



## Understanding how your application was scored

---

The Student Achievement Component (SAC) levels 1 and 2 competitive process aims to improve the quality of provision, encourage provision that best meets the needs of foundation education learners, and improve value for money.

---

To achieve this, we ran a process to allocate up to \$100 million of the SAC levels 1 and 2 funding pool to providers in both 2017 and 2018.

This document provides you with information about how applications were assessed for the 2016 SAC levels 1 and 2 competitive funding round. It breaks down how applications were scored against each component within the assessment framework. This will help you understand how your individual qualifications were assessed and scored.

### The assessment process

To ensure we are purchasing quality provision that meets the needs of learners and government priorities, we have used a two-stage assessment process.

#### Stage one – quality assessment

Applications were assessed against the five quality dimensions in the assessment framework (see table one below).

We considered information provided by applicants in their applications, as well as TEC-held TEO-level and qualification-level performance information. This performance information included relevant educational performance indicators, participation rates for Māori and Pasifika, and use of the Assessment Tool.

Applications that met a minimum level of quality then progressed to the second stage of assessment to ensure value for money.

#### Stage two – value for money

We want to purchase quality provision as well as ensure that provision is the best value for money possible. To do this we considered the quality and price of provision. For example, the lowest-priced delivery for any particular type of learning might not be the best value for money, if the higher-priced delivery results in better outcomes for learners. Likewise, the highest-quality delivery might not be the best value for money if it is significantly more expensive but not significantly better in quality than other delivery.

We also want to ensure we are purchasing a broad range of qualifications across the total levels 1 and 2 funding pool so that learners with foundation education needs can undertake study in an area of interest and value to them.

## Funding recommendations were made by the Review Panel

The Review Panel (the Panel) considered the results of the assessment process and made funding recommendations. In addition to the results of the assessment process, the Panel also considered:

- › regional and national learner needs (for example, regional demographics)
- › the network of regional and national tertiary education provision to ensure an adequate amount of provision of particular types (for example ESOL, Te Reo, trades-related provision, and prisoner education), and a range of learner pathways into higher education and employment that can be funded across both the competitive and usual Investment Plan funding processes
- › TEO capability and capacity
- › alignment with the applicant's mission and role, and place within the regional and national tertiary system.

## The quality threshold scores applied by provision type

The following table shows how we applied the quality thresholds per provision type and the maximum price per provision. Applications scoring below the minimum quality threshold were excluded from further consideration.

### General provision

Provision Type	Quality Score	Max price
ESOL	36+/ 73	\$8,114
Te Reo	43+/ 73	\$6,500
Special Education	47+/100	\$13,000
Trades-related	47+/100	\$14,300
Other Non-Trades	47+/100	\$9,750

### Prisoner education

Provision Type	Quality Score	Max price
ESOL	36+/ 73	\$8,114
Te Reo	43+/ 73	\$6,500
Trades-related	46+/100	\$14,300
Other Non-Trades	46+/100	\$10,000

## The fund hierarchy – what TEC-held performance information we used

Stage one of the assessment process looked at a range of TEC-held performance information. This information was taken from the types of funds each individual TEO received. We used the following fund hierarchy to ensure the most relevant fund was used when assessing a TEO's performance.

First we considered 2015 SAC levels 1 and 2 competitive and non-competitive performance information (combined).

Where SAC levels 1 and 2 information was not available because the TEO was not funded to deliver this provision in 2015, we considered:

- › 2015 Youth Guarantee
- › 2015 SAC at level 3 only.

If the TEO was not funded for SAC at levels 1–2, SAC at level 3 or Youth Guarantee, then we considered the best of 2015 participation information for:

- › Intensive Literacy and Numeracy (ILN)
- › Intensive Literacy and Numeracy – English for Speakers of Other Languages (ILN - ESOL), and
- › Workplace Literacy and Numeracy (WPL) TEO-led.

2014 data was used when no 2015 data was available.

### How component scores were scored

Components are specific criteria that sit alongside the five quality dimensions against which applications are scored. The quality dimensions and components are set out in table one below.

Each of the components was scored on a quartile basis except for two components. These were:

- › External Evaluation and Review (EER) rating from NZQA, and
- › Assessment Tool usage.

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

For Assessment Tool usage we considered initial assessment rates and progress assessment rates. The results were scored using deciles rather than quartiles.

As the majority of the scoring was on a comparative basis, most scores awarded were relative to other TEOs that applied. Te Reo qualifications were only compared to other Te Reo applicants, and ESOL qualifications were only compared to other ESOL applicants.

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

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

### Assessment of the application narrative (Part A of the application form)

Assessment of the narrative section of applications accounted for 31 points across all five quality dimensions. Application narrative sections were assessed and moderated by a team of our staff.

The narrative section was scored as follows:

Quality Dimension Component Scores	Max score
Experience targeting foundation learners including priority groups	5
Experience supporting and retaining learners	5
Capability in delivering foundation learning	5
Literacy and numeracy capability	8
Achieving successful outcomes for learners	8

Quality dimensions with a maximum score of 5 points were scored as follows:

Description	Score
Low or no confidence	0
Limited confidence	1
Confident	3
Highly confident	5

Quality dimensions with a maximum score of 8 points were scored as follows:

Description	Score
Low or no confidence	0
Limited confidence	2
Confident	5
Highly confident	8

### Assessment framework by provision type

A key difference from the 2014 round is that we have used a different assessment framework to assess ESOL and Te Reo provision.

Te Reo and ESOL qualifications are not required to use the Assessment Tool and do not have participation caps on the proportion of enrolled learners with prior qualifications at levels 2 and above, which made these components inappropriate to consider. For more details see the assessment framework in appendix one.

In addition, as Te Reo and ESOL qualifications were only compared to other Te Reo and ESOL applications respectively, the performance data ranges for these types of provision differ.

The guide to understanding component scores is therefore presented as three sections:

- › General (trades-related, special education and 'other' qualifications)
- › ESOL
- › Te Reo.

**Table one: Assessment Framework for 2016 SAC levels 1 and 2 Competitive Funding Round**

Quality dimensions	Components	General scores		Te Reo and ESOL scores	
Experience targeting foundation learners	Narrative	5	15	5	11
	Participation of Māori or Pasifika at TEO level	6		6	
	Learners with prior qualification at level 2 or higher	4		N/A	
<b> </b>					
Experience supporting and retaining foundation learners	Narrative	5	11	5	11
	Retention at TEO level	6		6	
<b> </b>					
Capability in Delivering Foundation Education	Narrative (qualitative)	5	23	5	23
	Course completion at TEO level	6		6	
	EER rating of TEO	2		2	
	Course completion by qualification	10		10	
<b> </b>					
Literacy and Numeracy Capability	Narrative (qualitative)	8	23	N/A	N/A
	Assessment Tool usage – initial assessment	10		N/A	
	Assessment Tool usage – progress assessment (quantitative)	5		N/A	
<b> </b>					
Successful Learner Outcomes	Narrative (qualitative)	8	28	8	28
	Progression at TEO level	8		8	
	Progression by qualification	12		12	
<b> </b>					
<b>Quality Assessment</b>		<b>100</b>		<b>73</b>	
<b>Value for Money Assessment</b>	Quality assessment results and proposed price per EFTS at qualification level				

## Section One: How general qualifications were scored

This section explains how trades-related, special education and ‘other’ types of qualification were scored.

### Quality dimension: Experience targeting foundation learners

Components of quality dimension	General scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	15
Participation of Māori or Pasifika at TEO level	6	
Learners with prior qualification at level 2 or higher	4	

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

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

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

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

Step 2: Based on the hierarchy of funds outlined above (SAC levels 1 and 2, Youth Guarantee, SAC level 3, WPL, ESOL or ILN), the TEO-level 2015 participation rate was determined.

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

Step 4: The percentages were then broken down to quartile level and the relevant score applied for both Māori and Pasifika.

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

#### *Māori participation compared to regional demographics*

Criteria	Quartile Level	General scores	Range <sup>1</sup>	
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<214.2%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥214.2%	<267.1%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥267.1%	<341.9%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥341.9%	≤1234.1%

<sup>1</sup> The ‘Range’ is the upper and lower thresholds for each quartile for each of the metrics.

### Pasifika participation compared to regional demographics

Criteria	Quartile Level	General scores	Range	
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<144.4%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥144.4%	<223.4%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥223.4%	<329.4%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥329.4%	≤1390.5%

#### Component: Learners with prior qualification at level 2 or higher

The assessment was based on how well a TEO is targeting the enrolment of learners with no prior qualifications at level 2 or higher in comparison to other TEOs.

Criteria	Quartile Level	General scores	Range	
Qualified learners represent lowest quartile (i.e. highest proportion of total) overall	25.0%	0	≤100.0%	≥25.6%
Qualified learners represent second quartile (i.e. second-highest proportion of total) overall	50.0%	1	<25.6%	≥17.8%
Qualified learners represent third quartile (i.e. second-lowest proportion of total) overall	75.0%	2	<17.8%	≥8.7%
Qualified learners represent highest quartile (i.e. lowest proportion of total) overall	100.0%	4	<8.7%	≥0.0%

#### Quality Dimension: Experience supporting and retaining foundation learners

Components of quality dimension	General scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	11
Retention at TEO level	6	

#### Component: Retention at TEO level

This component looked at retention at TEO level – that is how well the TEO is retaining foundation learners in comparison to other TEOs.

Criteria	Quartile Level	General scores	Range	
If Retention Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<50.9%
If Retention Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥50.9%	<61.3%
If Retention Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥61.3%	<71.7%
If Retention Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥71.7%	≤91.3%

### Quality Dimension: Capability in delivering foundation education

Components of quality dimension	General scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	23
Course completion at TEO level	6	
EER rating	2	
Course completion by qualification	10	

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

Criteria	Quartile Level	General scores	Range	
If Course Completion Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<62.4%
If Course Completion Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥62.4%	<72.8%
If Course Completion Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥72.8%	<79.1%
If Course Completion Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥79.1%	≤98.5%

### Component: Course completion at the qualification level

Criteria	Quartile Level	General scores	Range	
If Course Completion Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<62.0%
If Course Completion Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	3	≥62.0%	<77.0%
If Course Completion Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	6	≥77.0%	<81.1%
If Course Completion Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	10	≥81.1%	≤100.0%



## Quality Dimension: Literacy and numeracy capability

Components of quality dimension	General scores	Max combined score
Narrative	8	23
Assessment Tool usage – initial assessment	10	
Assessment Tool usage – progress assessment	5	

The Assessment Tool usage information was scored using deciles. Usage information was calculated across all foundation education. Specifically, Assessment Tool usage was based on level 1 and 2 courses within level 1 to 3 qualifications for any fund that a TEO received funding for in 2015 including SAC levels 1 and 2, Youth Guarantee, ILN and WPL. We also considered usage of the Assessment Tool in level 3 where no other information was available.

### Component assessment tool usage – initial assessment rates

Criteria	Quartile Level	General Scores	Range	
If LNAAT use is less than 20th percentile overall	20.0%	0	≥0.0%	<56.5%
If LNAAT use between the 20th & 30th percentiles overall	30.0%	1	≥56.5%	<67.2%
If LNAAT use between the 30th & 40th percentiles overall	40.0%	2	≥67.2%	<73.1%
If LNAAT use between the 40th & 50th percentiles overall	50.0%	4	≥73.1%	<78.3%
If LNAAT use between the 50th & 60th percentiles overall	60.0%	5	≥78.3%	<83.8%
If LNAAT use between the 60th & 70th percentiles overall	70.0%	7	≥83.8%	<86.6%
If LNAAT use between the 70th & 80th percentiles overall	80.0%	8	≥86.6%	<90.2%
If LNAAT use between the 80th & 90th percentiles overall	90.0%	9	≥90.2%	<94.2%
If LNAAT use is higher than 90th percentile overall	100.0%	10	≥94.2%	≤100.0%

## Component: Assessment tool usage – progress assessment rates

Criteria	Quartile Level	General Scores	Range	
If LNAAT use is less than 20th percentile overall	20.0%	1	≥0.0%	<38.9%
If LNAAT use between the 20th & 30th percentiles overall	30.0%	1	≥0.0%	<38.9%
If LNAAT use between the 30th & 40th percentiles overall	40.0%	3	≥38.9%	<52.0%
If LNAAT use between the 40th & 50th percentiles overall	50.0%	3	≥38.9%	<52.0%
If LNAAT use between the 50th & 60th percentiles overall	60.0%	4	≥52.0%	<59.6%
If LNAAT use between the 60th & 70th percentiles overall	70.0%	4	≥52.0%	<59.6%
If LNAAT use between the 70th & 80th percentiles overall	80.0%	5	≥59.6%	≤100.0%
If LNAAT use between the 80th & 90th percentiles overall	90.0%	5	≥59.6%	≤100.0%
If LNAAT use is higher than 90th percentile overall	100.0%	5	≥59.6%	≤100.0%

## Quality Dimension: Successful learner outcomes

Components of quality dimension	General scores	Max combined score
Narrative	8	28
Progression at TEO level	8	
Progression by qualification	12	

The EPI for progression was assessed at the TEO and qualification level. This reflects one of the key outcomes sought for foundation education - learners progressing to higher-level study or training.

## Component: Progression rates at TEO level

Criteria	Quartile Level	General scores	Range	
If Progression Rate is in lowest quartile	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<31.0%
If Progression Rate is in second quartile	50.0%	2	≥31.0%	<39.5%
If Progression Rate is in third quartile	75.0%	4	≥39.5%	<47.7%
If Progression Rate is in top quartile	100.0%	8	≥47.7%	≤79.6%

## Component: Progression rates at qualification level

Criteria	Quartile Level	General scores	Range	
If Progression Rate is in lowest quartile	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<25.5%
If Progression Rate is in second quartile	50.0%	3	≥25.5%	<45.0%
If Progression Rate is in third quartile	75.0%	6	≥45.0%	<53.0%
If Progression Rate is in top quartile	100.0%	12	≥53.0%	≤100.0%

## Section 2: How ESOL qualifications were scored

### Quality dimension: Experience targeting foundation learners

Components of quality dimension	ESOL scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	11
Participation of Māori or Pasifika at TEO level	6	
Learners with prior qualification at level 2 or higher	n/a	

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

#### *Māori participation compared to regional demographics*

Criteria	Quartile Level	ESOL scores	Range	
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<196.9%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥196.9%	<263.0%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥263.0%	<316.3%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥316.3%	≤577.5%

Pasifika participation compared to regional demographics

Criteria	Quartile Level	ESOL scores	Range	
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<112.3%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥112.3%	<170.3%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥170.3%	<253.1%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥253.1%	≤470.3%

Quality Dimension: Experience supporting and retaining foundation learners

Components of quality dimension	ESOL scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	11
Retention at TEO level	6	

Component: Retention rate at the TEO level

Criteria	Quartile Level	ESOL Scores	Range	
If Retention Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<52.6%
If Retention Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥52.6%	<58.7%
If Retention Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥58.7%	<72.0%
If Retention Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥72.0%	≤82.4%

Quality Dimension: Capability in delivering foundation education

Components of quality dimension	ESOL scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	23
Course completion at TEO level	6	
EER rating	2	
Course completion by qualification	10	

### Component: Course completion at the TEO level

Criteria	Quartile Level	ESOL scores	Range	
If Course Completion Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<68.8%
If Course Completion Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥68.8%	<75.5%
If Course Completion Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥75.5%	<82.3%
If Course Completion Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥82.3%	≤97.8%

### Component: Course completion at the qualification level

Criteria	Quartile Level	ESOL scores	Range	
If Course Completion Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<77.5%
If Course Completion Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	3	≥77.5%	<86.1%
If Course Completion Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	6	≥86.1%	<90.5%
If Course Completion Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	10	≥90.5%	≤100.0%

### Quality Dimension: Successful learner outcomes

Components of quality dimension	ESOL scores	Max combined score
Narrative	8	28
Progression at TEO level	8	
Progression by qualification	12	

### Component: Progression rate at the TEO level

Criteria	Quartile Level	ESOL scores	Range	
If Progression Rate is in lowest quartile	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<38.7%
If Progression Rate is in second quartile	50.0%	2	≥38.7%	<49.8%
If Progression Rate is in third quartile	75.0%	4	≥49.8%	<55.5%
If Progression Rate is in top quartile	100.0%	8	≥55.5%	≤62.3%

## Component: Progression rate at the qualification level

Criteria	Quartile Level	ESOL scores	Range	
If Progression Rate is in lowest quartile	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<57.4%
If Progression Rate is in second quartile	50.0%	3	≥57.4%	<63.6%
If Progression Rate is in third quartile	75.0%	6	≥63.6%	<81.0%
If Progression Rate is in top quartile	100.0%	12	≥81.0%	≤84.4%

## Section 3: How Te Reo qualifications were scored

### Quality dimension: Experience targeting foundation learners

Components of quality dimension	Te Reo scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	11
Participation of Māori or Pasifika at TEO level	6	
Learners with prior qualification at level 2 or higher	n/a	

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

### Māori participation compared to regional demographics

Criteria	Quartile Level	Te Reo scores	Range	
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<233.1%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥233.1%	<281.5%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥281.5%	<338.5%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥338.5%	≤1234.1%

Pasifika participation compared to regional demographics

Criteria	Quartile Level	Te Reo scores	Range	
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<90.4%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥90.4%	<180.5%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥180.5%	<289.7%
Participation Rate comparable to regional representation in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥289.7%	≤699.3%

Quality Dimension: Experience supporting and retaining foundation learners

Components of quality dimension	Te Reo scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	11
Retention at TEO level	6	

Component: Retention at TEO level

Criteria	Quartile Level	Te Reo Score	Range	
If Retention Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<61.9%
If Retention Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥61.9%	<68.4%
If Retention Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥68.4%	<70.4%
If Retention Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥70.4%	≤85.4%

Quality Dimension: Capability in delivering foundation education

Components of quality dimension	Te Reo scores	Max combined score
Narrative	5	23
Course completion at TEO level	6	
EER rating	2	
Course completion by qualification	10	

### Component: Course Completion Rate at the TEO level

Criteria	Quartile Level	Te Reo scores	Range	
If Course Completion Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<68.1%
If Course Completion Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	2	≥68.1%	<73.2%
If Course Completion Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	4	≥73.2%	<78.2%
If Course Completion Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	6	≥78.2%	≤82.3%

### Component: Course Completion Rate at the qualification level

Criteria	Quartile Level	Te Reo scores	Range	
If Course Completion Rate in lowest quartile overall	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<77.8%
If Course Completion Rate in second quartile overall	50.0%	3	≥77.8%	<77.8%
If Course Completion Rate in third quartile overall	75.0%	6	≥77.8%	<77.8%
If Course Completion Rate in top quartile overall	100.0%	10	≥77.8%	≤81.9%

### Quality Dimension: Successful learner outcomes

Components of quality dimension	Te Reo scores	Max combined score
Narrative	8	28
Progression at TEO level	8	
Progression by qualification	12	

### Component: Progression at TEO level

Criteria	Quartile Level	Te Reo scores	Range	
If Progression Rate is in lowest quartile	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<36.7%
If Progression Rate is in second quartile	50.0%	2	≥36.7%	<41.1%
If Progression Rate is in third quartile	75.0%	4	≥41.1%	<43.9%
If Progression Rate is in top quartile	100.0%	8	≥43.9%	≤79.6%



## Component: Progression at the qualification level

Criteria	Quartile Level	Te Reo scores	Range	
If Progression Rate is in lowest quartile	25.0%	0	≥0.0%	<53.0%
If Progression Rate is in second quartile	50.0%	3	≥53.0%	<53.0%
If Progression Rate is in third quartile	75.0%	6	≥53.0%	<53.0%
If Progression Rate is in top quartile	100.0%	12	≥53.0%	≤60.0%



We ensure New Zealand's future success.