contact between the tutor and each student.

---

<sup>33</sup> Excluding holiday weeks; day cohorts only (evening cohorts were shorter duration but more frequent [slightly lower total hours])

## Other matters

3.51 We note that the Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) and National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture) have a strong emphasis on employment based training. We say this because the:

- a) Students are usually all employed in related workplaces before they start studying the programmes;
- b) Students are commonly enrolled on the programmes at the direction of their employers;
- c) Training helps the development of skills that meet industry needs;
- d) Actual delivery of the programmes involves a high component of on-the-job training; and
- e) Actual delivery of the programme usually involves two to three contact days with tutors per month.

3.52 TEC may wish to consider whether it would be more appropriate to fund this provision through the industry training fund.

## 4. Subcontracting arrangements (Delivery Partners)

- 4.1 LTD's relationships with its delivery partners allow it to gain access to industry knowledge and to deliver programmes nationwide. We have summarised the EFTS that have been consumed by each of LTD's delivery partners in relation to the delivery of the programmes within the scope of our work:

**Table 5: EFTS consumed by LTD's delivery partners for programmes within scope<sup>34</sup>**

Delivery Partner Programme	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
<b>9(2)(b)(ii) &amp; 9(2)(f)(iv)</b>							
National Cert. Agriculture (Animal Feeding)	-	-	-	6.9	4.0	-	10.9
National Cert. in Horticulture	-	-	3.8	4.9	64.4	11.0	84.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	<b>3.8</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>68.4</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>94.9</b>
<b>BHU</b>							
National Cert. in Horticulture	-	-	-	-	7.0	13.1	20.1
<b>Emerge</b>							
National Cert. Agriculture (Animal Feeding)	-	-	-	10.8	24.2	0.7	35.7
Telford Cert. in Farming (Dairy)	-	-	-	-	48.3	60.2	108.5
<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	-	<b>10.8</b>	<b>72.5</b>	<b>60.9</b>	<b>144.2</b>
<b>Farm:Skills Joint Venture</b>							
Telford Cert. in Farming (Practices)	-	-	-	-	-	107.1	107.1
<b>National Trade Academy</b>							
National Cert. Agriculture (Animal Feeding)	-	4.9	6.6	12.3	-	-	23.7
Telford Cert. in Agriculture	6.0	7.0	5.0	-	-	-	18.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>12.3</b>	-	-	<b>41.7</b>
<b>Smedley</b>							
Telford Cert. in Agriculture	-	-	-	11.0	11.0	11.0	33.0
<b>9(2)(b)(ii) &amp; 9(2)(f)(iv)</b>							
National Cert. in Horticulture	-	-	-	6.1	15.6	0.4	22.1
National Cert. in Horticulture (Arboriculture)	-	9.1	28.9	23.4	16.8	22.2	100.5
Telford Foundation Cert. in Arboriculture	8.9	6.9	44.0	45.6	26.5	40.2	172.1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>75.1</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>62.8</b>	<b>294.7</b>
<b>Whenua Kura</b>							
Telford Cert. in Farming (Dairy)	-	-	-	-	7.0	13.5	20.6
<b>Total deliver partner EFTS</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>88.3</b>	<b>120.9</b>	<b>224.7</b>	<b>279.4</b>	<b>756.1</b>

<sup>34</sup> 030 TF EFTS consumption report.xlsx (provided by LTD)

- 4.2 The memorandums of understanding entered into between LTD and each of the delivery partners allocate a specific number of EFTS during each calendar year to the delivery partner at learning levels. The delivery partner is required to conduct and deliver all agreed services in accordance with the requirements and regulations of LTD, consistent with the specifications of the programmes. LTD's quality management system will be the guiding quality assurance policy, with LTD responsible for quality assurance<sup>35</sup>.
- 4.3 In consideration for the services that are provided, LTD agrees to pay each delivery partner a percentage of the SAC funding payable by TEC for each enrolled student. The agreed percentage in the memorandums of understanding we have reviewed was usually:
- For domestic students:
    - 9(2)(b)(iii) of the SAC funding plus the cost of registering credits for each enrolled student was to be retained by LTD; and
    - 9(2)(b)(iii) of SAC funding was paid to the delivery partner.
  - For international students, LTD would retain 9(2)(b)(iii) of the fee plus the cost of registering credits, plus the levy charged for international students.
- 4.4 The contracts also set out that LTD expected standards regarding course completions, qualification completions, student progressions and student retentions to be met.
- 4.5 We have reviewed LTD's subcontracting register for 2015. This register was submitted to TEC and should contain all of the subcontracting arrangements or contracts for service where LTD is paying to have SAC funded teaching and learning activity delivered on its behalf. We note that most of the contracts in relation to the programmes we reviewed are recorded on this subcontracting register and, accordingly, TEC was aware of each of the relationships.
- 4.6 According to the memorandum of agreements we have reviewed, LTD is responsible for the enrolment of students, supplying curriculum documentation to delivery partners and undertaking quality assurance on the programmes.
- 4.7 Following the receipt of our preliminary findings in January 2016, LTD implemented a number of initiatives to improve its processes regarding the use of delivery partners. These initiatives included:
- a) Implementing a new 'delivery partnership' model, which is going to be trialled through a pilot during 2016. This model will involve theory components of selected programmes being delivered by Lincoln, using Lincoln's distance delivery infrastructure. Delivery partners will be contracted for selected components of the programme;
  - b) Visiting delivery partners throughout the year; and
  - c) Contacting students to get their perspective on the course to ensure it matches with what LTD understands is being delivered.

---

<sup>35</sup> For example, clause 2.5 – Memorandum of Understanding, LTD and 9(2)(b)(iii) & 9(2)(f)(iv), 19 March 2015

## 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)

- 4.8 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(a)
- 4.9 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) is involved in the provision of horticulture and arboriculture related programmes throughout New Zealand and 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv). Between 2010 and 2015, 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) delivered 294.7 EFTS through LTD in the programmes that were within the scope of our review.
- 4.10 During the course of our investigation we identified three material issues regarding 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv):
- a) An apparent under-delivery of learning hours that were provided to students enrolled in the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture and National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture);
  - b) One student was marked as completing courses when he had never attended the programme. This resulted in SAC funding of the student and assessment information being submitted to LTD that supported the awarding of the qualification; and
  - c) 21 students were enrolled in a National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) cohort where no student completed the qualification.

### Under-delivery of programmes

- 4.11 We have assessed an under-delivery of learning hours provided to 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) cohorts on two programmes, which were the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture and National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture). Our analysis regarding these programmes is set out above, at paragraphs 3.19 and 3.36.

### Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture – student awarded qualification without attending

- 4.12 Our standard process when undertaking similar investigations is to interview ten randomly selected students from each programme that is within the scope of our engagement. The purpose of these interviews is primarily to gain an understanding of the learning hours that the students were required to undertake. However, we also ask a series of questions that provide evidence of the student actually enrolling and attending the programme.
- 4.13 One student that we interviewed advised us that he had enrolled in the Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture and was meant to attend the programme in 2015. However, the student got a job Section 9(2)(a) and, consequently, did not attend the programme. We investigated this student's enrolment further in order to determine why he was still included in the enrolment list. Our further inquiries discovered that:
- a) The student was recorded in a 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) class list for a Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture cohort that was delivered in Whangarei between May and July 2015;

---

<sup>36</sup> 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)

- b) A 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) results sheet recorded that the student successfully completed 11 different unit standards on various dates between 26 May and 15 July 2015<sup>37</sup>;
  - c) The minutes from the Telford Awards Committee Meeting, dated Tuesday 4 August 2015 recorded that the Awards Committee had reviewed the transcript for the student and recommended him/her to the Telford Division Teaching Committee for the granting of the qualification; and
  - d) LTD's SDR, which was submitted to TEC and forms the basis for SAC funding that is provided (along with performance indicators), recorded that the student was a valid enrolment for 0.2917 EFTS of SAC funded delivery between May and July 2015.
- 4.14 The evidence we sighted showed that LTD had received SAC funding for a student that had not attended the programme; and also indicated the student had been awarded with unit standards and the qualification.
- 4.15 We asked LTD for an explanation regarding this student's enrolment. On the 11th of February, LTD advised us that 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) had acknowledged that "*this student was mistakenly reported to Lincoln as successfully completing all course assessments in the programme*"<sup>38</sup>. Based on this finding, Lincoln University contacted the student and initiated the revocation of the award and any national unit standards that were associated with the award.
- 4.16 We also interviewed 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) Academic Manager and asked him what had led to the student being marked as having completed the unit standards. We were advised that 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) was embarrassed as a result of this issue and that it considered it to be a serious matter.
- 4.17 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) investigated the issue and discovered that the tutor had sent a blank results sheet to an administrator. On seeing that the results sheet was blank, this staff member inserted completion dates into the spreadsheet by copying data into cells that were blank.
- 4.18 As a result of this issue being highlighted, LTD requested that 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) further investigate the completion of a random sample of 5 cohorts to ensure that the same issue had not occurred previously. In total, the 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) Academic Manager estimated that they checked the records of between 60 and 70 students that were enrolled in the 5 randomly selected cohorts. We were advised that 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) is satisfied that this was a one-off event; however, they cannot explain the administrator's actions. The administrator is no longer employed by 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)
- 4.19 We note that LTD proactively undertook an appropriate investigation to determine what had occurred in this instance. LTD has advised us that it has now implemented new quality assurance and approval processes that will mitigate the risk of a similar issue occurring in the future. These processes include changing the reporting template that is submitted by delivery partners to include a record of attendance for teaching at block courses and work placements.
- 4.20 We recommend that the TEC considers whether LTD was overfunded during 2015 for the delivery of the EFTS to this student.

---

<sup>37</sup> FCA Whangarei Results May-June 2015 (provided to us by LTD)

<sup>38</sup> Email: RE: Telford review – update. Date: 11 February 2016, 8.38am.

### National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3)

- 4.21 As part of our investigation we requested copies of all reports or evaluations regarding each delivery partner's performance. Our objective with this document request was to gain a better understanding of LTD's oversight of its delivery partners, and also identify any issues that had been raised during annual programme reviews that may have required further investigation.
- 4.22 One of the documents we received in response to this request was an Annual Programme Report concerning a National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) cohort that was delivered by [redacted], Northland, during 2014. We have attached a copy of the Annual Programme Report at **Appendix D**. We have summarised the main points of this document as:
- In October 2013, [redacted] were given notice by Lincoln University that there would be no guaranteed new funding for the 2014 calendar year. Consequently, [redacted] tried to secure funding that may still remain available to it;
  - [redacted] scheduled the programme to run part-time for 50 weeks. However, student numbers dropped off quickly to the point where the delivery model was no longer effective. The timetable was revised a number of times throughout the year to try and suit the student's requirements; and
  - 12 students enrolled in the programme; however, no students completed it.
- 4.23 We interviewed [redacted] Academic Manager and discussed this cohort with him. He advised us that in approximately November 2013, Lincoln University advised [redacted] that it would not necessarily renew its contract for services with [redacted]. However, Lincoln University advised [redacted] that it could consume EFTS that had already been allocated. As such, [redacted] set up the delivery of this cohort on very short notice.
- 4.24 [redacted] Academic Manager advised us that it was unable to withdraw students for non-attendance of the programme because the programme documents that had been distributed to students did not state that non-attendance could result in withdrawal.

### Recommendation

- 4.25 Given the nature of these issues, we suggest that TEC considers [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]

### [redacted]

- 4.26 We have identified an under-delivery of learning hours provided to students enrolled in the National Certificate in Horticulture cohorts that are delivered through [redacted]. We discussed the delivery of this programme in Section 3 of this report.

# 5. Review of Enrolment Records

## Student Enrolments and Reporting of Course Completion

5.1 In this section we explain the results from our review of the underlying enrolment records for the randomly chosen students in each programme we reviewed. This involved:

- a) Sighting the enrolment application form for each student. We also confirmed whether or not the forms had been appropriately approved and signed by LTD;
- b) Checking that appropriate supporting information (e.g. birth certificate, passport) had been provided by the student to support their application;
- c) Reviewing the student details in the enrolment application forms to see if they reconciled with the details recorded in LTD's Student Management System ("SMS") and TEC's database;
- d) Reviewing the student's course completion records; and
- e) Reviewing evidence of assessment records for all students.

Programme	Documents supporting enrolment	Details reconcile in SMS and TEC	Evidence of assessment records	Completions and standards reported
Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture (TF0951)	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues
Telford Certificate in Agriculture (TF0751)	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues
Telford Certificate in Apiculture Knowledge (TF0845)	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues
Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy) (TF0963)	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues
Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (TF0964)	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues	✓ No issues

5.2 In total, we reviewed enrolment records for 69 students that studied the selected programmes during 2014 or 2015<sup>39</sup>. We identified no material issues with either the enrolment records or the course completion reporting.

<sup>39</sup> We randomly selected 75 students. Six of these students studied in both 2014 and 2015.

# Appendix A

## Key Sources of Information

Type	Details
Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LTD – Development and approval of new and revised qualifications (policy)</li> <li>• Lincoln University – Academic Administration Committee (policy)</li> <li>• Lincoln University – Academic Board (policy)</li> <li>• Lincoln University – Academic Programmes Committee (policy)</li> <li>• Lincoln University – Courses Committee (policy)</li> <li>• Lincoln University – Procedures to Introduce a new or modify an existing programme</li> <li>• Lincoln-Telford Division Teaching Committee (terms of reference)</li> <li>• Lincoln University - Merging Telford Policies into the Lincoln University Framework</li> <li>• Programme documents for ten selected programmes</li> <li>• Student handbooks for ten selected programmes</li> <li>• Class timetables for ten selected programmes</li> <li>• Memorandums of Agreement – LTD and Delivery Partners (annual MoU's) for selected programmes</li> <li>• Annual Programme Reviews for selected programmes</li> <li>• Delivery Partner Annual Reviews / Evaluations (selected programme delivery)</li> <li>• LTD Awards Committee Meeting minutes, student results, enrolments, attendance records and class timetables for 69 randomly selected students</li> <li>• Progress reports on further work done by LTD (May 2016)</li> <li>• LTD EFTS consumption reports (with delivery partners)</li> <li>• Lincoln University – TEC Financial Reporting 25 September 2015: Enrolments</li> <li>• Lincoln University – Future Funding of Lincoln University's Telford Division (memo)</li> <li>• TEC – 2015-16 Investment Plan funding approval letter Lincoln (5 December 2014)</li> <li>• LTD – Identified issues in relation to maintaining STEO data (memorandum)</li> <li>• LTD – Correction of STEO data for Certificate in Farming Practices (memorandum)</li> <li>• Telford Certificate Farming (Practices) modified programme/major proposals document</li> <li>• Draft template sheet for modified/new programmes</li> <li>• LTD submissions during engagement. Key submissions include:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lincoln University Memorandum: Concern re definitions used to review categorisation of learning hours on STEO (18 December 2015)</li> <li>○ Telford Certificate in Apiculture (December 2015)</li> <li>○ Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy) (December 2015 – January 2016)</li> <li>○ Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture (January – February 2016)</li> <li>○ Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (January – May 2016)</li> <li>○ National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) (May 2016)</li> <li>○ Lincoln University submission to TEC Review (24 February 2016)</li> <li>○ Lincoln University memorandum – response to email, Deloitte's draft preliminary findings (24 May 2016)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Type	Details
LTD staff and delivery partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 9(2)(a) (Director, LTD)</li> <li>• Section 9(2)(a) (Director, Student Administration, Lincoln University)</li> <li>• Programme Tutors and Delivery Partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 9(2)(a) [redacted]</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A total of 97 random students were interviewed across selected programmes</li> <li>• Graeme Cahalane (Tertiary Education Commission)</li> <li>• Section 9(2)(a) (Tertiary Education Commission)</li> </ul>

# Appendix B

Programme	Date programme approved by Academic Board	Programme Document	STEO (TEC)	Does STEO reconcile
<b>Telford Foundation Certificate in Arboriculture (L2)</b> 10 teaching weeks TF0951	Established December 2006. Latest removal of unit standards October 2013	Teaching: 210 Self-directed: 110 Work Experience: 80 <b>Total hours: 400</b>	Teaching: 210 Self-directed: 110 Work Experience: 80 <b>Total hours: 400</b>	Yes.
<b>Telford Certificate in Agriculture (L3)</b> 37 teaching weeks TF0751	Initial approval, Apr 1990 Latest external review Aug 2009 Latest clarification Nov 2015	Teaching: 666 <b>Self-directed: 96.2</b> <b>Work Experience: 436.6</b> <b>Total hours: 1,198.8</b>	Teaching: 666 <b>Self-directed: 111</b> <b>Work Experience: 444</b> <b>Total hours: 1,221</b>	No. Minor variance.
<b>Telford Certificate in Apiculture Knowledge (L3)</b> 50 teaching weeks TF0845	Initial approval, 1997. Review of qualification 2007 Re-documentation Aug 2011	<b>Teaching: 100</b> <b>Self-directed: 600</b> Work Experience: - <b>Total hours: 700</b>	<b>Teaching: 50</b> <b>Self-directed: 550</b> Work Experience: - <b>Total hours: 600</b>	No. Variance in teaching and self-directed hours.
<b>Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy) (L3)</b> 46 teaching weeks TF0963	New qualification Academic Board minute April 2013	Teaching: 138 Self-directed: 368 Work exp. / sup. prac.: 690 <b>Total hours: 1,196</b>	Teaching: 138 Self-directed: 368 Work exp. / sup. prac.: 690 <b>Total hours: 1,196</b>	Yes.
<b>Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (L3)</b> 18 teaching weeks TF0964	Programme document hours reflect amendments proposed 6 December 2015 (memorandum).	<b>Teaching: 45</b> Self-directed: 360 <b>Work experience: 180</b> <b>Total hours: 585</b>	<b>Teaching: 50.4</b> Self-directed: 360 <b>Work experience: 190.8</b> <b>Total hours: 601.2</b>	No. STEO hours updated 7/12/2015.
<b>National Certificate in Agriculture (Level 3) Animal Feeding and Pastures</b> 17 teaching weeks NC1435	Programme document dated September 2010.	Teaching: 100 Self-directed: 400 Work exp. / sup. prac.: 60 <b>Total hours: 560</b>	Teaching: 100 Self-directed: 400 Work exp. / sup. prac.: 60 <b>Total hours: 560</b>	Yes.
<b>National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3)</b> 28 teaching weeks NC1471	Programme document dated 2010	Teaching: 504 <b>Self-directed: 302.4</b> <b>Work exp. / sup. prac.: 240.8</b> <b>Total hours: 1,047.2</b>	Teaching: 504 <b>Self-directed: 308</b> <b>Work exp. / sup. prac.: 252</b> <b>Total hours: 1,064</b>	No. Minor variance.
<b>Horticulture (Arboriculture) (Level 3)</b> 52 teaching weeks NC1533	Programme document dated July 2010, amended July 2015 to include learning hours by unit standards.	Teaching: 242 Self-directed: 333 Work exp. / sup. prac.: 185 <b>Total hours: 760</b>	Teaching: 242 Self-directed: 333 Work exp. / sup. prac.: 185 <b>Total hours: 760</b>	Yes
<b>Diploma in Agriculture</b> 30 teaching weeks LI3015		8 different courses: ** One course stated 150 hours. Other courses no hours <b>Total hours: 1,200</b>	Teaching: 600 Self-directed: 600 Work exp. / sup. practice: - <b>Total hours: 1,200</b>	Yes (** assume courses all same size)
<b>Diploma in Farm Management</b> 32 teaching weeks LI3025		Various courses: 600 learning hours expected per semester (1,200 in total) <b>Total hours: 1,200</b>	Teaching: 640 Self-directed: 560 Work exp. / sup. practice: - <b>Total hours: 1,200</b>	Yes

# Appendix C

## MEMORANDUM

---

**To:** Section 9(2)(a), Deloitte  
**CC:** Section 9(2)(a), Lincoln University  
**From:** Section 9(2)(a), Director, Lincoln-Telford Division  
**Date:** 8 December 2015  
**Subject:** IDENTIFIED ISSUES IN RELATION TO MAINTAINING STEO DATA

---

### Background

As previously noted to TEC and Deloitte, Lincoln University has a number of internal review actions in place to address issues noted in recently released TEO review reports for other organisations.

Lincoln noted that one of these actions was an initiative to review approved programme documentation against STEO data for the programme.

The five programmes selected for the TEC review have been checked as part of this initiative and as part of the preparation for the current TEC review.

Two issues in relation to STEO data have been identified to date.

### Findings

- **Certificate in Farming (Practices)**

The Certificate in Farming (Practices) was developed and approved by CUAP 2013. The programme was reviewed and revised in 2014 in accordance with Lincoln University policies and procedures and the review changes approved by the Lincoln University Academic Board on 19 November 2014.

The revised Certificate in Farming (Practices) programme included a change in tutor contact hours from 90 to 50 hours based on approved changes at the individual course level. The revised 50 hours of tutor contact is set out in detail in approved course documentation but the programme document presented to, and approved at, the Academic Board incorrectly indicated that the total tutor contact hours were 90 hours.

This administration documentation error has resulted in the STEO data for the tutor contact hours for the delivery of the Certificate in Farming (Practices) not matching the approved programme course documentation and the actual tutor delivery provided between April 2015 to date.

A memorandum setting out the finding, an analysis of the factors that led to the error and recommendations was provided to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic Quality and Student Experience on 6 December 2015. (A copy of the memorandum is attached as appendix 1).

Based on the recommendations the STEO data for the Certificate in Farming (Practices) programme was amended on 7 December 2015 and an email sent to TEC noting the amendment and noting that the change was being reported to the Deloitte review team. (A copy of the email is attached as appendix 2)

- **Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy)**

At the beginning of 2014 Lincoln enrolled students in the year long Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy) programme (version 1 of the programme). The programme was then revised and approved for delivery for the Whenua Kura initiative (version 2 of the programme). Version 2 of the programme had a substantial increase in the tutor contact time (from 150 hours to 270 hours). Enrolments in the approved version 2 of the programme began in June 2014.

Enrolments in version 1 of the programme ceased at the end of October 2014. The final students in version 1 of the programme completed by 31 October 2015.

For the period June 2014 to 31 October 2015 students were enrolled in version 1 or version 2 of the programme. The STEO database only allows one set of data for a programme. During this period the STEO data remained set at version 1 – the lower tutor contact time of the two versions of the programme.

The key issues noted in the Lincoln's internal review are:

1. The approval of the version 2 programme to the Academic Board in 2014 and the subsequent increase in tutor contact time associated with version 2 of the programme did not trigger a revision of the STEO data.
2. The completion of the delivery of version 1 of the programme did not trigger a revision of the STEO data to align with the current version being delivered (version 2).

Steps are now underway to revise the STEO data in accordance with the approved Telford Certificate in Farming (Dairy) programme documentation (version 2).

Lincoln is currently implementing the following:

- development and implementation of a programme approval cover sheet for inclusion in the submission of new or revised programmes to Academic Programme Committee and Academic Board that includes the proposed STEO data based on the new/revised programme, and in the case of a revised programme notes any changes from previous STEO data and rationale for the change

**Section 9(2)(a)**

Director, Lincoln-Telford Division  
Lincoln University

**Appendix 1:** Internal Memo (6 December 2015) Re Correction of STEO Data For Certificate in Farming (Practices) –  
*Note: the attachment 1 referred to in the memo is a 173 page document and supplied in Drop Box and on USB*

**Appendix 2:** Email To TEC Re Amending STEO (7 December 2015)

## MEMORANDUM

---

**To:** Section 9(2)(a), Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic Quality and Student Experience  
**CC:** Section 9(2)(a), Director Student Administration  
**From:** Section 9(2)(a), Director, Lincoln-Telford Division  
**Date:** 6 December 2015  
**Subject:** CORRECTION OF STEO DATA FOR CERTIFICATE IN FARMING (PRACTICES)

---

### Background

As previously noted the Lincoln-Telford Division has initiated a project to review approved programme documentation against STEO data.

This paper notes the findings and recommendations in relation to the Certificate in Farming (Practices).

The Certificate in Farming (Practices) was developed and approved by CUAP 2013. The programme was reviewed and revised in 2014 in accordance with Lincoln University policies and procedures and the review changes approved by the Lincoln University Academic Board on 19 November.

### Introduction

The revised Certificate in Farming (Practices) programme included a change in tutor contact hours from 90 to 50 hours based on approved changes at the individual course level. The revised 50 hours of tutor contact is set out in detail in approved course documentation but the programme document (attachment 1) presented to, and approved at, the Academic Board incorrectly indicated that the tutor contact hours are 90 hours.

This administration documentation error has resulted in the STEO data for the tutor contact hours for the delivery of the Certificate in Farming (Practices) not matching the approved programme course documentation and the actual tutor delivery provided between April 2015 to date.

### Analysis

A review of the papers and minutes of the Lincoln-Telford Division Teaching Committee provides evidence that the review of the courses within the programme led to approved revision of the total programme hours from 90 tutor contact to 50 tutor contact hours.

The approved documentation for the courses within the Certificate in Farming (Practices) incorrectly identified 90 tutor contact hours:

*The students will be, at an average, devoting 33 hours per week of learning for about 18 weeks of training. The 33 hours of learning per week will be comprised of approximately 5 hours of lectures/instructions and field training, 15 hours of supervised practice and work experience, and 13 hours of independent student learning time.*

Page 12 under Proposed teaching/delivery methods section.

The indication of around 18 weeks by approximately 5 hours indicating 90 hours of tutor contact.

This is the same statement that appeared in the original version of the programme document in 2013.

The following three key situations appear to have led to the administrative error:

1. In preparing a revised programme document for submission to the Academic Board the original programme document is typically used as the basis for the revised document. In this case the section on total programme hours was not amended in accordance with the revisions carried out at the course level.
2. The Academic Board documentation does not include a requirement to include a summary breakdown of the total programme hours by course (course hours were provided in the detail of each course). In this case reviewers of the proposed programme document did not have the required data presented in a manner that would have allowed the administration error to be easily identified within the programme document.
3. The Academic Board documentation does not include a requirement to reference existing or proposed changes to STEO data. In this case there was no information to alert staff responsible for STEO data edits to make changes to the STEO data for the programme.

The three areas that have led to this STEO administration error could be managed and mitigated by the inclusion of a cover sheet in the submission of new or revised programmes to Academic Programme Committee and Academic Board that includes the proposed STEO data based on the new/revised programme, and in the case of a revised programme notes any changes from previous STEO data and rationale for the change.

## Recommendations

It is recommended that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic Quality and Student Experience:

1. **Notes** that the 2014 review and revision of the Certificate in Farming (Practices) programme followed the required Lincoln University policies and procedures for the redevelopment of the programme
2. **Notes** that an administration documentation error resulted in the presentation of a programme document for the Certificate in Farming (Practices) that included the old tutor contact hours (90 hours) rather than the new tutor contact hours (50 hours) identified and approved via the programme review and revision process
3. **Notes** that as a result of this error the STEO data remained unchanged and that as a consequence the STEO data for the tutor contact hours for the delivery of the Certificate in Farming (Practices) does not match the approved programme course documentation and the delivery tutor contact hours provided between April 2015 to date.
4. **Approves** the following changes to the Certificate in Farming (Practices) programme document, on the basis that the revised course hours, and resulting total programme hours, were approved in accordance with Lincoln University programme development policies and procedures:

*The students will be, at an average, devoting 33 hours per week of learning for about 18 weeks of training. The 33 hours of learning per week will be comprised of approximately ~~5~~ 2.5 hours of lectures/instructions and field training, ~~15~~ 10 hours of supervised practice and work experience, and ~~13~~ 20 hours of independent student learning time. Typically the lectures/instructions and field training will be delivered over 1 day workshops delivered every 2 to 3 weeks within the programme.*

5. **Agrees** that the STEO data for the Certificate in Farming (Practices) programme be amended to match the hours set out in the revised approved programme document
6. **Agrees** that this paper is provided to the Deloitte staff conducting the TEC review initiated on 1 December 2015
7. **Considers** the need for the development and implementation of a programme approval cover sheet for inclusion in the submission of new or revised programmes to Academic Programme Committee and Academic Board that includes the proposed STEO data based on the new/revised programme, and in the case of a revised programme notes any changes from previous STEO data and rationale for the change

## Attachment 1

Certificate in Farming (Practices) programme document presented and approved at the 19 November 2014 Academic Board Meeting.

## Appendix 2 Email To TEC Re Amending STEO (7 December 2015)

From: Section 9(2)(a) @lincoln.ac.nz  
Subject: TF0964 Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (Level 3)  
Date: 7 December 2015 at 2:23 PM  
To: Section 9(2)(a) @tec.govt.nz  
Cc: Section 9(2)(a)

Hi Section 9(2)(a)

I have just updated STEO with a change in the learning hours for the Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (Level 3). If you'll remember this was the programme that I had to resubmit a year ago when TEC approved funding. In the reconciliation of data for the TEC/Deloitte review we noticed that the summary page that was used to update STEO hadn't been changed to recalculate the changes made in the finalised individual courses. The new learning hours (shown below) reflect the total of the approved courses.

Please let me know if you need anything further to approve this. We will be advising the Deloitte team of this data request/change in STEO.

<b>Identity</b>	<b>Request Status</b> Submitted
<b>Status</b>	<b>Identity</b>
<b>Duration</b>	(Fields in this colour must be supplied)
<b>Description</b>	Local Qualification: TF0964 <b>Courses</b> Date Created: 10/Dec/2014
<b>Save</b>	Tertiary Resourcing Advisor: Donna Boot
<b>Cancel</b>	Title (max 255 characters): Telford Certificate in Farming (Practices) (Level 3)
	Contact: Section 9(2)(a)
	Reason for Change (max 255 characters): 7/12/15 Reconciliation of learning hours for individual courses completed. The sum of the course learning hours (submitted/approved
	<b>Status</b>
	Qualification Status: <b>Active</b> First Taught Date: 1/Jan/2015
	EFTS Based Funding: <b>Approved</b> Date: 10/Dec/2014 <input type="checkbox"/> Request Withdrawal
	Student Allowances: <b>Approved</b> Date: 10/Dec/2014 <input type="checkbox"/> Request Withdrawal
	Student Loans: <b>Approved</b> Date: 10/Dec/2014 <input type="checkbox"/> Request Withdrawal
	Qualification Approval Body: 2 Teacher Registration Board Approval: <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A
	<b>Duration</b>
	Tuition/Teaching (FTE) Weeks: 18 Teaching Hrs/Wk: 2.8 5
	Vacation/Recess Weeks: 2 Work Experience Hrs/Wk: 10.6 15
	Total Gross Weeks: 20 Self-Directed Learning Hrs/Wk: 20 13
	Number of Years: 1 Total Learning Hrs/Wk: 33.4
	Total Length: 18 Wks x 33.4 Hrs/Wk x 1 Years = 601.2 Hrs
	Provider Credits/Points: 60 NQF Credits: 60
	EFTS Value: 0.5 <input type="radio"/> Part Time <input checked="" type="radio"/> Full Time

Regards

Section 9(2)(a)

Section 9(2)(a)

Director, Student Administration

Student Administration

F001a, Ground Floor, George Forbes Memorial Building

# Appendix D

# 2014 Annual Programme Report

Programme: NC1471  
National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3)  
Provider: 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv)  
Location: Northland  
Start Date: December 2103  
Finish Date: November 2014

---

## 1. Outcomes/actions from the previous year's APR

N/a – 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) have not submitted an Annual Programme Report on this programme before.

The NC1471 programme has been offered by 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) in previous years, mainly to retain and/or align students in preparation for arboriculture. The delivery and support of these students has been maintained and provided in conjunction with our arboriculture learners.

## 2. Relevant data (student numbers, qualification completions, evaluation results, summary of moderation results).

There were 23 students enrolled, 0 completions. Evaluation and moderation not undertaken

## 3. How well the qualification went

In October of 2013 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) were given notice by Lincoln that there was no guaranteed new funding in 2014. Faced with this 9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) tried to secure whatever funding remained available to us. Because of this the logistics of delivery, vetting of students and training needs for Maori learners was not effectively researched and as a result of this the qualification did not go well.

The course was scheduled to run part-time for 50 weeks with an enrolment date of December 2. With consultation, two days of training per week was to begin February 12 and run through to July with some planting and project work running out until November. The teaching and tuition hours had some flexibility but remained consistent with the programme document.

The first few training events ran well but student numbers started to drop off to the point where the delivery model was no longer effective. Consultation was sought and a revised training plan was created. The second plan was for weeklong block course training events through to July with some planting and project work running out until November. Again the teaching and tuition hours had some flexibility but remained consistent with the programme document.

There was some confusion as to the actual start date of the first of these weeklong training events. Consultation followed and the events were then

rescheduled, extending into August.

At the beginning of the rescheduled training events it became apparent that some of the students were no longer available for training. Confirmation of those actually enrolled was requested and several of the students were seeking information about loans and allowances. Loans and allowance eligibility became increasingly problematic with the start date, the enrolment date and the end date all being questioned (there was also some inconsistencies with what the students were enrolled in according to the programme document part-time / full time which compounded the confusion around eligibility for loans and allowances).

A forth a revised training plan was created around the specific cultural needs of learners; contact time between 10AM and 2PM, to accommodate their commitments. Having lost four staff members as a direct result or through restructuring as a result of the October 2013 Lincoln announcement – staff availability and continuity was an issue. Delays in finding trainers lead to improbable completions with these concerns being signalled to Telford.

The course was progressed through to December 2, even through there was with no way of resulting the students (the course ended on November 11).

The last correspondence I had with Section 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] was on December 8 where I apologized for what had happened and noted. *'I think trying to get the student to fit our schedule was something we didn't investigate or understand fully when we initially planned this course. The way forward would be to completely flip conventional programme delivery around; work with the learners to confirm their availability and time commitments, build a timetable around that, find a trainer then enroll the students'*

#### **4. Qualification is relevant and meets stakeholder needs**

I do not see a problem with the programme. The NC1471 - National Certificate in Horticulture (Level 3) is a National programme created and maintained through stakeholder involvement. The programme remains relevant to industry and learners and with the elective options available there is potential to tailor this qualification to meet the needs of future learners.

4.1 The qualification is unit standard based and has a high generic content with the National Certificate in Horticulture (Arboriculture) Level 3 that we have been successfully delivering for the past nine years

4.2 Assessment strategies are a mix of formative and summative assessments based of the required learning outcome or context in which individual courses are delivered. We feel these best reflect the stated outcomes of the qualification.

#### **5. Include if new processes were implemented to improve enrolment systems and QA.**

The breakdown of this particular programme can be attributed to haste brought about initially by the October 2013 Lincoln announcement, followed

by a limited understanding of cultural needs and learning styles of the student demographic. This was compounded by the location and the loss of staff as a result of the Lincoln announcement.

Going forward:

- 5.1 The student selection process needs to be expanded beyond 'Open entry. No pre-requisites' to include availability to attend teaching and tuition sessions.
- 5.2 A detailed delivery plan and timetable needs to be provided and adhered.
- 5.3 Consequences of lack of attendance needs to be explained to and acknowledged by the students before programme commencement.
- 5.4 Eligibility for student loans and allowance needs to be directed to and addressed through Lincoln before programme commencement.
- 5.5 Training staff need to be assigned and confirmed as per delivery plan.
- 5.6 Training staff need to be able to (better) communicate directly with students as well as student representatives / Kaumatua and employers as required

## 6. Include Challenges ahead/areas of concern for 2015

See 5.1 to 5.6 above.

9(2)(b)(ii) & 9(2)(f)(iv) plans to run this programme in 2015 but at the time of writing this report there is not confirmed start date or location.

- finish -

Personal comment:

We are confident that we have sufficient training resources and assessment material to deliver this programme, but before we do the we need to develop a course book / student hand book which contains delivery plan and timetable information, accurate information about student loans and allowance, attendance requirements and the consequences for lack of attendance.

The failure of this particular programme is disappointing, but it has highlighted the difference between delivery models and exposed areas that when addressed will improve what we do and how we do it.

There has also been considerable work done through Telford and Lincoln to confirm as much as possible that funding will be allocated and budgeted in advance.

Section 9(2)(a)

Academic Manager

## Annual Programme Review (APR)

APR's are relevant to Quality Assurance (QA), the programme review cycle/schedule and audit purposes (to test against self assessment).

With regard to the qualification, there is an emphasis on 'how do we know it was good' and 'was it of value to e.g. students, stakeholders'? How can we improve the qualification?

The following are recommendations (where applicable) which should be **summarized** with the knowledge there is supporting evidence to validate your findings. If evidence is not available, this should be highlighted in your summary as an area for improvement.

### Recommendations for the APR

1. **Include the outcomes/actions from the previous year's APR**
2. **Include relevant data as an appendix** i.e. student numbers, qualification completions, evaluation results, summary of moderation results.
3. **Include how well the qualification went** - which can be measured by:
  - Evaluation results i.e. were the students overall satisfied /not satisfied (summary as to why)
  - Anecdotal evidence to support if the course did/did not go well
  - Is there any evidence of career pathways as a result of course completions e.g. further enrolment, employment
  - Feedback from work experience farmers, PAC meetings (Stakeholder consultation), department meetings
  - Completions/retentions – is there evidence as to why the student left/did not complete their course of study
  - Evidence of student progress and continuous support, which may be measured as a result of completions, or embedding numeracy/literacy, meeting cultural needs
4. **Include if the qualification is relevant and up to date and does it meet e.g. student/stakeholder needs** - which can be measured by:
  - Internal/external moderation of resources – was this carried out during the year
  - Do assessment strategies reflect the learning outcomes of the qualification and is it effective e.g. moodle/on line
  - Surveys and a review of qualification/courses
  - Feedback from employers/work experience farmers, PAC meetings (Stakeholder consultation), department meetings
  - Literacy and Numeracy – use of the assessment tool and embedding of literacy and numeracy into teaching,
5. **Include if new processes were implemented to improve enrollment systems and QA.** As a result of the merger, has adopting Lincoln processes helped improve enrollment/delivery. Are students aware of what they are enrolling in and will the qualification meet their needs
6. **Include Challenges ahead/areas of concern for following year** (including timeframes for addressing any issues highlighted in the APR)

**About Deloitte**

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee, and its network of member firms, each of which is a legally separate and independent entity. Please see [www.deloitte.com/about](http://www.deloitte.com/about) for a detailed description of the legal structure of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited and its member firms.

Deloitte brings together more than 1000 specialists providing New Zealand's widest range of high quality professional services. We focus on audit, tax, technology and systems, risk management, corporate finance and business advice for growing organisations. Our people are based in Auckland, Hamilton, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin, serving clients that range from New Zealand's largest companies to smaller businesses with ambition to grow.

Deloitte's local experts draw on best practice and innovative methodologies from around the world as part of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, whose 168,000 people globally serve over 80 percent of the world's largest companies. A long track record and a wealth of international research into the needs of growing organisations has made Deloitte the world's leading advisor to emerging businesses. For more information about Deloitte in New Zealand, look to our website [www.deloitte.co.nz](http://www.deloitte.co.nz)