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INTRODUCTION

The Education Act 1989 requires the Minister responsible for tertiary education to, from time to time, issue a Tertiary Education Strategy (TES). The strategy must set out the Government’s long-term strategic direction and current and medium-term priorities for tertiary education. The long-term strategic direction must address economic, social and environmental goals, and the development aspirations of Māori and other population groups.


The draft strategy contained six strategic priorities:

• delivering skills for industry
• getting at-risk young people into a career
• boosting achievement of Māori and Pasifika
• improving adult literacy and numeracy
• strengthening research-based institutions
• growing international linkages

This document summarises the submissions received in response to the draft TES (including feedback from meetings), the key themes of these submissions and issues raised by stakeholders. The report follows a format similar to that of the draft TES. It does not provide officials’ advice on possible responses to submissions or other advice for changes to the draft TES.

Consultation Process

The Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment held general meetings in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin. In total, 13 sessions were held. Approximately 170 attendees representing more than 110 different organisations (including providers, education peak bodies, businesses, and industry representatives), attended these meetings.

Officials also attended a number of additional meetings with key stakeholders such as the Industry Training Federation, ACE Sector Strategic Alliance, and Business New Zealand.

Consultation ran from 2 October to 15 November 2013. A total of 167 written submissions were received from:

• 25 business / business groups
• 6 council/government agencies
• 3 wānanga and 1 iwi
• 8 universities and 5 other university sector groups
• 4 industry training organisations (ITOs)
• 10 institutes of technology and polytechnics (ITPs) and 3 other ITP sector groups
• 18 private training establishments (PTEs), 1 government training establishment (GTE) and 2 other PTE sector groups
• 11 adult and community education organisations
• 2 cross sector submissions (Ako Aotearoa and a joint ITP/ITO sector submission)
• 5 student organisations
• 2 unions
• 12 other interest groups or peak bodies outside the tertiary education sector
• 39 individual submitters.

Eleven submissions did not provide identifying information and therefore could not be categorised by respondent type. These submissions were analysed collectively and the feedback included in the summary report as appropriate.

A feedback form and online survey was provided through the Ministry of Education website. The feedback form and online survey followed the same format and asked submitters seven specific questions about the draft strategy.

**Summary of Feedback**

In general, feedback on the draft TES has been relatively positive. Most submitters agreed in general to the direction and focus areas for the TES, and the priorities. This is evidenced by the responses received to questions about whether submitters agreed with the key statements within the TES.

All submitters were asked whether they agreed with the long-term areas of focus. Approximately half of submitters provided measurable responses to these questions, and generally agreed with the areas of focus. This is illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of focus</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total no. responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building international relationships that contribute to improved competitiveness</td>
<td>82.1% (69)</td>
<td>11.9% (10)</td>
<td>6.0% (5)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support business and innovation through development of relevant skills and research</td>
<td>90.6% (77)</td>
<td>5.9% (5)</td>
<td>3.5% (3)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve outcomes for all</td>
<td>91.8% (78)</td>
<td>5.9% (5)</td>
<td>2.4% (2)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to improve the quality and relevance of tertiary education and research</td>
<td>96.4% (80)</td>
<td>2.4% (2)</td>
<td>1.2% (1)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within this broad agreement, however, submitters have identified a range of issues that they consider need to be changed for the final TES. The key themes of this feedback are outlined below.
Key Themes

- **Economic and outcomes focus:** Submitters generally agreed about the importance of an economic and outcomes focus in the TES, although there was a divergence of views about the strength of this, and its balance with other outcomes. Business submitters were in general strongly positive about the emphasis on economic outcomes, with many vocationally-focused TEOs also supporting this. Student organisations, tertiary institutions, staff and unions generally felt that while some degree of economic focus is appropriate, the current draft does not balance this with broader objectives including social, cultural and environmental outcomes, or the value of education and research in their own right. They also considered that, for the focus on outcomes to be successful, robust, data-informed outcome measures would be needed.

- **Clarity about the role of government:** Many PTE and ITP submitters, and a number of businesses, suggested that greater clarity about government’s role and responsibilities in relation to tertiary education might be a useful addition to the document – i.e. a description of the role of government (and central education agencies) in enabling the sector to deliver the strategy, along with appropriate performance measures. Some business also wanted the strategy to be more specific as to how the Government would facilitate closer relationships with industry.

- **Contribution of compulsory education:** A strong theme from the consultation meetings was that many of the issues that the strategy identifies also require action in the school system. This applied particularly to literacy, language and numeracy, but also to some other areas including ensuring students have the core skills to perform well in the labour market, and make good choices about areas of tertiary study (supported by relevant and useful career guidance and clear pathways). Submitters who raised this point felt that the TES could not stand alone from the rest of the education system.

- **Aspirational:** Some submitters, particularly in the university and student sectors, were concerned that the draft TES was too focused on immediate problems and how they might be resolved, and not sufficiently ambitious or long term in describing opportunities and the Government’s aspirations for tertiary education. For example, there was commentary that the draft TES did not adequately set an agenda for responding to technological change and the changing needs of the workforce (including in relation to demographic change and the need to support life-long learning). Other TEO groups commented on their perception that the draft had a deficit approach.

- **Learner focus:** A range of submitters identified that the role of learners in the strategy was not strongly articulated and that a greater focus might be needed – including in relation to groups requiring particular attention in the tertiary education system. In particular, the needs of people with disabilities, older people, students from low socio-economic backgrounds, and students from refugee backgrounds, and queer students were referred.

- **Role descriptions:** In general, sub-sectors sought greater reflection of their individual roles within the larger tertiary education sector. For example, universities fed back on the need to better reflect universities’ contribution across the sector, while ITPs commented that their role in the “Delivering the Strategy” section was too limited. Students’ associations commented on the need for the TES to recognise the importance of student voice and the role of students’ associations.
Response to the Strategic Priorities

The table below sets out the level of agreement in relation to each priority (where measurable), and also summarises the key points made by all submitters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total no. responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1: delivering skills for industry</td>
<td>95.1% (77)</td>
<td>3.7% (3)</td>
<td>1.2% (1)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2: getting at-risk young people into a career</td>
<td>85.9% (67)</td>
<td>5.1% (4)</td>
<td>9.0% (7)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3: boosting achievement of Māori and Pasifika</td>
<td>86.1% (68)</td>
<td>2.5% (2)</td>
<td>11.4% (9)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 4: improving adult literacy and numeracy</td>
<td>86.1% (68)</td>
<td>5.1% (4)</td>
<td>3.8% (3)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 5: strengthening research-based institutions</td>
<td>91.1% (72)</td>
<td>5.1% (4)</td>
<td>3.8% (3)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 6: growing international linkages</td>
<td>87.2% (68)</td>
<td>5.1% (4)</td>
<td>7.7% (6)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There was general agreement to this priority, with vocational based providers and business more supportive.
- Many submitters wanted more clarity and specific information about how relationships between industry and tertiary education could be facilitated.
- Some groups were concerned that this priority would make success in tertiary education dependent on economic and employment outcomes alone.

- Some submitters expressed concern about this as a “deficit” approach, including the specific focus on ‘at-risk’ young people instead of ‘all’ young people.
- Some submitters considered that there was a need for greater acknowledgement of the inputs from and role of secondary education in supporting this priority.

- Some submitters considered that Māori and Pasifika should have separate priorities, reflecting differences between groups and government’s particular obligations in relation to Māori (including Treaty of Waitangi obligations).

- Some submitters suggested funding changes to support the priority, e.g. more funding for Adult and Community Education and better targeting.
- Feedback reinforced the importance of in-work provision, and also of literacy and numeracy delivery being embedded in skills delivery at levels 1 and 2.

- Some submitters highlighted the global advantage that could be gained through strong research-based institutions.
- There was some concern that the priority may place too much emphasis on commercial and industry-linked research.

- Submitters who disagreed with this priority tended to be concerned about the impact of increased numbers of international students on domestic students, and on the employment prospects of domestic graduates.
LONG-TERM FOCUS AREAS

Submitters were asked if they agreed with each of the four proposed long-term focus areas outlined below, and to comment on why they agreed or disagreed.

The draft strategy proposes the following four areas that the tertiary education system will need to focus on in the long-term:

- Build international relationships that contribute to improved competitiveness.
- Support business and innovation through development of relevant skills and research.
- Improve outcomes for all.
- Continue to improve the quality and relevance of tertiary education and research.

Overall

In general, submitters on the draft TES who commented on the proposed long-term focus areas agreed with these areas. Of the four focus areas:

- Building international relationships that contribute to improved competitiveness was supported by approximately 82% of the submitters who completed the feedback form or online survey. Comments specific to this focus area could relate concern that a focus on international students could be at the expense of domestic provision.
- Supporting business and innovation through development of relevant skills and research was supported by approximately 91% of the submitters who completed the feedback form or online survey. Business was strongly supportive of this focus area, but many TEOs expressed some concern at the strong focus on business needs.
- Improving outcomes for all was supported by approximately 92% of the submitters who completed the feedback form or online survey. Some submitters indicated concern about the interaction between this focus area and the economic focus of the document.
- Continuing to improve the quality and relevance of tertiary education and research was supported by approximately 96% of the submitters who completed the feedback form or online survey. Comments specific to this focus area identified the importance of continuing to provide relevant, internationally competitive tertiary education.

Across the long-term direction as a whole, there was positive feedback. Business indicated that a greater linking of tertiary education to economic value and the importance of education for employers and industry was welcomed. This was also supported by institutes of technology and polytechnics (although some submissions noted that too great a focus could be at the expense of the broader outcomes of tertiary education).

The shift to measuring outcomes would also be welcomed, provided robust measures could be identified and used – some providers talked about the need for measures to respond to students’ different starting points in the system and measure the value-add provided by tertiary education.

However, some concerns were raised, particularly by TEOs, that the focus areas:

- are too economically focused, and show insufficient recognition of the broader purposes and value of tertiary education – in relation to social, cultural and environmental outcomes, and outcomes across communities, as compared to employment and other
economic outcomes (this concern was particularly strong for universities and adult and community education organisations)

- may be too deficit focused and are insufficiently aspirational
- set expectations for providers while not outlining what government will do to support the direction sought – some providers, particularly private training establishments, identified specific concerns with their interactions with parts of government and/or the requirements set by government (for example, English language requirements for international students)
- do not provide sufficient detail about how the long-term focus areas can be achieved (this concern was expressed particularly by business submitters and industry training organisations)
- might not be achievable if funding mechanisms and processes are not aligned.

Many of the subsectors within tertiary education commented that their subsector’s role was insufficiently recognised within the TES, including within the long-term focus areas. For example, some universities felt that their distinctive contributions to tertiary education – particularly in relation to international relationships, innovation, and research – were not recognised.

Some other focus areas were suggested for inclusion in the TES. These included:

- social / cultural / environmental goals
- life-long learning
- more focus on students, as users of the tertiary education system
- greater focus on particular groups not currently explicitly provided for within the focus areas – including older people, women in particular sectors, disabled people, and Māori and Pasifika
- teaching and learning in the tertiary sector
- the roles of communities and organisations, other than businesses.

**Business**

Across the 25 businesses and business representative bodies that submitted feedback on the TES, the tone was largely in favour of the overall direction and the four proposed focus areas. BusinessNZ was of the opinion that it is vital for the TES to focus on achieving the best return for the public’s investment in tertiary education and this should include raising the ability of people to add value to any enterprise they work in. According to BusinessNZ:

*We agree there is a need for more explicit co-operation and engagement between industry and TEO’s on skills’ demands; industry needs a clear line of sight to the key points of influence in the planning and delivery of education.*

However, a number of businesses expressed concern as to how the high level goals would be achieved, and sought more detail – particularly around how businesses could become more involved, and what the Government would do to facilitate closer working relationships with industry. Biodirectionz agreed with the focus areas but felt that the TES needs to address in greater detail how certain concepts are going to be handled.

Overall, business was strongly in support of the focus around supporting business and innovation through the development of relevant skills and research:

*This goal is at the heart of the Bay of Plenty region’s economic development strategies. Tertiary education and research provision aligned directly with regional industry and community needs is critical if the Bay of Plenty is to achieve its economic and industry growth potential.* [SmartGrowth and PriorityOne]
Other businesses offered solutions. Aviation New Zealand suggested a small government-led industry engaged working party across sectors to examine the issues undermining international competitiveness. Tait Communication commented that organisations “must consider their value proposition in a globally competitive environment and build their strategies accordingly”.

**Council and Government Agencies**

Councils and government agencies generally supported the proposed long-term focus areas of the draft TES, although had some suggestions to broaden their scope. For example, Professor Sir Peter Gluckman (the Prime Minister’s Chief Science Advisor) commented that the draft TES does not acknowledge “the tertiary sector’s critical role in producing knowledge and skills to advance society in broader ways (like producing knowledge aimed at enhancing public policy)”.

**Interest Groups and Individuals**

*Iwi*

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua, the representative body for Ngāti Whātua, was supportive of three of the four proposed focus areas (support business and innovation through development of relevant skills and research, improve outcomes for all, and continue to improve quality and relevance of tertiary education and research), but was unsure of the proposed focus on building international relationships that contribute to improved competitiveness.

**Student Organisations**

There was feedback from student organisations that the strategy lacks the necessary balance across social, cultural, environmental and economic values. The Victoria University of Wellington Students’ Association (VUWSA) commented that this lack of balance means that the TES “lacks a commitment to maintaining the elements of the sector and its systems which give meaning to those values [which are not articulated]”.

Student organisations generally considered that the draft TES insufficiently recognises learners. According to New Zealand Union of Students’ Associations (NZUSA), there is a risk that by not referencing the importance of community, staff, and student involvement in processes, their input will be ignored.

Student groups also commented that the strategy should better reflect the needs of particular learner groups. The Auckland University Students’ Association (AUSA) commented about disconnects between the focus area of “improving outcomes for all” and the priorities which target Māori and Pasifika and 18-24 year-olds.

> All institutions with equity plans have a wider focus than this, for example student with disabilities, students from lower socio-economic areas, first in family, students from refugee backgrounds, women students in areas that women are unrepresented, etc. [AUSA]

There was some concern about the TES’s focus on connecting students to work.

> We disagree that the principal benefit (or “outcome”) for students from tertiary education should be a pathway to work, rewarding or otherwise. Work is ultimately only part of a human being’s life. The benefit of tertiary education should be based around the completion of a human being’s potential in terms of their educational
possibilities. This will most likely have positive employment outcomes, but that is only part of the purpose, and therefore the benefit, of tertiary education. [NZUSA]

NZUSA commented about the importance of focus area 4 (continuing to improve the quality and relevance of tertiary education and research), and that this area was important also to “maintain a sense of cultural identity and belonging”. VUWSA also commented about this focus area, stating that:

_We believe maintaining and improving relative quality should be a key focus of the Government. We believe including it as a priority will ensure we remain internationally competitive with international students choosing their country of study, as well as improving the quality of our graduates and the satisfaction of our academic and general staff through reputational integrity._

The Otago University Students’ Association (OUSa) fed back on the draft TES’s overall positioning and they suggested that references to Massive Open Online Courses be removed as this reference may date the strategy. They also suggested that:

_A vital point absent from this section is that international reputation is a key factor in determining the ability of universities to compete internationally, and that maintaining (let alone enhancing) reputation is going to be challenging as countries such as China make a massive investment in their higher education sectors._

Te Mana Ākonga supported the general tone of the document to increase the engagement between the tertiary sector and the broader community. It agreed with the priorities but had concerns over how they would be implemented.

**Unions**

The Tertiary Education Union (TEU) and the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions (CTU) both expressed concern about the general strategic direction of the TES. Both commented that they would like to see the TES take a wider view of the role and purpose of tertiary education in society beyond its narrow focus on economic outcomes. For example:

_Tertiary education is much more than providing skilled workers to industry but this is the dominant theme in the draft TES strategy. Tertiary education has a critical role in establishing the foundations for a strong civil society. It is a public good that has benefits for everyone and leads to a fairer, better and more equitable society._ [CTU]

The TEU also commented more specifically on each of the four proposed focus areas. It was supportive of the focus on building international relationships but did not support what it perceived as the emphasis on “revenue generation” within this focus area. Instead, it supported building international relationships for the purpose of:

_strengthening collegiality and collaboration, sharing knowledge and understanding and providing opportunities for staff and students from around the globe to participate in and contribute to tertiary education in a New Zealand context._

The TEU agreed that tertiary education should support business and innovation but felt this focus area should also recognise the importance of tertiary education’s response to the needs of other parts of New Zealand society, such as social services, health, community organisations, iwi and hapu.

The TEU supported the focus on improving outcomes for all but commented that recent policy decisions in tertiary education may serve to undercut this aspiration. For example, it suggested that there was a mismatch between student support settings and this focus area, particularly in relation to the levels of debt that might be incurred by students with particularly high needs.
The focus on improving teaching and research quality was supported by the TEU, but it noted its opposition to performance models such as the Performance Based Research Fund as a means of achieving this. In relation to improving the relevance of tertiary education, the TEU strongly believe that TEOs and staff should retain autonomy to determine what course and programmes are offered and what research is undertaken.

The TEU identified several gaps in focus areas for the TES. These related to:

- participation and access for low socio-economic groups
- the role of communities and non-business organisations
- how low female participation in particular sectors and industries can be addressed
- the importance of life-long learning.

**Other Peak Bodies and Groups**

There was general support for the proposed long-term focus areas from other peak bodies, although a number of organisations expressed concern that the specific groups they represented were not included within the draft TES. This was particularly evident with relation to older people, refugees, and people with disabilities. Australasian Campuses Towards Sustainability wrote to express concern that there was little mention of environmental and sustainability issues:

*We believe that New Zealand’s 100% pure brand requires that students gain the sustainable development skills necessary to remain relevant in an increasingly interconnected global workforce.*

However, the closer relationship between TEOs and industry was welcomed, in particular by the New Zealand Refugee / Red Cross Services, the Change Makers Refugee Forum, and the New Zealand Biotech Association.

*A closer relationship between industry/business and TEOs programme development and monitoring by Industry Advisory Committees etc would improve the relevance of tertiary education and ensure that priority groups are prepared for engagement in industry/business/NGOs and public service. [New Zealand Refugee/Red Cross Services]*

**Individuals**

Most individual submissions agreed with all four focus areas of the draft Tertiary Education Strategy. Most disagreement came with the first priority of building international relationships with some individual submitters stating that too much attention is paid to international export education at the expense of domestic student education.

Some of the specific feedback received from individuals included:

- concern about the level of weight given to business (generally that too much weight was given to business needs, although one individual suggested that the TES better recognise the importance of TEOs learning from business so that educators can deliver the skills, including transferable skills, needed on the “shop floor” and in a fast-changing economy)
- that the TES should also represent the importance of pursuing knowledge for its own sake
- commentary that more attention should be given to those currently not engaged in tertiary education or whose needs are not met in the current system
- suggestions that greater focus should be given to teaching and educator capability
- concern about the lack of focus on the environment
One individual disagreed with all focus areas, believing that none of them would help develop graduates with “…quality intellectual, social, economic and cultural capital” and the strategy should instead be about “quality teaching” and developing “international citizens.” Another considered that universities only took industry needs seriously when their interests overlapped, and recommended that research be commissioned, or funding ring-fenced, to enable universities to identify what skills they should be delivering, and how their practices can support this delivery.

Another submission had concerns about the focus on improving the quality of tertiary education, and specifically the review of level 1-6 qualifications. The concern was about the potential impacts of a review of a qualification on the graduates from that qualification, and also the role of organisational reputation should there be an expectation that all qualifications delivered across the sector are broadly the same.

Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups

Universities

University submissions mostly supported the four proposed long-term focus areas for tertiary education as outlined in the draft strategy. However, the majority (7 out of 8) had some concerns about these areas or about the overall strategic direction of the TES. The University of Canterbury did not comment on the focus areas but noted that the university is “supportive of the intent of the Tertiary Education Strategy.”

The University of Auckland, Massey University and the University of Otago all commented that the draft TES presents an overly narrow view of the role of tertiary education, particularly the role of universities, and focuses too heavily on economic outcomes at the expense of other outcomes for the sector. The University of Otago was concerned that the “unbalanced and narrow” nature of the draft might “hinder … universities to maintain, or preferably enhance, their international standing,” while Massey University commented that while it welcomed “the increased connection between tertiary education and industry development and needs… the value of tertiary education should not be limited to supplying skills to industry…”

According to the University of Auckland:

The TES needs to demonstrate a broader understanding of the role of tertiary education…We are concerned that the narrow focus on economic outcomes risks the important social, cultural and environmental outcomes provided by the sector… The TES 2014-2019 needs to provide for investment in the range of contributions that the tertiary education sector makes to improving social, cultural and environmental outcomes for New Zealand communities...

Similarly, the University of Waikato, while supporting the long-term focus areas, felt that in general the draft strategy was not sufficiently ambitious:

Overall, we consider that the draft strategy does not go far enough and represents conservative thinking. The four long-term focus areas and six priorities are difficult to argue with but we believe that there is room to be more aspirational in order to guide the tertiary education sector.

In relation to the general strategic direction of the TES, Victoria University commented that a number of the goals appear to “exist in unresolved tension with one another”. In particular, Victoria highlighted the example of recent moves towards increasing differentiation of the university sector in New Zealand in the interests of quality improvement and international competitiveness. They argued that the draft TES may undermine this work by requiring that
all universities give primacy to industry engagement, business-led research and skills-based education.

Robust university sectors internationally are often highly differentiated and it is not at all clear that the Strategy’s goal of achieving high international credibility and reputation for New Zealand universities will be met by requiring them all to focus on the same priorities, prepare graduates to meet the same current skills shortages, consult the same stakeholder groups, and seek to meet the same indicators of progress. [Victoria University]

Four universities provided specific comments on one or more of the four proposed long-term focus areas of the TES.

Victoria University supported each of the proposed long-term goals of international competitiveness, support for innovation, achieving more equitable outcomes and maintaining high quality. Their only concern was that:

the language of ‘improvement’ in the draft TES – for example, ‘relationships that contribute to improved competitiveness’ or ‘improve outcomes for all’ – could be read as implying that institutional performance in New Zealand is currently low.

Lincoln University supported the proposed long-term focus areas and the positioning of New Zealand’s tertiary strategy in an international context, but commented that:

... reference to Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) is too narrow and specific a reference to reflect the magnitude and scale of the changes that are occurring. While we understand the intent of this reference, we suggest it needs to be broadened to include other phenomena such as unbundling of education, development of new forms of educational organisation, new forms of credentialisation of learning, etc, that are changing the international education environment.

Lincoln University and the University of Waikato commented positively on the shift within the TES to a focus on the outcomes of tertiary education, while also identifying the difficulty of this move and the need for more work to ensure the robustness of outcome measures.

Current ‘measures’ of tertiary educational performance are significantly compromised by weak (and pragmatic) indicators that measure the lowest common denominator of what the data available permits, rather than ensuring data availability for robust measures. In developing outcome measures, attention should also be paid to ‘input’ measures so that change in the learner (or contribution of the TEI) can also be assessed. [Lincoln University]

Auckland University of Technology agreed with the four proposed focus areas but suggested some modifications:

- that the focus area ‘to build international relationships that contribute to improved competitiveness’ should be modified to acknowledge the fact that building such relationships also contribute to New Zealand’s social cohesion and cultural development
- that the supporting business and innovation focus area should be extended beyond business and innovation in the TES
- that New Zealand’s social, cultural and economic advancement should be referenced in the focus area around supporting innovation through development of relevant skills and research.

University Other

Three of the five submitters in this category (Universities New Zealand, the Massey University Council, and the University Careers Association of New Zealand) provided
comments on the overall direction of the draft TES. Te Tumu, the School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies at the University of Otago (Te Tumu), agreed with all four proposed focus areas and provided no further comment.

The University Careers Association of New Zealand (UCANZ) was supportive of the overall direction of the draft strategy, and in particular the statement about the need for the system to be outward facing and engaged, with strong links to industry, community and the global economy.

Both the Massey University Council and Universities New Zealand commented more generally that the draft strategy lacks an aspirational element. Massey University Council commented that the draft was “largely a continuation of the status quo” and that its focus “is mainly remedial”, while according to Universities New Zealand:

*The draft strategy seems largely lacking in ambition and aspiration for the university sector...Nowhere... is there the type of aspirational statement on the purpose of tertiary education that is common in the strategic plans of the universities.*

Massey Council noted that the draft strategy favours a narrow view of the role of tertiary education, particularly the role of universities, and places too much emphasis on economic outcomes:

*It leaves the strong perception that the tertiary sector’s role is almost exclusively economic. Universities in particular have a much wider role and responsibility to society than just producing economic outcomes.*

Universities New Zealand expressed concern that the focus of the strategy is skewed towards the Government’s current and medium-term priorities for tertiary education rather than providing direction for long-term strategic goals. They questioned whether this would meet the Education Act requirements for what must be included in a tertiary education strategy.

### Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)

In general, ITPs were supportive of the overall direction of the long-term focus areas, although there were some concerns raised that the focus on economic outcomes might be at the expense of broader outcomes from tertiary education.

Western Institute of Technology agreed with all the focus areas and priorities and indicated that they believe the strategy will effectively drive change.

A submission from the Whitireia-WelTec Strategic Partnership indicated that:

*the strong focus on employment and income outcomes for learners, devalues the wider social good of education. A high-quality, high-performing tertiary education system allows learners to meet their aspirations – and business too.*

Unitec agreed with all the long-term focus areas and, with the exception of strengthening research-based institutions, considered that they would drive change. However, they indicated that they consider a focus on environmental issues and sustainable development is needed:

*The proposed Tertiary Education Strategy is currently silent on environmental issues. To improve outcomes for individual students and society as a whole provision for sustainable development should also be included.*

Waiairiki Institute of Technology described the TES as “deficit” thinking and suggested reworking the priorities to have “a stronger emphasis on building capacity as opposed to addressing short comings in the current education system or within particular groups”.


However, they agreed with the long-term focus areas. They commented that the “improving outcomes for all” theme was too economically framed, and suggested that teaching and learning quality should also be a focus area.

**ITP Other**

The Metro group submitted that while they “are generally supportive of the draft”, some rebalancing is required and some important points have been omitted. They welcome linking funding with subjects delivering the most economic impact, and focusing on the outcomes that matters to current employers, industry and potential employers. However, they want more focus on university rankings and improving global competitiveness.

> All of our universities are now ranked in the top 500 globally and their qualifications are taught to a uniform standard. At individual faculty level there are real pockets of global excellence. This strategy should be seeking to help improve the ratings of our institutions and create further centres of global reaching and research excellence.

The NZITP submission, while strongly supportive of the overall focus and increased alignment of tertiary education to productivity, as well as linking funding to subjects delivering “the greatest economic impact,” noted concern that “the voice of employers is largely missing” from the draft.

**Private Training Establishments (PTEs)**

Overall PTEs were mostly supportive of the four proposed long-term focus areas. Criticisms focused mainly on the policy implementation details and the ability of the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) to implement the proposed focus areas.

Auckland Institute of Studies, an international education provider, disagreed with the long-term focus on “improved outcomes for all” taking the opportunity to fault the current objectives of the TEC Investment Plan which:

> ... requires us to increase the number of Māori students to the same level as the local population, whereas our strength is in other ethnic groups where we have a higher than average proportion of students.

They also disagreed with the last focus area of improving quality and relevance by critiquing the work of NZQA and its use of external evaluation and review (EER) assessment as having been introduced “prematurely”. Further, it considered the way Immigration NZ uses the EER assessment to determine work rights for international students as too restrictive and having “…impacted on the commercial viability of a large segment of the export education industry.”

Agribusiness Training, while agreeing with the focus on international relationships, was concerned that outcomes needed to be achievable for smaller TEOs as well as large ones. They gave an example of agricultural training in India and the difficulty of maintaining viability while keeping fees low to give more students access.

New Zealand School of Dance (NZSD) raised several concerns. They considered that:

- the focus on completion of courses and qualifications was not an appropriate way to fund or judge employment outcomes for their students, who might be offered a place at the Royal NZ Ballet within weeks of starting their programmes
- “too onerous” English language requirements adversely impacted on the School’s ability to recruit international students.
New Zealand Management Academies, a PTE with over 2,000 domestic and 400 international students, was highly critical of the lack of collaboration and pathways between PTEs and universities. They felt “academic snobbery” made pathways from PTEs to universities unnecessarily difficult, expensive, and repetitive. They also criticised NZQA’s qualification approval criteria as too rigid.

In relation to “improve outcomes for all”, New Zealand Management Academies agreed with the intent but was concerned about implementation. They considered that insisting on proof of improved outcomes could lead to aberrant behaviour in the sector and without taking into account the starting point of learners, the policy could be counter-productive. They gave the example of how a NEET student re-engaged with their education might progress less distance through education than someone who had not been NEET, and therefore not be seen as a success according to outcomes based assessment.

Tectra Ltd was unsure that the first long-term focus area of the strategy was correct. They stressed that striving for competitiveness does not necessarily mean quality, and that there was no indication about how this would be measured or achieved. They also were concerned that tertiary education should not internationalise itself to the detriment of New Zealand society and more local communities who were not going overseas.

High Tech Youth Network Ltd thought international relationships should pay special attention to partnerships between New Zealand and governments, universities, and businesses in the Pacific region. They also thought that improving outcomes for Māori and Pasifika should be recognised with its own focus area.

English Language Partners New Zealand (ELPNZ), while generally supportive, proposed that the overall balance of the draft TES be readdressed:

> Its heavy focus on ‘productive and competitive’ takes away from the ‘improved outcomes for individuals and society as a whole’.

**PTE Other**

Independent Tertiary Institutions (ITI) agreed with all the proposed long-term focus areas, noting that its members were already involved with most of them, particularly international education. They commented that:

- PTEs play and should be encouraged to play a strong role, alongside universities, in supporting business and innovation
- the “improving outcomes for all” focus area was too focused on economic outcomes rather than the “value-added” by education, and did not capture the “complexity of the various student cohorts and what can be expected of them”
- defining and measuring quality and relevance would be complex and require improvement to the current Education Performance Indicators.

ITI were also concerned that the strategy was very specific on what was required of providers while being less specific on what the government was or was not going to do in order to achieve these focus areas. It recommended adding a section about what tertiary education providers can expect from government.

**Adult and Community Education Organisations (ACE)**

ACE organisations mostly supported the four proposed long-term focus areas for tertiary education in the draft strategy but expressed some concern with the overall strategic direction of the TES. More specifically, comments reflected concern that the draft strategy presents a narrow view of the role of tertiary education and over-emphasises economic outcomes. For example:
The draft TES is silent on the raft of other outcomes that benefit society other than qualifications and employment. Other outcomes include individual and group empowerment, equity, active citizenship, personal and collective critical awareness and sustainable development. There is little mention of social or cultural outcomes for learners except in reference to expectations of tertiary system performance. [The ACE Sector Strategic Alliance]

Literacy Aotearoa similarly noted that while it is broadly supportive of the proposed focus areas, it would like to see more vision in the strategy and a longer term focus that promotes an education system that is responsive to a rapidly changing environment. It commented that:

*There are dangers in providing education that is heavily focused on serving the needs of today. Such an outlook can lock people into skills and learning that will be irrelevant in 10 to 20 years’ time. The Strategy needs to promote education that is flexible, creative and responsive so that people are equipped to adapt to the changes.*

Adult and Community Education Aotearoa, the ACE Sector Strategic Alliance and the Pasifika Education Centre said they would like to see the term ‘Adult and Community Education’ used in the draft strategy rather than ‘Community Education’. Adult and Community Education Aotearoa commented that this language was important “to distinguish that ACE is a process where adults choose to engage in a range of educational activities within the community or in tertiary institutions.”

Several submitters proposed additional areas of focus for the draft strategy, including greater recognition of life-long learning and the ACE sector. For example:

*There needs to be a recognition of life long learning especially for adults who need new skills for new jobs whether through redundancy, going back to the workforce or for jobs yet to be developed. ACE can often be the mechanism to start the how to learn process.* [Community Learning Association through Schools]

Three submissions were received from SeniorNet Learning Centres. These were supportive of the proposed four focus areas but commented that the strategy fails to address the learning needs of older people, who also contribute to the New Zealand economy and community.

**Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)**

There was general support and agreement on the proposed long term focus areas for the tertiary sector amongst the ITOs. For example, Primary ITO commended “the authors for a well thought out strategy”.

However, paralleling responses from the business community, many ITOs are of the opinion that more detail needs to be provided in the draft TES. NZITO commented that TEOs “need to think of the outcomes in terms of their stakeholders,” while Primary ITO stated that:

*The real challenge is how various operational systems and policy decisions will support or hinder the ability for the sector to implement the TES.*

---

1 SeniorNet Learning Centres offer courses on computer skills and allied new technology to older people at various locations throughout New Zealand.
There was also a suggestion that funding mechanisms and policy objectives may be a barrier to achieving long term goals. NZITO commented that these can create barriers to collaboration, cooperation and coordination.

**Cross Sector Submissions**

Ako Aotearoa, while supporting “in broad terms” the draft strategy’s explicit focus on outcomes from tertiary education, had concerns that the strategy placed too great an emphasis on employment outcomes and too little emphasis on learners and their broader aspirations.

This relatively narrow focus on employment outcomes ignores the point that different learners require more than simply ‘a job’ from their education. Thinking strategically about investment in tertiary education should be based on information about outcomes, but these must be more sophisticated than simple income premia or placement rates. Investment decisions need to include a focus on other types of outcomes: progression to higher study, increases in overall wellbeing etc. Key to this is ensuring that programmes and qualifications are linked to clearly-defined purposes, and evaluated in terms of those purposes and the outcomes that learners are seeking.

The joint submission from Metro, ITF, and NZITP was a generally positive submission. It agreed with the priorities and focus areas but described concern over whether the strategy as worded will drive change.

We strongly endorse the overall direction of the Draft Tertiary Education Strategy (TES) and its explicit link to the Government’s Business Growth Agenda goal of creating a more productive and competitive economy. In particular, we welcome the new focus on outcomes and view this as potentially transformative of the tertiary education system.

We agree that a high priority be given to ensuring that the knowledge and skills people develop through tertiary education are well matched to labour market needs.
THE SIX STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Submitters were asked several questions in relation to the proposed strategic priorities for tertiary education for 2014 to 2019 (see below), including:

- Whether they agreed with having these as priorities?
- Whether they believed these would effectively drive change?
- How these priorities could be improved?
- Whether they thought tertiary education should have any additional or different priorities?

*The draft strategy proposes the following six priority areas:*

- Priority 1: Delivering skills for industry.
- Priority 2: Getting at-risk young people into a career.
- Priority 3: Boosting achievement of Māori and Pasifika.
- Priority 4: Improving adult literacy and numeracy.
- Priority 5: Strengthening research-based institutions
- Priority 6: Growing international linkages.
Priority 1: Delivering Skills for Industry

Overall

The majority of submitters agreed with having delivering skills for industry as a priority for the new Tertiary Education Strategy. However, some groups were more supportive than others. For example, universities were divided on their support while PTEs and business were very supportive.

Of those who completed the online survey or made a form submission (85 of 167 valid submissions) 95.1% (n77) answered that they agreed that delivering skills for industry should be a priority. Those that disagreed comprised only 3.7% (n3) and 1.2% (n1) did not know whether it should be a priority or not.

Despite the very high level of agreement on its inclusion, there was slightly less agreement that delivering skills for industry would effectively drive change in the tertiary education sector. For this question only 82.1% (n64) agreed that it would be effective in driving change with 11.5% (n9) disagreeing, and 6.4% (n5) stating that they did not know.

All businesses agreed that delivering skills for industry should be a priority. A number commented on the need to ensure all students at all levels of tertiary education are equipped with transferable skills.

While comments from submitters indicated mostly agreement with this priority area, there were some concerns and suggestions for how the priority might be improved. The main issues raised were:

- Some groups were concerned that this priority would make success in tertiary education dependent on economic and employment outcomes alone.
- The concern about employment as an indicator of success was shared by many who similarly wanted the social, community, and environmental benefits of tertiary education recognised. Those who supported this priority strongly also wanted to see it developed further and with more specific commitments from the government.

Business

Overall, business responded in a positive manner to this priority, and expressed strong support in favour of it. All businesses agreed that Priority 1 should be a priority in the final TES:

*The steering group welcomes... active consultation with industry and... the high level aspirations within the draft TES of securing a more explicit co-operation between industry and TEOs on skills demands. [Christchurch Manufacturing Steering Group]*

Business New Zealand was supportive of this priority, but felt it needed more development, and supported a sharper focus on outcomes and transferable skills:

*A key priority for the tertiary sector is to ensure all students at all levels of tertiary education are equipped with transferable skills such as literacy, numeracy, critical thinking, problem solving, collaboration and the ability to communicate. Employability and transferable skills form the foundation for more advanced, specialised and technical vocational skills development. Technical and specialist vocational skills must be relevant to, and meet, industry needs.*

Other businesses, while finding the priority commendable, thought that there needed to be clearer direction on providing a means of achieving the priority. Many organisations thought skills needed to be built up to Level 3 on the job. Rayonier Matariki Forests commented that...
the TES needs to acknowledge that entry level on the job training is important and this is a productive sector of the labour market, and that Priority 1 ignores industry training, especially at the foundation level.

Business Central commented favourably on linking the strategy to the Business Growth Agenda. Other submitters commented that business would need to take more responsibility for articulating their skills needs, and to also take initiative in training and development, to achieve the economic outcomes sought.

Federated Farmers discussed this priority in relation to current skills shortages in agriculture. It submitted that the reliance on skilled migrant labour is not a long-term sustainable solution, and recommended that the Government actively encourage young people into a career in agriculture.

Overall, businesses liked the broader perspective of tertiary education in this priority. For example:

*In our experience, tertiary education has a somewhat siloed approach to skills, and education curriculums rarely traverse areas that are beyond the boundary of the core faculty... A wider view would be more useful. While there is a balance between generalisation and specialisation we believe that there is some merit in wider exposure to a few key skills. [Spatial Industries Business Association]*

It was also noted that this priority requires TEOs to be more responsive to the needs of industry and a number of specific suggestions were made to improve TEO/Industry consultation overall. As an example, Business New Zealand commented that there is a role for Government to:

- establish a common understanding of labour market trends and developments
- look beyond current shortages and consider likely future shortages
- lead strategic research and analysis to inform industry, students and the tertiary sector on these issues and;
- raise awareness of the role industry itself can play in the co-creation of skills (such as programme design and influencing student choices).

**Council and Government Agencies**

Council and Government agencies making comment around this priority largely agreed with the intent of the priority:

*The priority draws attention to the need to continue to address skills shortages in specific areas such as ICT, engineering and large animal sciences. NACEW sees a significant opportunity for this Strategy to help address these skill shortages by increasing women’s participation [NACEW]*

**Interest Groups**

*Iwi*

The iwi group Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua supported Priority 1.

**Student Organisations**

The New Zealand University Students Association agreed that TEOs need to develop skills and knowledge for innovation and agreed that the core higher level skills such as the capacity to process information, and think critically and logically, are central to this. It was of
the opinion that industry is failing to clearly outline the skill-needs of a discipline and the tertiary sector is failing to provide the appropriate modes of into curriculum design.

Otago University Students Association did not agree with the focus on employment outcomes and believed that this had already been considered by their institution and was therefore not needed as part of the TES. In addition, it made the following comments relating to skills:

_There is clear evidence from our graduates (who we survey on this very matter 18 months after they have left us) that skills and attributes relating to intellectual independence are those which they find most useful in their life after leaving university. We believe that this section oversimplifies the process by which students and their families make study choices._

Therefore, OUSA were of the opinion that a focus on developing core personal skills, such as critical and logical thinking, should be the focus of Priority 1.

Te Mana Ākonga supported Priority 1 but noted:

_That this has the potential to focus more on the needs of industry without necessarily supporting the needs or aspirations of learners – relevant skills and knowledge, clear career paths, good social outcomes to ensure success. In this instance, success includes access, participation, achievement, and completion of degree programmes that help to achieve the aspirations of students while at the same time delivering skills required by industry._

**Unions**

Both the Tertiary Education Union and the Council of Trade Unions were supportive of the proposed TES priority to deliver skills for industry, but felt that industry was too narrowly defined in the draft strategy. For example, the TEU argued that this priority area could be strengthened by:

_recognising that ‘industry’ is much broader than simply meeting employer needs. The concept of ‘industry’ should include those working within businesses and industry, unions and of course institutions and ITOs._

The TEU also suggested that the TES should highlight the importance of ensuring a broad base to skill and knowledge development as well as the value of lifelong learning:

_Doing so ensures that those working within industry have the flexibility to adapt to changing need, leading to a stronger and more responsive workforce. This focus area makes no mention of skills leadership and lifelong learning in the sector. The work that was undertaken on a Skills Strategy some years ago was a good start - we need to resume this._

**Other Peak Bodies and Groups**

In essence, the peak bodies that responded were generally supportive of Priority 1 with a number of organisations offering specific comment as to how the priority might be achieved. For example:

_There is a need to have more up to date information as demand for skills changes. The lag between training and the development of skills needs accurate forecasting. There needs to be closer collaboration between industry, education and policy makers. [Employers and Manufacturers Association]_
The Early Childhood Council and the New Zealand Playcentre Federation also supported Priority 1 in relation to the early childhood sector. The Early Childhood Council made specific comments around early childhood education graduates:

*On balance, the reasons given for 61.25% of respondents preferring university ECE graduates over other tertiary institutions is that they could count on them to have all the skills required to make a quality ECE teacher. The main words used for this claim were – literate, numerate and professional. [Early Childhood Council]*

**Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups**

**Universities**

Universities were mixed in their support for Priority 1: *Delivering skills for industry.*

Four universities, the University of Canterbury, Lincoln University, Massey University and the University of Waikato, were supportive of the priority. For example:

*It is important that students are equipped for current and, as far as possible, future workplace needs. This includes technical expertise as well as higher-order attributes. A broad range of programmes needs to be available to support students to up-skill, including via professional Masters degree programmes. [University of Waikato]*

Lincoln University described how the recent Qualification Reforms undertaken by the university support this priority.

*Lincoln is able to produce graduates that support industry capability need, contributing to productivity objectives and aligned with the business growth agenda.*

Massey University and the University of Canterbury supported Priority 1 but raised some concerns. Massey University, for example, felt that the wider benefits of tertiary education, beyond supplying skills to industry, should be acknowledged in the strategy.

*We endorse the view that delivering skills for industry should be a priority in the TES and agree that this priority should be closely aligned with relevance of qualifications offered in the tertiary education sector, graduate outcomes and life-long learning. We also believe tertiary education delivery should not be limited by industry-driven, labour market outcomes... To deliver the priority it will be necessary to ensure that appropriate indicators and frameworks are in place to ensure the achievement of the priority.*

The University of Canterbury felt that the draft strategy did not adequately reflect some of the complexity involved in this area:

*Universities produce graduates with a range of skills. Some graduates have skills directly applicable to a particular profession... others have developed higher level research and analytical skills that can be applied to a wider range of workplaces in the public and private sectors... Universities are also often considering the skills that graduates will need in 10 years as well as the current need. Therefore while UC endorses this priority we believe that the authors should be cognisant of the differing timelines of the various providers.*

Four universities did not agree that delivering skills for industry should be a priority in the TES: The University of Auckland, Auckland University of Technology, the University of Otago, and Victoria University. These universities did not support the explicit linkage of qualifications to current labour market needs, perceiving this to be an overly simplistic approach and one that represents an outdated view of the labour market.
We believe that this section oversimplifies the process by which students and their families make study choices, and that its name does not reflect its true intent (a better title might be 'Delivering Skills and Talent for New Zealand' [Otago University of Otago]).

Victoria University submitted that there is “little local or international evidence of workforce planning as a successful guide to educational strategies at the tertiary level.” Victoria University thought that there was a danger in tailoring degree level provision to current employment opportunities would result in expanding and shrinking programme intakes in particular areas of disciplines.

AUT thought matching provision to current demand would be difficult to achieve, is based on an outdated view of the labour market, and fails to take account of entrepreneurial university graduates who can also be classified as job makers.

The University of Auckland suggested that the TES should acknowledge the important contributions of disciplines such as the arts and humanities, education, law and the creative arts to the development of our economy and of our society. It submitted that the strong focus on STEM subjects does not promote teaching and research beyond the STEM subjects that are “vital to the improved social and economic outcomes for New Zealand”.

The University of Otago noted that addressing the issue of study choices involves supporting the provision of good career advice and attention should be focused on ensuring young people get comprehensive advice from people who are trained in matching their strengths with career opportunities.

The Auckland University of Technology commented that the priority should recognise “the importance of lifelong learning and building an adaptable, well-educated citizenry, as well as the contribution of higher education to social and economic development.”

**University Other**

The Massey Council agreed that delivering skills for industry should be a priority in the TES but had some concerns around potential barriers to achieving this priority:

*In the university sector response to market signals from industry is often confounded by funding decisions from the Government. Lower financial margins on many courses, particularly those requiring laboratory or workshop work are often a disincentive to increase offerings despite market demand.*

*Use of employment outcomes as a measure of success is a concern particularly if used as a KPI for universities. Employment is driven by many factors only one of which, employability, do they have much control over. Perverse incentives arise if inappropriate performance indicators are used.*

Universities New Zealand supported the emphasis in the draft strategy on providing more information to assist students to make informed choices and addressing skill shortages. However, it pointed out that changing labour market conditions during students’ periods of study need to be taken into account.

*There is a minimum lag-time of three to four years between a university student’s decision to enter a programme and graduation, even longer before they are a fully competent member of their chosen profession. Labour market conditions can change considerably during this period.*

Moreover, Universities New Zealand noted that an important role for tertiary education that should be acknowledged in the draft strategy is in re-skilling and up-skilling for the changing workforce.
The University Careers Association of New Zealand (UCANZ) highlighted the key role that university career services are able to play in providing feedback to the academic community on the skills requirements of the business community. UCANZ made a number of comments on addressing the skills gap, noting that it is important to acknowledge that the skills requirements of the New Zealand labour market may differ from the international market, and that graduates need to be equipped for success in a globally competitive arena.

**Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)**

Waiariki Institute of Technology expressed concern over the use of employment outcomes as indicators of success and additionally submitted that while it believed tertiary education has a key role to play in delivering skills for industry, there should also be a focus on the softer skills required by industry.

The Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology (CPIT) thought a greater focus on transferable ‘generic’ skills across a wide range of qualifications and tertiary providers would benefit graduates and employers.

The Universal College of Learning (UCOL) submitted that industry needs do not always align neatly with qualifications or what an individual provider can deliver. It suggested relaxing the over-focus on inputs to greatly assist the shift to a more of an outcomes focus.

**Private Training Establishments (PTEs)**

Auckland Institutes of Studies thought that preparing New Zealand and international students for work opportunities with foreign employers overseas should also be recognised as a valid outcome of the tertiary education system.

English Language Partners New Zealand (EMPNZ) wanted the second indicator for this priority reworded as “there are opportunities and pathways for adults returning to the workforce or retraining in industry.”

New Zealand Management Academies wanted the inclusion of a fifth indicator of success that would encourage universities to enter into articulation agreements with PTEs to enable pathways for students.

**PTE Other**

Independent Tertiary Education New Zealand (ITENZ) was supportive of the priority focusing on the Canterbury rebuild but warned that there should be long-term approach to up-skilling as well. It wished to see a greater commitment to a longer term and more holistic approach to training provisions of any projected workforce requirements.

ITENZ suggested that the Government should be confident in its ability to meet the infrastructure needs in terms of programme construction and approval. It wished the Government to note that the independent tertiary education sector had an advantage in that it can quickly adapt to changing needs.

Independent Tertiary Institutions (ITI) expressed concern that the TES provided no transparent framework within which the necessary trade-offs were to be made in shifting resources to focus more on high demand skills. It thought it was unclear whether this shift was for new funding or existing funds or both.

**Wānanga**

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa (TWoA) was not supportive of Priority 1. It commented that the priority over-emphasised economic factors at the expense of social and cultural outcomes and presented a narrow view of the role of education in society. A related concern for the
wānanga was that the draft strategy did not acknowledge the role of tikanga Māori and āhuatanga Māori in learner success, and both the Māori and New Zealand economy.

TWoA proposed the priority statement be modified to ‘Delivering Skills for Industry and Society’ and the supporting text include reference to the wider benefits of education and the role of tikanga Māori and āhuatanga Māori.

**Adult and Community Education Organisations (ACE)**

ACE organisations supported Priority 1 but did express some concerns. Literacy Aotearoa, for example, was concerned that:

*The Strategy’s focus is restricted to high level education provided by universities and polytechnics, when there is a large proportion of the workforce whose literacy is below level 3 on the Adult Literacy and Life Skills survey. These potential learners would not be able to access a university or polytechnic.*

ACE Aotearoa and the ACE Sector Strategy Alliance both commented that this priority is skewed towards the young and needs to be broadened to include older adults. For example:

*Creating a skilled labour force is not restricted to the young. Many older learners are re-entering the workforce due to forced and voluntary changes in employment. Current wording of this priority and supporting initiatives exclude older learners.* [ACE Aotearoa]

**Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)**

There was widespread support for this priority amongst Industry Training Organisations:

*ITOs are perfectly placed to address future skills needs through ongoing research and engagement with industry... Now that ITOs have consolidated into bigger entities, their research capacity is there to be tapped due to their deep reach into the industries they serve.* [NZ Marine]

We strongly agree that tertiary education providers and industry need to invest more time, money and expertise in skills development to ensure that students graduate with knowledge and skills relevant to employment opportunities and achieve better employment outcomes [Industry Training Federation].

However, some specific suggestions for improvement of the priority were made:

*Labour market modelling helps quantify industry skill requirements* [Primary ITO]

*Priority One will not effectively drive change unless: ITOs are empowered to arrange training for Level 2 on the job; generic skills are developed by a centralised agency; industry is mandated to have a place on TEOs oversight committees to ensure their needs are met; KPIs are set for employment outcomes for all pre-employment skills based education; ‘better’ and ‘good’ are not outcome measures.* [Competenz]
Priority 2: Getting At-risk Young People into a Career

Overall

The majority of submitters agreed with including getting at-risk young people into a career as a priority for the new TES.

Of those who completed the online survey or made a form submission (85 of 167 valid submissions) 91.8% (n75) answered the question “should this [getting at-risk young people into a career] be a priority in the TES?” Of these, 85.9% (n67) answered yes, 5.1% (n4) answered no, and 9.0% (n7) answered don’t know. The remaining 7 submitters chose not to answer this question.

While this shows a high level of support for this priority, submitters were not as confident that this priority would effectively drive change. As above, 91.8% (n75) of submitters who used the online survey or form submission answered the question “will this priority effectively drive change in the tertiary education sector?” Of these, 62.7% (n47) said yes, 14.7% (11) said no, and 22.7% (17) said they did not know.

While comments from submitters reflected agreement with this priority area, there were also some concerns and suggestions for how the priority might be improved. The main points were:

- Submitters agreed with using the term “career” rather than “job”. However, one submitter commented that the traditional notion of career may now be redundant.
- Some submitters were concerned that, as written, this priority showed deficit thinking. These submitters were generally against labels such as ‘at-risk’ and suggested that the label be removed so that the priority focuses on all young people.
- Other groups suggested that the word “young” should be removed so the priority focuses on all at-risk groups. There were a number of reasons given for this, including concerns that other at-risk groups (such as prisoners, refugees, and people with disabilities) would be overlooked because of the focus on young people. Submitters also highlighted that a number of older people are also at-risk. One group suggested that the age range should be extended to include 25-34 year olds.
- There were also suggestions that the TES should acknowledge the role compulsory education has in supporting this priority, for example by including an indicator of success that relates to transitions between the compulsory and tertiary sector.

Business

The majority of businesses supported the intent behind this priority; however, a number of businesses believe the scope of the priority needs to be wider with more emphasis on the semi-skilled workforce. For example, Moffat Ltd commented that it is unfortunate that manufacturing is not seen as a career and that the TES “does not value or celebrate the honest toil of a semi skilled workforce.” They felt that the “national focus seems to be recognising only those with ‘qualifications’.

Other skills, such as soft skills and core skills were mentioned as a means towards increasingly employability for young people:

As the demand for vocational and technical skills continues to change, it is important that getting at risk young people into a career should incorporate key employability or core skills such as literacy, language and numeracy, critical thinking, problem solving, communication, collaboration and information processes. The emphasis should be on keeping career choices and pathways open. [BusinessNZ]
Interest Groups

**Iwi**

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua were unsure of Priority 2, commenting that the term ‘risk’ is deficit rather than strength-based language and should not be included in the TES.

*Our young people are too often being labelled at risk! At risk of what? Failing a system that hasn’t been designed for them?*

**Student Organisations**

NZUSA supported the proposed priority to get at risk-young people into a career.

*We support the goal of getting young at-risk young people into a career through harnessing the possibilities of tertiary education to transform lives. There is considerable evidence that study, particularly at degree level, offers opportunities out of poverty.*

However, it felt that the priority area should be extended to include all people not just this group and should mention the need for lifelong learning.

*[That] tertiary education as a path out of poverty is true for people at all stages of life [and should not be limited to those aged 18-24]. The pathway should be available for all New Zealanders through the re-embracing of a commitment to life-long learning. [NZUSA]*

Te Mana Ākonga wanted to see this priority extended to include 25-34 year olds. In addition it commented that Level 4 qualifications should not be seen as a way of addressing at-risk young people which has the potential to demean this qualification and the role these play within the industry.

OUSA saw this priority area as being outside the scope of a university.

**Unions**

The Tertiary Education Union was supportive of the proposed priority, but felt that the draft strategy lacks any detail on new initiatives that might contribute to the goal as well as how the priority links to the compulsory sector.

The CTU did not support limiting the priority area to “at-risk young people” arguing instead that the TES should take a more universal approach addressing the needs of all young people.

*The TES must ensure all young people develop their abilities and have opportunities to acquire skills that will enable them to have access to good jobs, wages and realise their potential. The outcomes for “at risk young people” will be enhanced by a response that responds to all young people – a universal approach. [CTU]*

**Other Peak Bodies and Groups**

There was general support for this priority within these peak body groups, with specific support for existing Government initiatives such as the Vocational Pathways tool and Youth Guarantee.

The Employers and Manufacturers Association noted that:

*The training needs to be relevant to the needs of the industry. While training should focus on skill development it should also include job search training [There is a need*
to reduce the cost to business of engaging youth, and a need to have more programmes around mentoring youth.

There was some concern that a focus on youth would be to the detriment of older working age people. Grey Power submitted that older people are “practically invisible” within the TES as a whole and much of the focus is on the young.

Both the New Zealand Red Cross/Refugee Services and the Change Makers Refugee Forum felt that the needs of young refugees needed recognition within the priority.

The National Advisory Council on the Employment of Women noted that young women in a caregiving role are at-risk of low workforce participation and that this should also be acknowledged within this priority in the TES.

**Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups**

**Universities**

Most universities supported getting at-risk young people into careers as a priority in the TES. The University of Auckland and Victoria University did not comment.

The University of Canterbury and Lincoln University both described how they are currently addressing this issue. Lincoln noted that recent qualification reforms undertaken by the university support this priority. The University of Canterbury described how it is developing further transitional programmes to support youth access to university study.

The remaining universities, while supporting the priority, had some suggestions for improvement or identified issues that they felt needed further consideration.

Massey University noted that the TES needs to address the role of the compulsory education sector in being able to achieve this priority.

> We endorse the view that getting at-risk young people into a career, as well as lifting tertiary education achievement of young people working in low-wage, low-skilled jobs are important priorities in this strategy. We also recognise that these are problems inherited by the Tertiary Education sector from current and historical gaps in the compulsory system, and linkages between the TES and the compulsory education sector strategy need to be in place to ensure better transitions in the future.

Massey University also made the general point that there “needs to be enough job opportunities available in the economy” for this priority to be achieved.

The Auckland University of Technology suggested that the TES incorporate “a positive youth development framework, rather than the current deficit approach”. It also made some suggestions in relation to success indicators:

> While recognising that the Better Public Services target for NCEA Level 2 would significantly improve the current state if achieved, it is TES priorities which inform Investment Plan guidance. AUT would therefore advocate for a TES indicator of success relating to achievement of university entrance.

The University of Waikato suggested that this priority would be further advanced by the Government providing greater support for TEOs to collaborate:

> Universities can play a key role in supporting at-risk young people through providing their own foundation programmes, as well as participating in bridging partnerships.
with other TEOs. This could be strengthened by Government support for collaboration between TEOs rather than competition between them.

The University of Otago questioned whether support exists for these students.

**University Other**

There was support among this group of submitters for Priority 2. Te Tumu, the School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies at the University of Otago were supportive of this priority area for the TES but provided no further comment.

Universities New Zealand noted that universities are already addressing this priority area through transition programmes to assist those who are capable of succeeding in tertiary education but who may not have succeeded at school. They commented that:

> With this foundation support, the programme completion rates in universities are already significantly above those cited on page 11 of the draft Strategy.

**Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)**

Waikari Institute of Technology disagreed with having this as a priority and commented that:

> .. the focus here is on a deficit model of getting at risk young people in to a career, we would argue that the focus should be on working with all young people to ensure that they are able to progress into tertiary education.

Manukau Institute of Technology also suggested that this priority should be extended to cover all young people.

UCOL indicated that while the framing of the priority is correct, greater policy coherence is needed to achieve goals:

> While the priority is probably framed right we note that the tools to achieve it are still relatively under-developed...the interaction between Youth Guarantee, Trades Academies and L1&2 Fees Free creates a mosaic approach to getting at-risk young people into a career, rather than a coherent set of policy tools.

Unitec indicated that secondary-tertiary transitions needs to be included in this priority due to the impact they have on at-risk youth.

**Private Training Establishments (PTEs)**

Several PTEs commented that the TES should acknowledge the role of the compulsory sector in supporting this priority area. New Zealand Management Academies wanted the inclusion of another indicator of success to focus specifically on supporting the transition of students from high school into tertiary education. They noted that a greater partnership to achieve this between TEOs and secondary schools would help this priority.

Auckland Institute of Studies, while supporting this priority, believed that not all providers should be expected to contribute equally to these groups because they believe they are “...quite different markets and providers may have strengths with particular communities.”

English Language Partners New Zealand (EMPNZ) similarly thought this priority unnecessarily excluded older adults who they felt were just as in need of access to first time education opportunities.

Tectra Ltd thought a more precise definition of “at-risk” was needed. This was also shared by Agribusiness Training who worried that at-risk might exclude “less academic” types of young people.
**PTE Other**

Independent Tertiary Education New Zealand (ITENZ) was supportive of this priority but wanted the strategy to address the needs of all young people not just at-risk ones. They recommended a more flexible and innovative funding model so that perhaps individuals not in employment, education or training (NEET) could attract more funding.

ITI were also concerned that this priority disadvantaged older learners and second chance learners including those coming off benefits and learning in prison. They felt it important not to have at-risk youth prioritised at the expense of other at-risk groups.

**Wānanga**

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa was concerned with the exclusive focus on youth in Priority 2 and proposed that the priority be modified to include people of all ages. They submitted that:

*The current text...focuses on raising the educational level of those aged 34 years and under. This ignores all those aged 35 years and over whose needs were initially ignored by the secondary education system and are now to be ignored by the tertiary system. Those aged 35 years and over still have a significant contribution to make with up to 30 years of working life to contribute to being employed and not only contributing to the New Zealand economy but also lifting the wellbeing of their whānau. [Te Wānanga o Aotearoa]*

**Adult and Community Education Organisations**

Adult and Community Education (ACE) organisations expressed support for Priority 2. Comments typically centred on the key role that ACE can play in providing a pathway for learners into further education. For example:

*ACE is a transitional stepping stone through informal learning to new opportunities. Courses with no barriers to entry build self-esteem and confidence. ACE has value in helping learners to future success. [Community Learning Association through Schools]*

**Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)**

Four out of the five Industry Training Organisations (ITOs) supported the priority with one ITO unsure whether it will effectively drive change. NZITO questioned the use of the term “career” in the priority, commenting that:

*...traditional notions of careers may be redundant given the instability of employment and the subsequent effects on the labour market.*

In contrast, two ITOs, NZ Marine and the Industry Training Federation, welcomed the wording “career” in the priority, as opposed to “job”

*The ITF welcomes the shift in focus to getting ‘at-risk’ young people into a career – not just ‘a job’. This recognises that skills development involves a commitment that takes time, and the learner needs to aim towards achievement at higher qualifications levels, including NZ Apprenticeships.*

NZ Marine noted the need for ITOs to have flexibility to introduce Level 2 Foundation Trades programmes as a bridge for at-risk young people to access Level 4 apprenticeships.

Competenz also requested flexibility, (with pathways for a career needing to be accessible while youth are in the workplace) noting that the new NZ apprenticeships will not be an option unless progression through Level 2 to Level 4 is possible.
We agree that this [getting at-risk young people into a career] should be a priority in the TES; however the focus on off the job training will not drive change. Many young people not achieving in the formal education system thrive in the workplace. [Competenz]

**Cross Sector Submissions**

Ako Aotearoa strongly supported this priority, highlighting their support for the use of the term ‘career’ in the priority as opposed to the term ‘job’ or ‘employment’.

Our recent work on foundation education, including *Lifting Our Game* (2012) and *A Foundation for Progression* (forthcoming) has emphasised the point that tertiary education for at-risk young people – and at foundation levels in general – must be part of building a pathway that includes good quality learning and employment outcomes. The concept of a ‘career’ embodies that principle. [Ako Aotearoa]
Priority 3: Boosting Achievement of Māori and Pasifika

Overall
The majority of submitters agreed with having boosting achievement of Māori and Pasifika as a priority in the new TES.

Of those who completed the online survey or made a form submission (85 of 167 valid submissions) 92.9% (n79) answered the question “should this [boosting achievement of Māori and Pasifika] be a priority in the TES?” Of these, 86.7% (n68) answered yes, 2.5% (n2) answered no, and 11.4% (n9) answered don’t know. The remaining 6 submitters chose not to answer this question.

While this shows a high level of support for this priority, submitters were not as confident that this priority would effectively drive change. In contrast to the above, 90.6% (n77) of submitters who used the online survey or form submission answered the question “will this priority effectively drive change in the tertiary education sector?” Of these, 68.8% (n53) said yes, 11.7% (9) said no, and 19.5% (15) said they did not know. The remaining 8 submitters chose not to answer this question.

Feedback on Priority 3 raised the following concerns:

- Many submitters considered that Māori and Pasifika should be represented in separate strategic priorities, to reflect the different issues and responses needed in relation to each group. In particular, there was concern that linking Māori and Pasifika together might not recognise government’s particular obligations in relation to Māori, including obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi.
- Several submitters, across the sector commented that the priority should also include a focus on increasing Māori and Pasifika teaching staff.
- Submitters commented that a coordinated approach was required to address this issue – including coordinating the efforts of TEOs, government agencies, and schools. Appropriate funding and support systems would reinforce this coordinated approach.

Business
All businesses supported the inclusion of Priority 3 within the new TES. For example, SmartGrowth and Priority One strongly supported this priority, stating that:

This priority is critical for the future of the Bay of Plenty region where Māori comprise 25% of the population (compared to 14% nationally) and one half of the region’s young Māori are between 0-24 years of age.

Overall, support for this priority recognised that Māori and Pasifika will make up an increasing share of New Zealand’s workforce over the next 10 to 20 years.

Council and Government Agencies
There was limited response from council and government agencies specifically focused on this priority. However, the Human Rights Commission welcomed the TES setting specific targets for Māori and Pacific tertiary education:

The Strategy recognises the need for tertiary education to improve its delivery to Māori and Pacific students... The Commission welcomes this commitment to address enduring inequalities for Māori and Pacific people.
Interest Groups and Individuals

Iwi
Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua supported this priority but felt that tertiary education organisations need to show genuine commitment to achieving these goals.

*Indicators of success need to be clearly developed and show commitment for culturally responsive provision. It has been too easy for TEOs to write the right words and nod their heads but do nothing different to effect culture change.*

They also noted a desire for the Government to accelerate outcomes for Māori in the short to medium term, recognising a balance between academic and vocational pathways. They also submitted that the indicators of success need to be more clearly developed and show commitment for culturally responsive provision.

Student Organisations
Student organisations agreed with this as a priority and the shift towards insuring equal outcomes over the previous emphasis in the TES on equal access and participation. For example, New Zealand Union of Students’ Associations (NZUSA) commented that:

*The focus on Māori and Pasifika access and achievement has, for some time now, been a priority area for the tertiary sector. We agree with the recent shift in perspective, from an emphasis on equal access and equal participation to a prioritisation of equal outcomes for Māori and Pasifika, and believe that this is an important distinction.*

However some groups recommended separate priorities for Māori and Pasifika – including the Otago University Students’ Association and Te Mana Ākonga.

*We are fully supportive of this remaining a key focus of the tertiary strategy. Some thought could be given to providing a stand-alone priority for Māori. This would recognise both the partnership relationship with Māori that exists with the Treaty, and that the causes and remedies of underachievement amongst Māori and Pasifika are not the same. [Otago University Student Association]*

Te Mana Ākonga disagreed with the use of the wording “boosting achievement” in the TES, commenting that it “does not carry notions of inclusiveness or opportunities and support necessary to enhance success for Māori and Pasifika.”

The need for regional assessment was noted by NZUSA:

*... in the context of Te Reo Māori and Mātauranga Māori research and development, it needs to be clearly stated that this will be undertaken with a regional focus, rather than a one-size-fits-all attitude. Mātauranga Māori and Te Reo Māori are fundamentally unique to regions of delivery and local tikanga must be acknowledged.*

Te Mana Ākonga also noted that the demographics of teaching staff have an impact on learner outcomes and that the priority should include a focus on increasing Māori and Pasifika teaching staff. This sentiment was also noted by the Victoria University Students’ Association who recommend inclusion of the development of pathways for Māori teachers and researchers into this priority.

*While the Tertiary Education Strategy 2002-2007 outlined that Government’s strategy in the context of Te Ao Māori, and how pathways would be developed for*
Māori academics; the current draft Strategy focuses exclusively on a narrow set of outputs. [Victoria University Students’ Association]

**Unions**

Union submissions supported Priority 3: Boosting achievement of Māori and Pasifika.

> The draft TES recognises that much greater progress is needed in improving Māori and Pasifika rates of tertiary education. This is an urgent task. The TES refers to the fact that in 2030, 30 percent of New Zealanders will be Māori or Pasifika. The tertiary education system has a critical role in responding now to these groups. [CTU]

Both the Tertiary Education Union and the CTU, however, felt that this priority should be separated into two distinct priorities to recognise the unique positions of Māori and Pasifika within the tertiary sector and New Zealand society. The TEU also commented that this priority would be strengthened by recognising the need to focus on employment of Māori staff in all areas of the sector as an important element in Māori learner achievement.

**Other Peak Bodies and Groups**

The Tikanga Māori Governance Group provided endorsed the focus on tikanga Māori. The group noted that tikanga Māori and Te Reo Māori are fundamental to Māori cultural identity an imperative component for Māori achieving as Māori.

**Individuals**

Many individuals thought the needs of Māori and Pasifika were sufficiently different as to warrant separate and distinct priorities in the Strategy.

**Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups**

**Universities**

Universities strongly supported the inclusion of Priority 3 in the new TES. For example:

> Māori and Pacific achievement is one of the priorities of the TES and we endorse this focus. [The University of Auckland]

> We are fully supportive of this remaining a key focus of the tertiary strategy. [The University of Otago]

Universities, while supportive of this priority, also made a number of suggestions for how the priority could be improved.

Massey University suggested that the focus of the priority should be broader to include indigenous development as well as increased participation of Māori and Pasifika staff within tertiary education organisations.

> As well as the need to improve performance of Māori and Pasifika students, we believe this strategy should have a broader focus to include tertiary education as a conduit of indigenous development.

> We also suggest that the focus of this priority should be extended to include increased participation of Māori and Pasifika as staff within TEOs, particularly academic staff. In the global race for talent, diversity and different world views brought by different ethnicities will become increasingly beneficial for innovation and international linkages. It is also important for Māori and Pasifika students to have role models within the TEOs. [Massey University]
Victoria University commented that the draft strategy doesn’t address the key role that primary and secondary schools play in preparing Māori students for tertiary education, noting that effective transitions from school is critical for Māori success.

The University of Otago felt that Priority 3 should be separated into two priorities to acknowledge key differences between the two groups.

*Some thought could be given to providing a stand-alone priority for Māori. This would recognise both the partnership relationship with Māori that exists within the Treaty, and that the causes and remedies of underachievement amongst Māori and Pasifika learners may not be the same.*

Otago also noted that Māori and Pasifika underachievement and efforts to address it are a highly complex area, which should be acknowledged in the TES and in funding.

*A more open acknowledgement of financial barriers to tertiary success for these groups (and Pasifika in particular) would be helpful, as would the unfortunate reality that one of the root causes of tertiary under-achievement is poor engagement in the compulsory sector...We would also make the point that due in part to the complex root causes of Māori and Pasifika underachievement, effective interventions are typically very intensive, and thus expensive to deliver. It is important that this be recognised in the funding decisions that the new TES triggers.*

Victoria University and the University of Waikato were both concerned about statements about the ‘regional dimension’ of Pasifika student success, and the focus on the Auckland region, when other areas may also have high Pasifika populations.

*We think it is important that the highlighting of the Auckland region not act as a distraction from and deterrent to the commitment and achievement of institutions elsewhere in New Zealand. The growth rate of the Pasifika population in the Wellington region is, at 10%, higher than the national average growth rate, and Victoria has in recent years given high priority to meeting the educational needs of this group.* [Victoria University]

Lincoln University strongly supported the priority and noted that it has recently developed its Whenua Strategy and is due to complete its Pasifika Strategy in early 2014. Similarly, the University of Canterbury described current efforts at the university to address this priority area, including a range of programmes and initiatives to assist these groups to improve their educational performance.

**University Other**

There was support for boosting achievement of Māori and Pasifika as a TES priority among this group of submitters. Submitters did, however, voice some concerns or make suggestions for improving the priority.

Universities New Zealand was concerned by the conflation of Māori and Pasifika needs in this priority and recommended two priority areas to recognise that Māori and Pacific learners come from different contexts, experience education in different ways, and that the system will need to address their needs in different ways. They commented that addressing this issue requires considerable effort by all parts of the education system, not the tertiary sector alone.

*Tertiary institutions alone cannot be expected to rectify this deficit. The high proportion of Māori students still leaving school before Year 13 points to systemic failure which will only be overcome by concerted efforts by all parts of the system – government, secondary schools and tertiary institutions.* [Universities New Zealand]
Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)

ITPs made a number of suggestions relating to Priority 3. Manukau Institute of Technology suggested that to achieve this priority there will need to be an Auckland specific response to the needs of Pasifika, while Unitech felt that to achieve better outcomes for Māori and Pasifika there needs to be an integrated approach across a number of agencies.

We believe that the draft strategy needs to recognise the impact other agencies have on Māori, Pacific and youth education success. Education outcomes for these groups can be significantly influenced by health, employment, and other socio-economic factors – for this reason, we would advocate the strategy speaks to the needs for agencies, including TEOs, to deliver an integrated approach to education service delivery. [Unitec]

Waiairiki Institute of Technology indicated that to achieve success with Māori and Pasifika would require “recognising the importance of partnerships with schools” and suggested that “having an indicator of success that is about improved pathways from school into tertiary education may thus be important”.

CPIT and UCOL also expressed some concerns around this priority area:

The priority should not be limited to trades or to people under 34. It is important to recognise that Māori and Pasifika have been disadvantaged at all stages of their education, and it is important that access be available for all ages and all potential careers [CPIT]

Improved sharing of best practice information in this area would assist providers in boosting the achievement of Māori and Pasifika students. Right now there is little support to help providers in developing responses to this priority, which will slow down achievement of this priority as providers have to trial and pilot before investing more fully. Other priority areas have more information on best practice available than this one. [UCOL]

Private Training Establishments (PTEs)

PTEs expressed a number of concerns with this priority as well as some suggestions for improvement. For example, the New Zealand Management Academies was concerned that the indicators of success for this priority were not specific to each group, noting that each had different needs in other strategies.

Tectra Ltd believed that programmes showing the most promise for this were heavily weighted towards pastoral care, which were more expensive yet they perceived the funding for this to be “...reduce[d] or static.” Similarly, Enrich+ felt that this priority could also relate closely to Priority 2 and recommended early intervention programmes such as Whanau Ora as possible solutions.

PTE Other

Independent Tertiary Education New Zealand (ITENZ) thought this a “high priority” but was not confident that its desired outcomes could be met. They suggested new funding models for proven successful programmes and qualifications. How programmes were quality assessed was also questioned with ITENZ recommending government taking a more holistic approach to achievement for Māori and Pasifika in particular. ITENZ offered their services in an advisory role for this.

Independent Tertiary Institutions (ITI) questioned why two groups with two different sets of issues had a single priority in the TES.
Wānanga

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa (TWoA) did not support the combining of objectives for Māori and Pasifika under a single priority, arguing that each group is distinctive and should always be acknowledged separately. Te Wananga o Raukawa (TWoR) similarly did not support combining Māori and Pasifika in a single priority. TWoR stated that:

“Pasifika is not a treaty partner unless the Crown includes them in their part. Māori should always be treated separately”

TWoA also expressed concern that the focus of Priority 3 is on boosting Māori and Pasifika participation and achievement at Level 4 and above, and that this fails to take into account that many Māori and Pasifika students leave school with limited options for moving into tertiary education.

Significant work remains in providing targeted tauira with the foundation skills they were denied during ten years of ineffective compulsory education. Until achievement rates for Māori and Pasifika are on a par with those of non-Māori, the focus must be on providing the skills they didn’t receive while at school – this means providing a wide range of options at levels 1 to 3 supported by extensive and comprehensive pastoral and academic support systems. [TWoA]

Adult and Community Education Organisations

There was support for Priority 3: Boosting achievement of Māori and Pasifika, among ACE organisations. A common concern, however, voiced by several organisations (Community Learning through Schools, Pasifika Education Centre, ACE sector Strategic Alliance, ACE Aotearoa) was that the draft strategy could better address intergenerational learning opportunities for Māori and Pasifika which is often provided through Adult and Community Education.

ACE Aotearoa were also concerned that the draft strategy focuses on Māori and Pasifika students who are in the formal tertiary education system, studying at certificate level and higher, but fails to mention how it will address the needs of Māori and Pasifika who have no qualifications and are not yet studying at certificate level. ACE Aotearoa notes that it is this group of learners that ACE providers are often engaged with.

Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)

There was strong support for the intent of the priority amongst Industry Training Organisations (ITOs); however, one ITO submitted that it is up to the employers to hire Māori and Pasifika people and to encourage the progression of Māori and Pasifika through the workforce and into higher learning:

Industry training is available only for those in employment and …employers, not ITOs, hire employees. The relative percentages of different ethnicities engaged in our industries are therefore outside of ITOs’ control. [Primary ITO]

There were also concerns that the priority might not drive change unless it encourages Māori and Pasifika to achieve higher levels of industry training:

...entry to apprenticeships will be difficult for many if entry is at Level 4, and on the job training will offer limited opportunity if ITOs are supposed to concentrate on training at Levels 3 and above… The priority will not effectively drive change unless it is recognised that industry training on the job will help lift Māori and Pasifika achievement from study at Level 1 to achievement at Level 3 and above. [Competenz]
Two ITOs, NZITO and Independent Tertiary Institutions (ITI), recommended that Priority 3 be separated into two priority areas.

**Cross Sector Submissions**

Ako Aotearoa was concerned by the conflation of Māori and Pasifika needs in this priority and recommended two priority areas be developed. They also felt that the priority would be strengthened by also supporting Māori and Pasifika educators in the tertiary education.
Priority 4: Improving Adult Literacy and Numeracy

Overall

There was strong support across all categories of submitters for improving adult literacy and numeracy as a priority area within the new TES.

Seventy-nine of the 85 submitters who used the online questionnaire or feedback form answered the question whether in their view Priority 4 should be a priority of the TES. 86.1% (68) agreed, 5.1% (4) disagreed and 8.9% (7) did not know.

Submitters were less confident that this priority would effectively drive change. Of the 74 online survey or feedback form submitters who answered the question whether this priority will effectively drive change in the tertiary education sector, 71.6% (53) said yes, 10.8% (8) said no, and 17.6% (13) said they did not know.

While largely supportive of Priority 4, submitters did have some specific concerns about this priority or suggestions for how it could be improved, including:

- changing or reprioritising funding – for example, to target learners and providers who can deliver the most gains, to support longer-term comprehensive programmes teaching basic skills, and/or to better support the Adult and Community Education sector
- commentary that employers should be expected to support job-specific literacy
- concern that the current 100 hour ILN provision may not be sufficient to effectively raise literacy and numeracy levels
- suggestions that te reo Māori literacy should be included in Priority 4, acknowledging that literacy in te reo Māori is an essential element in enabling Māori to fully express their cultural identity
- commentary that attaining level 1 and 2 qualifications may not resolve language, literacy and numeracy gaps, as some qualifications at this level are highly skill-based
- suggestions that NZQA could include literacy and numeracy skills into programme approvals as another way to achieve this priority.

Business

There was strong support for improving adult literacy and numeracy amongst the business community. For example, BusinessNZ commented that:

Poor literacy, language and numeracy skills not only affect the competitiveness of individuals in the labour market, they also affect business itself, constraining workplace productivity and putting workers at risk.

BusinessNZ also commented that it is looking for a stronger focus on lifting the literacy, language and numeracy skills of those already in the workforce, especially those who may not be able to progress from their current position. BusinessNZ noted that the workplace is becoming increasingly dynamic and the opportunity to re-skill is essential to many careers.

Moffat Limited commented that New Zealand should not lose sight of its changing racial and cultural environment which means the New Zealand workforce is made up of many people for whom English is a second language. The organisation noted that there is a need to ensure that those people are not neglected when targeting improvements in literacy and numeracy programmes.

Federated Farmers noted that the agricultural industry desperately needs people who are literate and numerate, and indicated its support for the priority. It commented that it “believes these programmes should also be industry specific”.
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Interest Groups and Individuals

Iwi

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua was unsure of this priority area and felt that it would be difficult to measure given the diversity of programmes addressing learners’ different needs.

Student Organisations

NZUSA supported the focus on adult literacy and numeracy, suggesting that this type of study should be free and that the best way to achieve this goal would be to reinstate funding to the ACE sector. Te Mana Ākonga also strongly supported this priority area.

Unions

There was support for Priority 4 among union submitters.

The CTU commented on how this priority can best be achieved, stating its support for embedding literacy, language and numeracy in vocational skills training.

For adult LLN to be successful it must be embedded in vocational education and aligned to the other priorities across the tertiary work and vocation sectors. This is a gap in the strategy.

The Tertiary Education Union welcomed the new initiatives for adult literacy and numeracy highlighted in the draft strategy but wanted to see funding reinstated for Adult and Community Education. It commented that “this sector plays an important role in supporting adult literacy and numeracy, and restoration of funding would enable ACE to continue this work”.

Both the TEU and CTU highlighted the success in this area of the CTU Learning Representatives programme. For example, the CTU commented that:

The CTU Learning Representatives Programme trains workplace representatives to understand and break down the barriers to learning in the workplace and provide support to co-workers for completion of training and qualifications. This programme fits within a broad suite of LLN opportunities in workplace.

Other Peak Bodies and Groups

The peak bodies that responded specifically to this priority were in support of its intent and offered a number of suggestions:

- Literacy and numeracy programmes need to reflect peoples’ different learning needs and provide a variety of delivery mechanisms. [Change Makers Refugee Forum]
- [It] is important for employers to have in-house training. Embedded literacy should be included in most courses. English as a second language is becoming more important in this priority. [Employers and Manufacturers Association]

Individuals

A small number of individual submitters provided comments on this priority area. Comments included: concern about the effectiveness of 100 hour ILN funding, believing it to be too short a time to be effective; a recommendation to make better use of assessment tools, particularly the ’Starting Points’ assessment; and the importance of differentiating level 2 qualifications which are heavily skills based and level 2 literacy and numeracy qualifications expectations.
Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups

Universities

Universities expressed support for this priority but also identified some issues and concerns.

The Auckland University of Technology suggested that in addition to the focus on short-term job-specific programmes, the TES should also recognise and support comprehensive programmes teaching basic skills.

Basic skills in these areas are vital for successful participation in the host society; short-term, job-specific programmes are too narrowly focused and do not meet the substantial needs of these learners. The draft TES should recognise the importance of longer term, comprehensive programmes such as the ILN Targeted ESOL and the Refugee English Grants, and their vital role in ensuring positive settlement outcomes.

Massey University raised concerns around funding, querying for example whether job specific literacy should be funded by employers rather than Government, and whether funding may be better targeted in this area.

The draft strategy states that TEOs should continue to take a diverse approach to improving literacy and numeracy, including shorter quicker options targeting job specific literacy. While job specific literacy is no doubt important for workplace productivity, the question could be asked whether this is an employer’s responsibility to fund rather than Government. In a wider sense, the strategy appears to be to try to reach everyone with a need and to rectify this need. While this is a desirable aim, it is acknowledged that New Zealand exists in a fiscally constrained environment where tertiary funding includes a focus on performance. Given this it might be better to target funding to only those learners and provisions that can provide the most gain and where this can assist learners to staircase into higher qualifications.

The University of Otago and University of Canterbury both noted that while this priority is important, it is largely outside the scope of the universities, and other TEO types may be better placed to support this Government’s goal. Otago commented that its “main contribution in this area as a university is likely to be research that supports the development and implementation of appropriate interventions”. The University of Waikato supported the proposed priority, highlighting the role that universities play in terms of offering research-led qualifications supporting the teaching of literacy and numeracy for adults.

Three universities, the University of Auckland, Victoria University, and Lincoln University, did not comment on Priority 4.

University Other

Priority 4 was mostly supported by this group of submitters. For example, Universities New Zealand commented that “the fundamental importance of literacy and numeracy skills for social and economic wellbeing is indisputable.” Te Tumu agreed with this strategic priority for the TES but provided no further comment.

Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)

ITPs were supportive of including improving adult literacy and numeracy as a priority in the new TES, but also expressed some concerns. CPIT, while supportive of the priority, was concerned about maintaining the gains in this area:
We question whether the process of embedding literacy and numeracy has become [business as usual] such that it is appropriate to remove targeted funding. The initial focus has been good, but we need to be able to maintain the momentum.

Unitec welcomed the retention of this priority area in the TES but felt that the draft strategy does not propose any significant advances in this area.

Waiariki Institute of Technology commented that the success indicators for this priority area appeared to lack specificity, and that it would, for example, like to see the inclusion of an indicator on the embedding of literacy and numeracy in programmes.

**Private Training Establishments (PTEs)**

PTEs expressed a number of concerns about this priority area as well as offering suggestions for improvement.

Enrich+ considered that the current 100 hour ILN provision was not sufficient in effectively raising the literacy and numeracy levels of their students. They felt expectations for quick success were too high given the type of students they had to deal with.

New Zealand Management Academies thought that requiring greater achievement across all age groups attaining qualifications at levels 1 and 2 might not address the problem as many level 1 and 2 qualifications were heavily skills based and could be achieved without the necessary literacy and numeracy skills. It also recommended having NZQA including literacy and numeracy skills into programme approvals as another way to achieve this priority.

**PTE Other**

Adult Literacy Education & Consulting Ltd (ALEC) was very supportive of this priority and suggested that:

...possible voluntary registration of trades and vocational tutors actively involved in embedding literacy and numeracy into levels 1-3 a requirement of funding for the organisation that they work for.

Independent Tertiary Education New Zealand commented that there are still a lot of industries and smaller organisations that cannot access support for their staff in this area. It suggested linking adult numeracy and literacy to workplace qualifications such as health and safety, helping to achieve this priority and linking it to Better Public Services and increased organisational productivity and profitability.

Independent Tertiary Institutions commented that care should be taken in not assuming all level 1 and 2 qualifications will necessarily produce the literacy and numeracy skills of a level 2 literacy qualification.

**Wānanga**

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa expressed concern at the lack of any mention of te reo Māori literacy in Priority 4. The wānanga recommended that te reo Māori literacy be included in this priority.

*Te Wānanga o Aotearoa views literacy in te reo Māori (with literacy rates currently far lower than literacy rates for English) as an essential element in enabling Māori to fully express their cultural identity and to live as Māori. Beyond declaring te reo Māori an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand, successive governments have failed to acknowledge this taonga as worthy of promotion or support through meaningful and equitable recognition in a Tertiary Education Strategy.*
**Adult and Community Education Organisations**

ACE organisations supported improving adult literacy and numeracy as a priority of the TES, with comments mostly highlighting that ACE should be recognised as an important pathway for re-engaging and up-skilling learners.

Literacy Aotearoa Wellington identified some specific issues around programme delivery that it felt needed to be addressed more clearly in the draft strategy, particularly concerns around the effectiveness of short programmes.

> [Short programmes] are not effective for learners who have very limited literacy and numeracy skills and have huge amounts to learn. Short programmes can also disadvantage those who have any social issues or those with poor confidence...as they need time to acclimatise to the learning environment before they will engage with the learning content.

**Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)**

The Industry Training Organisations that responded all supported the priority. One ITO, however, responded that it needs to work for industry and not create any unnecessary compliance burdens.

Competenz noted that the tertiary education sector needs to:

> continue to offer a diverse and flexible range of foundation skills programmes...but government policy means this cannot be done in the workplace...Adults with numeracy and literacy issues have to be either removed from the workplace to access programmes, or attend classes outside work hours.

Competenz further commented that numeracy and literacy skills can be effectively built into the workplace environment where learning is in context.
Priority 5: Strengthening Research-Based Institutions

Overall

There was support across all categories of submitters for strengthening research-based institutions as a priority area of the TES, with university submitters unanimously supportive. Some submitters highlighted the global advantage that could be gained in strengthening research-based institutions.

Eighty-five (out of 167) submitters completed the online questionnaire or feedback form. Of these, 79 answered the question whether in their view Priority 5 should be a priority of the TES: 91.1% (72) agreed, 5.1% (4) disagreed and 3.8% (3) did not know.

While this shows a high level of support for this priority, similarly to other priorities, submitters were not as confident that this priority would effectively drive change. Of the 75 online survey or feedback form submitters who answered the question whether this priority will effectively drive change in the tertiary education sector, 80.0% (60) answered yes, 4.0% (3) answered no, and 16.0% (12) answered that they did not know.

While comments from submitters reflected agreement with this priority area, there were also some concerns and suggestions for how the priority might be improved. The main points were:

- acknowledgement from the business sector of the important role that they can play in research and development across the country
- concern from some TEOs that the proposed priority may place too much emphasis on commercial and industry-linked research and present an overly narrow view of the purpose and value of research, which may be at the expense of other research activities
- commentary that the priority may undermine the legislated role of critic and conscience of universities, and impinge on TEOs’ academic freedom
- commentary that collaboration between TEOs and other research organisations, while promoted in the TES, may be difficult in NZ given the high number of small organisations, and funding sources (such as the PBRF) that incentivise competition
- the need for acknowledgement of non-university research (a particular concern of the ITP sector, and also of some PTEs) and the value of rangahau (research) related to mātauranga Māori in achieving its goals in this priority area
- that there needs to be greater investment, including government investment, in the area of research and development.

Business

There was general support for this priority among business submitters, although opinion was divided as to how effective it would be in achieving its aims:

[Strengthening research-based institutions] will not lead to economic growth in NZ unless the research is applied to NZ issues. [G.A. Carnaby Associates]

the addition of an assessment of commercialisation success and/or industry commitment to the 2012 PBRF round was a positive move and more needs to be done to drive focus on real commercial returns from research activity. Industry should also be prepared to share in the risk and the reward. [Tait Communications]

Spatial Industries Business Association noted that research will only be stronger if there is a more direct connection with the perceived problems of external markets.
Tait Communications outlined their view of the importance of collaboration between business and academic research to drive business growth, in the context of the “diminishing returns” of the “20th century business models of product/service differentiation or operational excellence in processing and manufacturing”. They comment that:

Innovative/disruptive IP is what will drive business success today. The creation of this IP will generally not arise from an academic researcher locked away in a lab, or from a market research exercise by a business. It is most likely to arise from the creative collaboration of academic research depth, business insight, and target customer participation. As above, a networked approach that wraps around a target customer will be needed, not an academic researcher having the mythical “eureka” moment and then finding a factory.

Business New Zealand supported the priority, highlighting the need to produce researchers with both technical specialist knowledge and soft skills.

[We] commend the Strategy for recognising the need to produce researchers with technical and specialist knowledge and to develop soft skills such as collaboration, critical thinking and entrepreneurship. In a commercial innovation setting, soft skills play an important role in unlocking the value of technical and specialist skills and knowledge.

Callaghan Innovation submitted:

This strong research and knowledge base has positive spin offs in commercialisation and developing entrepreneurs and risk takers and acts as a source of new companies on the back of new ideas.

Federated Farmers also noted that there needs to be further research in agriculture:

The [agricultural] sector desperately needs more research and development investment...By encouraging more young people to complete an agricultural sciences degree we may see improved research in the agricultural sector...We therefore recommend that the Government increases investment in agricultural based institutions.

Councils and Government Agencies

Most council/government agency submitters supported this priority, and considered the global advantage that could be achieved in strengthening research based institutions.

Interest Groups and Individuals

Iwi

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātau, while supporting the priority, commented that it would not support increased spending in this area, preferring instead that the “budget aligns to supporting people and students in other priority areas”.

Student Organisations

Student organisations, in general, supported this priority, but also expressed some concerns around the TES presenting an overly narrow view of the purpose and benefits of research. For example, NZUSA stated that:

We support incentives to encourage collaboration between industry and research institutions but this cannot be at the expense of the world-leading research that is
undertaken because leading researchers are pursuing inquiry based [research] in their areas of expertise.

Otago University Students’ Association suggested that Priority 5 should be modified to more explicitly acknowledge the underpinning value of blue skies research and that research is driven by a wider range of factors than just economic or commercial gain.

Te Mana Ākonga similarly suggested that “there should also be a reference to matauranga Māori and a broader focus on social and whanau wellbeing when considering funding for research and not just an economic focus on commercial innovation”.

**Unions**

The Tertiary Education Union strongly disagreed with Priority 5, arguing that this priority undermines the legislated critic and conscience role of universities and other tertiary education institutions involved in research, and impinges on academic freedom.

...we should not permit government and/or industry to decide where research priorities for the tertiary education sector lie. This draft strategy proposes a level of government, business and industry involvement in setting the direction of research that risks academic freedom and the exercising of the role of critic and conscience, which is so crucial to research, inquiry and scholarship. [TEU]

The CTU commented that there is merit to strengthening research-based institutions but noted that in its opinion New Zealand’s low level of R&D expenditure (1.2 % of GDP in 2012 compared to the OECD average of 2.38 %) is “primarily due to low business spending in this important area for economic development”.

**Other Peak Bodies and Groups**

There was general acknowledgment of the value of research and development, but groups commented that they would like to see more government investment in the area:

[This priority] requires that researchers have incentives where appropriate to be involved in teaching, enterprise and technology transfer activity so their research is actually used rather than simply read about in the academic literature... NZ Biotech recommends that funding for research in tertiary institutions be increased. [The NZ Biotech Association]

**Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups**

**Universities**

There was strong support among universities for strengthening research-based institutions, with all eight agreeing that this should be included as a priority in the strategy.

Massey University noted that Government support is important in order to ensure that New Zealand universities remain competitive internationally. The university highlighted its support for the increased importance of external research funding, the increased investment from the Government in Performance Based Research Funding and the proposed changes to reduce compliance cost, and the creation of incentives to encourage the business sector to double its expenditure on research and development.

Universities did however express some concerns and suggested ways to improve the priority.
The universities of Auckland, Otago, Victoria, and Waikato, as well as Auckland University of Technology, commented that while they were supportive, they were also concerned that the proposed priority places too much emphasis on commercial and industry-linked research. They considered that this may reflect a very narrow view of the purpose and value of research. The University of Otago felt that this perspective ignores the fact that:

*much applied and commercially successful research has its foundation in decades of fundamental discipline-focused research, or research that is focused on providing new knowledge that underpins important questions in health, society, cultural, environmental and economic development.*

These universities wanted to see Priority 5 acknowledging the underpinning value of blue skies research and referencing the importance of applying research for reasons other than direct economic or commercial gain. For example, the University of Waikato stated that:

*While we recognise the value of business-led research, it is important that other research drivers, for example, environmental and social drivers, are also recognised.*

The University of Otago expressed the need for a broader focus in relation to subject areas.

*It is also important that with the focus on STEM subjects, we do not lose sight of the value of other subject areas such as the humanities and business. New Zealand also needs to produce graduates with skills in fields such as the languages, history and philosophy, not only for reasons of cultural diversity, but because they provide the mix of talent our industries need to compete in a global market.*

The University of Canterbury noted how funding policies may be negatively impacting on university research.

*There are policies of various funding agencies that are effectively undermining the research efforts of the Universities and probably the CRIs. Currently there is no government policy as to the model that will be used by public funding agencies so overhead funding ranges from Marsden (full cost recovery) to HRC (salary cost recovery only). In the latter case it means that the actual cost of the research is borne by the investigating institution. Whilst this may be efficient for HRC, it does mean that the research is being subsidised and the size of this subsidy is significant.*

Both the University of Canterbury and Massey University expressed some concern about the resourcing required to achieve this priority.

*UC is a complex organisation and in order to further engage with businesses on research it will be necessary to reduce effort in other areas or increase the resource... The TES could consider either an alternative funding line or reduce requirements in other areas to free resource, and ensure that the relationship with industry is enhanced.* [University of Canterbury]

The University of Otago commented on barriers to encouraging greater interest in the STEM subjects (e.g. sciences).

*A major constraint to increasing enrolments in these subjects is the number of students coming out of the secondary school system with the academic credentials and science enthusiasm required to embark on degree level study in STEM subjects. This constraint is due, in part, to the standard of science teaching in some schools, and also in our view to a lack of understanding amongst some school career advisors about the career opportunities that exist for strong science graduates.*

Both the University of Auckland and Lincoln University supported the proposed priority and described specific initiatives at their institutions to address this priority area, including the
recent Degree Qualifications Reforms at Lincoln University. The University of Auckland commented that universities make a wide contribution beyond the tertiary education system:

*We also partner with a wide range of organisations, such as local and international universities, CRIs, DHBs, international research funders such as the U.S. National Institutes of Health, local and national government departments, the philanthropic sector, community organisations, and business and industry to deliver and disseminate high-quality research that can lead to transformational change.*

**University Other**

There was some support for strengthening research-based institutions as a strategic priority in the TES, as well as some concerns. Universities New Zealand, for example, commented that placing too much emphasis on commercialisation activities may be at the cost of other important research activities.

*A balance must be maintained between the universities’ contribution to innovation and their role as providers of basic research. Much of this latter research has no immediate impact but often leads in the long term to the development of new products and processes. There is a real danger that if too much emphasis is placed on commercialisation activities this will be to the detriment of other research activities.*

The Massey Council, while supportive of the strategic priority, commented that collaboration is made difficult by New Zealand having many small and competing tertiary education organisations:

*We have a concern that the TES pays lip service to collaboration between TEOs and other research organisations. Our experience is that collaboration occurs between scientists on a convenience basis, but is frowned upon if the parent institution sees no real benefit to itself – regardless of the National benefit arising. The best way to develop centres of excellence and scale in technical areas is to aggregate the capability under common governance structures. Commonality needs to be real, not notional. The failure of the TES to address the inefficiencies and effectiveness issues arising from a small country like NZ having so many small, competing TEOs is one of its major weaknesses.*

Moreover, the Council highlighted that while the TES promotes collaboration, the PBRF “tends to incentivise competitive and individualistic behaviours.”

**Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)**

Many ITPs commented that this priority was very ‘university-centric’ and failed to acknowledge the role of ITPs in research and development. The ITP sector clearly stated that the research it undertakes should be recognised within the strategy. For example:

*We would like to see the role of ITPs in the provision of applied research more strongly in the strategy... The draft strategy is silent on the valuable contribution the ITP sector can make in the research arena and we would advocate review of this for the final strategy document. [Unitec]*

UCOL similarly commented that more recognition needs to be given to non-university research and development of linkages that provide significant benefits to regional Small and Medium Enterprises who have growth opportunities. It noted that “existing tools to incentivise this (PBRF) are designed for more academic research rather than applied, practical connections”.


UCOL, however, supported the move to reduce compliance costs of the PBRF as this could encourage wider organisation participation, but suggested “there needs to be more tools to encourage and incentivise SMES and TEOs to connect with practical, applied assistance for R&D, particularly around internships and initiatives to create a culture of innovation.”

CPIT indicated that there needs to be clarity over the roles that providers should take with regards to business and research: “there is a need to clarify the role of institutions regarding business and innovation research: Are we in a lead role, or a following role, or is it a combination?”

**ITP Other**

NZITP also wanted the TES to acknowledge the value of applied research undertaken by ITPs.

*This priority should recognise more explicitly the importance of applied research in ITPs. As currently stated in the draft TES, this priority carries a significant risk of perpetuating an underlying prejudice that tertiary sector research is carried out in universities only.*

**Private Training Establishments (PTEs)**

New Zealand Management Academies believed more articulation agreements between PTEs and universities could help achieve this priority. Intueri Education Group did not support this priority believing that institutions that did applied learning and vocational skills development were just as important as research-based institutions.

**PTE Other**

Independent Tertiary Education New Zealand (ITENZ) commented that their members were supportive of the priority and wanted to see more collaboration between themselves and other institutions. It believed that it was essential that collaboration between tertiary education, business and government be supported.

Independent Tertiary Institutions (ITI) suggested that the Government should look to increase private provider participation in the PBRF and other research and innovation activities. ITI commented that ownership structure should not be the prime determinant of research funding. It wanted the wording in the draft TES “universities and other research based institutions” changed to “universities, ITPs and PTEs”. ITI also recommended changing the wording of the third indicator of success from “Tertiary Education Institutions” to “Tertiary Education Organisations” in order to include PTEs.

**Wānanga**

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa commented that the value of rangahau (research) related to mātauranga Māori should be acknowledged in Priority 5, specifically its contribution to providing data, knowledge and innovative approaches.

*Mātauranga Māori research paradigms are not considered to be of equal weight or value. Whilst we acknowledge the stark differences between western and indigenous approaches, we would prefer that both approaches be valued equally. The devaluation of mātauranga Māori research constrains wānanga from delivering on their statutory obligations and role.*

The wānanga further suggested that there should be clear links between Priority 5 and the role that mātauranga Māori rangahau can play in the achievement of the Māori Economic Development Strategy and Action Plan, He Kai Kei Aku Ringa.
**Adult and Community Education Organisations**

Submitters in this category indicated support for the TES priority area to strengthen research-based institutions but did not provide further comment.

**Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)**

There was general support for Priority 5 amongst Industry Training Organisations.

NZITO supported the priority but commented that more emphasis should be placed on the innovation capability within firms. Competenz submitted:

*Most operational (industry training) qualifications do not have a direct link to research within the industry...Research based institutions need to have a strong link to degree and diploma level qualifications...any new initiatives and technologies [need to be] reflected in unit standards and qualifications.*

There was also some concern amongst ITOs that the priority refers mainly to universities. NZ Marine commented that the priority needed to reflect the fact that Industry Training Providers also conduct research in order to provide degrees for learners.
Priority 6: Growing International Linkages

Overall

Most submitters agreed that growing international linkages should be a priority of the new TES. Most groups want to see international education continue to grow and continue to benefit tertiary education in New Zealand.

Of those who completed the online survey or made a form submission (85 of 167 valid submissions) 78 answered the questions relating to this priority. Of those that answered 87.2% (n68) agreed that it should be in the TES, while 5.1% (n4) disagreed, and 7.7% (n6) indicated that they did not know.

While the support for its inclusion in the TES was high, there was less agreement about whether this priority would effectively drive change in the tertiary education sector. Of those who answered 77.3% (n58) agreed that it would, 6.7% (n5) disagreed, and 16.0% (n12) did not know.

While comments from submitters reflected agreement with this priority area, there were also some concerns and suggestions for how the priority might be improved. The main points were:

- commentary that the economic focus on growing revenue through international education may not sufficiently recognise the broader value of increased international linkages (eg for improving the quality and experience of research, teaching and learning, benefits for domestic students, and the knowledge and skills gained in education and later applied in the economy and across society)
- acknowledgement of the important role for government in this area, to provide direction, appropriate funding, and ensure alignment across agencies – some submitters identified problems that international students face participating at a New Zealand tertiary education provider including language requirements, employment restrictions, and interactions with Immigration NZ
- suggestions that this priority could better reflect the two way nature of international education by having a stronger focus on domestic students and the opportunities provided by greater international linkages
- commentary from some submitters (particularly universities and students) that improving New Zealand’s international standings (for example, university rankings) will help to contribute to the increased international competitiveness of the sector.

Business

There was wide support for this priority from the business community with minimal specific comments. However, Aviation New Zealand commented that there are a number of factors that undermine New Zealand’s international competitiveness such as: GST on educational services exports; immigration rules and the inconsistency of their application in some markets, and a lack of international qualifications and standards.

Councils and Government Agencies

The Prime Minister’s Science Advisor, Professor Sir Peter Gluckman, submitted that:

Strategies to enhance university [international] rankings are important and [therefore the] appropriate incentives [need to be put] in place... [Therefore] our universities need to be encouraged to find points of focus for reputational enhancement.
We need to consider with greater granularity the various types of TEO and thus the multiple goals of ‘international education’ within them...International graduate students are attracted by the promise of quality mentorship by top names in their fields in top ranked universities...ultimately the quality of NZ’s research cadre and institutional reputation will be the deciding factor.

**Interest Groups**

*Iwi*

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua was unsure about Priority 6 and commented that while there are financial gains to be made from growing international linkages this should not be at the expense of New Zealand students and culture: “Our main priority should remain with culturally responsive boost to achievement for Māori and those groups under served.”

**Student Organisations**

The Auckland University Student Association (AUSA) was concerned with the strong focus in Priority 6 on international students and developing international export education:

> The material in the Strategy is entirely focused on developing export education and increasing the income from international students coming to New Zealand, and does not address the need to internationalise the experience for New Zealand students.

The New Zealand University Students Association’s submission expressed the same sentiment as AUSA but also noted that:

> There has been good work in this space, most noticeably the publication *Seriously Asia* which was produced for the Asia New Zealand Foundation. Its recommendations should be incorporated into the Strategy...Additionally, there is insufficient introduction to understanding Asia, or the world, integrated into the New Zealand tertiary curriculum.

**Unions**

The Tertiary Education Union did not support Priority 6 and disagreed with the focus on generating revenue from increased international student enrolments.

> This focus area is not about enhancing the community of tertiary education through strategic relationships that will support quality teaching, learning and research. Rather it highlights the increasing attempts to re-shape the tertiary education sector into a business, with international students seen primarily as revenue for the sector.

The TEU commented that it would only support this priority area if it was “re-framed with a primary focus on developing strategic relationships for the purposes of enhancing and sharing knowledge.”

Similarly, the CTU disagreed with what it saw as the implication in the TES “that the major purpose of building international relationships is to improve competitiveness and revenue.”

**Other Peak Bodies and Groups**

There was overall support for this priority amongst these organisations. There was minimal feedback or suggestions on improvement of this priority.

The Employers and Manufacturers Association stated that the importance of international education must be emphasised. It commented that there is still more to be done in retaining
and encouraging overseas students with particular skills to seek employment in New Zealand. The Association also suggested that international providers should be encouraged to locate training institutions in key overseas markets.

Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups

Universities

Universities supported growing international linkages as a priority area in the TES. A number of these institutions noted challenges for the New Zealand tertiary sector in the area of international education, including increased global competition for students. For example:

The Government has long-term aspirational goals for international education, mostly focused on its economic value as shown in the Indicators for Success... However, these aims are becoming harder to achieve, with the expansion of local higher education provision in key source markets such as China and India, a higher New Zealand dollar, and increased competition for international students around the world. [AUT]

The competition for students, staff and resources has increased substantially since the Global Financial Crisis. Competition stems not only from our traditional partners (and also competitors) – Australia, UK, America, Canada and Europe (mostly English speaking), but we now face increased competition from non-traditional, developing countries in Asia, Middle Eastern and Latin America. [Massey University]

While supportive of this priority, universities also provided a number of suggestions for improving it and for achieving success in this area.

Massey University and the Auckland University of Technology commented on the role of government in this area, including the need for government to work more closely with the tertiary sector, introduce strong incentives, and for policy alignment across the relevant government agencies in order to attract international students to New Zealand.

There is a strategic role for the Government to financially support New Zealand universities in achieving better positioning internationally which will drive improved competitiveness. The strategy briefly discusses the investment made by the Government to Education New Zealand, but the strategy lacks direct engagement and support with universities. [Massey University]

Alignment across the various Ministries and Agencies is also vital for the success of this priority, ensuring that there is inter-agency collaboration to ensure policy alignment will assist in making New Zealand an internationally competitive destination for education. [AUT]

Similarly, the University of Canterbury commented on funding issues and government support in relation to achieving this priority.

Consideration needs to be given to the provision of skills though Education NZ as a provider or funder. This would also allow Education NZ to coordinate the in-market investment for the whole sector. This may enable institutions or groups of institutions to coalesce in a particular market and achieve a stronger presence than could be achieved otherwise.

The expansion of offshore teaching partnerships will create a significant additional cost for institutions. Whilst the importance of these initiatives is accepted, the reality...
is that some activity must be reduced or eliminated to facilitate the deepening and expansion of international relationships... For clarity, it is accepted that the responsibility for delivery must be shared between the institution and government.

The University of Otago noted that international reputation is an important factor in attracting international students to New Zealand and that this reputation is largely determined by research and by the international recognition of New Zealand graduates. Otago felt that this issue needs to be more fully addressed in the draft TES.

The reality that high-calibre international students will only be attracted to tertiary institutions that are well-resourced and of high international standing... [is] underdone in the current draft.

The University of Auckland commented that in addition to the focus on export education, the TES should also acknowledge the importance of other international partnerships and relationships occurring within New Zealand universities.

The TES rightly acknowledges the importance of international linkages in terms of export education. It fails to realise the important role of international partnerships and relationships, particularly with New Zealand’s research universities, as the main conduit of international research-based intellectual capital that can improve outcomes for New Zealanders.

The University of Waikato identified some areas in which it felt the TES could provide a clearer direction.

This priority focuses on international education. Although it recognises the long-term benefits of international education to the tertiary system as a whole, the role of other forms of international linkages could be more strongly signalled, for example, with respect to research. This would bring it better in line with the Government’s long-term focus on building international relationships that contribute to improved national effectiveness.

Massey University commented on how New Zealand tertiary education organisations can adapt to technology-driven changes, such as Massive Open Online Course (MOOCS), and their impacts in the international education environment.

We...believe that New Zealand TEOs need to position themselves strategically in this context. There are over 3,500 universities in the US – compared to 8 universities in New Zealand. We believe New Zealand’s positioning will not be on adjusting provision to lead the way in MOOCs development, but lead in quality assurance, assessment and in the accreditation environment. New Zealand’s proposition needs to be more refined, of added value, aiming not only for the New Zealand domestic market, but in establishing global partnerships in this environment.

**University Other**

There was some support for growing international linkages as a strategic priority in the TES, as well as some concerns and suggestions for improvement.

Universities New Zealand, for example, were concerned that New Zealand universities’ standing in international rankings not be compromised by the increased emphasis on closer relationships with business and greater commercialisation of research. It noted that international rankings are an important factor in attracting international students.

International rankings of universities are an increasingly important factor in international students’ choice of study destination and the New Zealand universities
work very hard to maintain their international standing. While there are some positive developments, such as the inclusion of all eight of the NZ universities in the QS Top 500 universities for 2013, the general trend is towards a gradual decline in international rankings.

Massey University Council felt that more emphasis needed to be placed in the TES on facilitating New Zealand students to study overseas.

The primary focus of this priority is on bringing international students to NZ and delivering our educational offerings overseas. An element of this mix given little attention is encouraging NZ students to complete components of their educational qualifications overseas (outbound students). These students are effective ambassadors for NZ and acquire knowledge and skills of use to NZ employers. Means to facilitate such study would be a useful addition to Government initiatives.

**Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)**

Waiairiki Institute of Technology indicated that the TES should recognise the importance of staff and student exchanges. CPIT also shared this view.

There is also a need to ensure that it is two way. There needs to be both better access and more funding arrangements available for international students coming to NZ – but also NZ students getting access to international learning experience scholarships... We applaud the strategy to grow international linkages. Successful international relationships require developing a greater cross cultural understanding and this can be achieved by increasing student and staff mobility. [CPIT]

**ITP Other**

While there was general support for this priority, NZITP expressed some concern:

International education remains one such area of significant concern. We applaud the overall focus of Education NZ and its alignment to Government’s overall economic strategy, but are often frustrated at apparent tensions between these objectives and the day-to-day operations (e.g. immigration and quality assurance operations).

There is relatively little incentive or facilitation for TEOs to collaborate to ensure a ‘New Zealand Inc.’ approach; instead, individual TEOs are largely left to identify and pursue options that deliver the most benefit to them individually (rather than to New Zealand’s tertiary education system as a whole).

**Private Training Establishments (PTEs)**

Auckland Institute of Studies supported including this priority to achieve the Leadership Statement for International Education, but commented that “the current implementation of Government policy settings in this area is flawed and leading to the opposite result.” They also recommended greater coordination between NZQA and Immigration NZ to address perceived impediments in place to developing the international education sector. External Evaluation and Review quality assessment was blamed for undermining the commercial viability of large segments of the export education industry.

They also felt that the indicators of success for this priority were unbalanced and wanted inclusion of ones that mentioned “…the Leadership Statement in terms of foreign exchange earnings, international student numbers, and proportion of students continuing to work and residency pathways…”
Agribusiness Training expressed concern that when providers are expected to show their contribution to all priorities that Priority 6 would not be easily achievable for some because of the “considerable financial risks in setting up international education.”

**PTE Other**

Independent Tertiary Education New Zealand (ITENZ) supported the growth of international education as a key priority and generally believed it could add value to education provision for all New Zealanders.

ITENZ noted that of all the priorities, this was the one that had a small minority of its members disagree with. Those that disagreed were concerned that there could be a detrimental effect on education if it was seen as an exportable commodity rather than “…an intervention that grows New Zealand’s economy through developing knowledge and skills.”

Independent Tertiary Institutions (ITI) believed this to be the most important priority from their perspective and wanted to know what providers can expect from government.

**Wānanga**

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa felt that Priority 6 presented an overly narrow view of the benefits of international linkages, focusing primarily on economic gains:

> As with the other priorities in the draft TES, the focus on revenue and economic value from international students and international relationships is over stated and does not recognise that sustainable relationships need to be founded on more than revenue alone. We propose that the text within the priority more strongly identifies the cultural and social benefits that flow from international relationships.

**Adult and Community Education Organisations**

There was support for growing international linkages as a priority area for the TES among ACE organisations.

ACE Aotearoa and the ACE Sector Strategic Alliance commented that New Zealand’s ACE sector is acknowledged internationally as a high performer in delivering ACE and as such is already making a contribution to achieving this priority. Both expressed concern that this is not recognised in the draft strategy.

**Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)**

There was wide support for this priority amongst Industry Training Organisations.

NZITO commented:

> We support this priority and as a TEO have always sought co-operation / collaboration with off shore organisations that complement our activities. We believe the cross fertilisation of ideas in any of these international connections are beneficial to New Zealand.

NZ Marine commented that it welcomes this priority, and noted that:

> Licensing agreements for training and assessment resources with companion industries overseas is an area where the Government can support ITOs to assist our industries [to] excel on the world stage through international recognition of our industry training models.
ADDITIONAL OR DIFFERENT PRIORITIES

Overall

While the priorities were supported by the majority of submitters, some submitters across all parts of the sector identified issues that they considered were not adequately covered by the existing priorities. In some cases submitters suggested new priorities, while in other cases it was unclear whether the submitter was seeking a new priority or better reflection of the issue across existing priorities.

The key areas suggested for new priorities included, a priority:

- focusing on lifelong learning and continuing education, reflecting the changing demographics, and people staying longer in the workforce (this was a particularly strong theme, in submissions from ITPs, universities, ACE providers, and unions)
  - connected to this suggestion, some parts of the ACE sector suggested that a priority might be around opportunities for older people (that is, seniors) to develop new and wider skills, including in technology, so that they can participate in and contribute to the community
- relating to the 18-25 year old age group, as in the existing TES
- relating to people with disabilities
- relating to effective transitions into and progression through tertiary education – linking to feedback that there should be a priority around access
- relating to quality teaching, learning and research – linking to feedback that better professional development opportunities should be a priority
- reflecting the sector’s responsibilities to their communities and environment.

Broader feedback that might be reflected in existing priorities, or across the TES document, included suggestions that the TES might more strongly refer to:

- the impact of changing technology and digital literacy
- enhancing cultural citizenship – including language, knowledge, culture and tikanga practice
- the role of higher education institutions in delivering critical and analytical thinking, and of the role of universities as society’s critic and conscience.

Interest Groups

Student Organisations

Students’ associations commented that there were a range of other groups that should also be mentioned in the TES. Auckland University Students’ Association and New Zealand Union of Student Association (NZUSA) both identified, in order of importance, the need to include students with disabilities, students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, and students from refugee backgrounds. The Otago University Students’ Association also identified queer students as a group requiring mention within the TES.

NZUSA suggested increased funding for language courses, commenting that the need for this “has been identified every time there has been a review of cost categories”.

Victoria University of Wellington Students’ Association commented that it would like to see both quality and access as strategic priorities in the TES.


**Unions**

The Tertiary Education Union commented that the priority areas outlined in the draft TES address economic goals for the sector but fail to address other legislated goals around society, the environment, and the development aspirations of Māori and other population groups. As such, the TEU said it would like to see the draft strategy include additional priorities that focus on:

... the sector’s responsibilities to our communities and environment, that ensure we retain a broad base for teaching, learning and research, and that we prioritise lifelong learning. In addition, the strategy needs to make clear connections with other strategies, such as those relating to gender equity, persons with disabilities, ethnic minorities, low-income whānau/families and so forth. A greater focus on social goals other than purely economic ones will enhance the effectiveness of the strategy and the sector.

The CTU identified a number of changes it would like to see in the TES, including some additional and different priorities:

- a strong role for community centred education and more emphasis on lifelong learning
- Support for community education, including a review of the funding of community education
- stronger connections between tertiary education organisations and the communities they serve, and the value they have to offer
- better acknowledgement of the role of other tertiary education stakeholders
- better acknowledgement of the role that higher education institutions have in delivering critical and analytical thinking and the importance of universities “critic and conscience role” in society.

**Other Peak Bodies and Groups**

The New Zealand Association for Cooperative Education commented that there is currently “a lack of clear pathways for research careers” in cooperative, work-integrated, vocational education, with impacts on students, providers and business.

Work-integrated learning can be the catalyst for students to move into research careers for business and innovation development.

**Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups**

**Universities**

The Universities of Auckland, Canterbury, Lincoln, and Otago did not suggest any additional or different priorities for the TES.

Massey University supported the priorities identified in the draft TES but also outlined additional areas that they felt were not adequately addressed in the TES. These related to the impacts of changing demographics and technological change on tertiary education.

The draft strategy does not fully address the issue of changing demographics (e.g. new migrant needs) and people working longer in their lives, and having multiple career changes throughout their working lives. There is a strong focus on supplying young, industry-ready graduates to the labour market, but the lifelong learning and continuing education aspects of tertiary education, which have societal benefits, are not present in this strategy.
Incorporating new technologies, new methodology driven by these changes and ensuring that the provision of education in New Zealand and our learning systems are on par with what is required for educational providers of the 21st century should be a tertiary education strategy priority on its own.

Massey also commented that the indicators for success identified in the strategy required further work “to ensure they are fit for purpose and to ensure that any additional compliance cost for the sector is justified”.

The Auckland University of Technology supported the proposed priorities with some modifications, as outlined in previous sections. However, they suggested that the priorities could be “framed to acknowledge the on-going sustainability of the New Zealand tertiary sector and its wider contribution to New Zealand’s success”.

Victoria University commented that they would like to see the reinstatement of the priority learner category of 18-25 year olds, included in the Tertiary Education Strategy 2010-2015 but omitted from the new draft TES.

The emphasis elsewhere in the document on getting at-risk young people into a career and on developing better pathways from unemployment into the tertiary sector makes clear that there is still much to be achieved in relation to this age group, and the draft makes no argument as to why this priority has been omitted.

The University of Auckland noted that the previous TES included students with disabilities as a priority group, and argued that in order to achieve the long-term strategic aim of improving outcomes for all, “the TES needs to provide for investment in meeting the needs of a broad range of equity groups”.

Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs) Other

NZITP wanted greater attention paid in the TES to encouraging closer collaboration with regional and sector industry groups, including a specific attention on fit-for-purpose vocation education and integration of applied research, and on up-skilling and re-skilling people through their working lives.

Private Training Establishments (PTEs)

Tectra Ltd suggested “better professional development opportunities” claiming that for smaller institutions a change of staff or funding requirements impacted heavily.

Wānanga

Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi (TWoA), commented that they would like to see the concept of enhancing Cultural Citizenship (including language, knowledge, culture and Tikanga practice) acknowledged in the TES. This was viewed as important for connecting policies such as The Māori Education Strategy, Ka Hikitia, to the TES.

TWoA also noted that the TES should take a broader view of education for Māori.

Education for Māori needs to be more rounded and it should not only provide skills for work, but also fit Māori learners for their cultural context.

Adult and Community Education Organisations (ACE)

Some ACE submitters identified supporting life-long learning as an additional priority area for the TES. For example:
Life long learning – this contributes to social cohesion, encourages healthy communities, and supports the challenges of workplace and social change.

[Community Learning Association through Schools]

REAP Aotearoa New Zealand, the national body for Rural Education Activities programmes operating in New Zealand, expressed concern that the draft strategy failed to include mention of digital and online skills.

REAPANZ believes strongly that the provision of digital literacy and applied technology should continue to feature as a priority area for tertiary learning. Being able to make best use of ‘our existing modes and means of delivery – including new and emerging technologies’, as stated in the Minister’s Forward, is critical for rural communities where learning can be isolated and infrastructure for access limited.

Submissions from the Federation of SeniorNet Societies, SeniorNet Wellington, SeniorNet Mac and SeniorNet Bream Bay all wanted to see an additional priority area in the TES acknowledging the need to upskill older New Zealanders. More specifically, SeniorNet groups want the TES to support opportunities for older people to develop new and wider skills, including computer and technology skills, so that they can more effectively participate in and contribute to the community. This aligned with feedback from Grey Power.

**Cross Sector Submissions**

Ako Aotearoa felt that the strategy should place greater emphasis on issues relating to transition into and progression through tertiary education. They acknowledged that it is referred to in various parts of the draft (particularly in priority 2) but considered that this did not adequately represent the importance of this issue and its multifaceted nature.

[Transition] includes a variety of aspects, such as:

- Better collaboration and/or integration between tertiary and secondary education sectors.
- Young people are able to develop effective career management competencies.
- Ensuring that qualifications and programmes are ‘purposeful’.
- Good systems exist for supporting learners’ transition into tertiary education, particularly for those who have little prior educational success.
SYSTEM EXPECTATIONS

Submitters were asked to comment on the roles and expectations for tertiary education organisations, industry and students, as outlined in the draft tertiary education strategy.

Overall

Feedback on this section was mixed. Some groups were generally happy with the section, while others had substantial concerns. Many providers had recommendations for changes to their articulated role within the section.

However, even within groups, feedback could be mixed. For example, some universities identified substantial concerns with the system expectations section, while others did not comment. By comparison, Victoria University indicated broad agreement while suggesting that the role of schools in preparing students for tertiary study should be identified.

The key concerns identified were that:

- the section as a whole did not reflect the outcome-focused approach of the strategy, in particularly because of the hierarchical approach to describing the sector and the compartmentalisation of different parts of the sector into different roles
- some institutions considered their role was inappropriately represented – this message was particularly strong in relation to:
  - universities, some of which (along with students’ associations) felt that the TES as a whole needed to better reflect the distinctive and unique role of universities within New Zealand society and the tertiary education system – Otago University suggested that a separate strategy might be required for universities
  - ITPs, who considered that the role description of ITPs was restrictive and did not recognise their role across all levels of delivery and in all areas
  - ITOs, who considered that skills leadership should be joint between ITOs and government
- there was insufficient detail – including in relation to how performance would be measured, and what funding would support achievement of the expectations.

Business

The majority of submitters supported the intent of this section, although there was concern that the TES was too heavily focused on tertiary education providers and inputs and outputs:

*Employers have a whole-of-workforce view of the skills requirements of their workforce that does not focus exclusively on tertiary level attainments. [Christchurch Manufacturing Workforce Steering Group]*

*This section of the Strategy is too focused on inputs and outputs. A true outcome focused system will require more diverse information, including some meaningful benchmarking both domestically and against international best practice.*

[BusinessNZ]

Callaghan Innovation also commented that the narrative of this section is unclear: “unclear in this section whether ‘graduates’ [includes] international students or not. The discussion in several places on the recovery from the Christchurch earthquake and financial crisis, seem unnecessarily short term issues in the context of a long-term strategy and there is a risk that the strategy will go out of date in a year or two.”
Interest Groups and Individuals

Student Organisations
The New Zealand Union of Students’ Associations (NZUSA) expressed concern with the Delivering the Strategy section of the draft TES, in particular because of its lack of reflection of student voice. They commented that New Zealand’s description of the system “should follow the leadership of Australia, Scotland and England in declaring that the tertiary system should be student-centred and that its performance could be best enhanced by a focus on developing and incorporating the student voice into all aspects of system delivery”.

NZUSA agreed with the representation of system responsibilities in relation to te reo Māori, tikanga Māori and mātauranga Māori, but were concerned with changes to the definitions of roles across sub-sectors. In particular, they considered that:

- requiring universities to be measured against achievement of good employment outcomes “is inappropriate … when so much of the responsibility for this lies elsewhere” (including over-supply where the government is “funder, educator and employer”)
- universities’ role of “acting as critic and conscience” should be identified
- wānanga should be recognised as having a leadership role in relation to, but not own, mātauranga Māori
- ITPs may still have a responsibility in relation to applied research
- PTEs being identified as “contributing to ‘competitive innovation’” may not reflect the fact that all TEOs “should be being charged with being innovative in their research, and teaching, including in ways of delivery.”

Otago University Students’ Association also commented that they would like to see the role of universities more directly reference the Education Act and their role as critic and conscience. They want the focus to be on developing intellectual independence not skills.

... this critic and conscience role is so fundamental to the operation and role of a university in a western democracy, and so intertwined with the equally important concept of academic freedom, that it really requires explicit expression. [OUSA]

Unions
The Tertiary Education Union commented that some of the proposed focus areas and priorities outlined in the draft TES may not work to achieve the improvements in the areas of access, achievement and participation being sought by the Government. It suggested that these issues need to be addressed “if the strategy and the sector are to meet the full range of requirements and expectations for tertiary education.”

Individuals
There was limited feedback from individuals on this section. There was a concern that higher level qualifications were being overvalued and might discourage young people from entering industries that didn’t require high level qualifications.

Tertiary Sector and Associated Groups

Universities
Some universities provided strong feedback throughout their submissions that the draft strategy should acknowledge the key and distinctive role of universities in achieving the goals of the TES.
We recognise that the draft strategy is inclusive of all sub-sectors of tertiary education, and that universities are only one group within these, however, the distinctive role that universities can play in this space could be strengthened. For example, universities have a key leadership role in enhancing New Zealand’s international competitiveness and relationships. [The University of Waikato]

The TES must acknowledge the distinctive contribution of research universities in achieving the TES. [The University of Auckland]

The University of Waikato also made this point specifically in relation to the focus area ‘to support business and innovation through development of relevant skills and research’. Universities play a crucial role in the innovation system through the development of skills, research and knowledge and technology transfer. This contribution to the innovation system needs to be highlighted as differentiating universities from the other TEO sub-sectors. [The University of Waikato]

The University of Otago proposed that “a separate strategy be developed specific to universities, consistent with the range of factors that make them unique within an otherwise strongly vocationally-focused tertiary sector”.

More specifically in relation to the “Delivering the Strategy” section of the TES, the Universities of Auckland, Otago, Waikato and the Auckland University of Technology made the point that they wanted acknowledgement of the distinctive contribution of the university sector in the draft TES. For example:

The draft TES does not acknowledge the distinctive contribution of each sub-sector to New Zealand’s tertiary education system. As a result, the Delivering the Strategy section sets up artificial divisions between the sub-sectors where, in actuality, universities for example, significantly contribute to TES priorities other than Priority 5 (and particularly Priority 1). Universities deliver the largest number of EFTS of the entire tertiary sector; any changes to policy or funding for teaching and learning will have an immediate impact. [AUT]

AUT also felt that the system expectations section lacked clarity and sufficient detail.

It is important to note that the order and assignment of the Priorities does not align with the roles and responsibilities of each sub-sector, as outlined on page 21. For universities, the production of graduates with good employment outcomes is placed ahead of research and stakeholder engagement. The responsibilities outlined also differ from those presented in the Education Act (1989). In comparison with the relatively narrow view presented in the draft TES, the Act describes the primary aims of universities as intellectual independence, being a repository of knowledge and expertise, and acting as the critic and conscience of society; and that a university is characterised by a wide diversity of teaching and research, especially at a higher level, that maintains, advances, disseminates, and assists the application of, knowledge, develops intellectual independence, and promotes community learning. These roles must be acknowledged within the TES.

Victoria University commented that they fully support the system expectations outlined in the draft TES, but would have liked to see some mention of the role of primary and secondary education in achieving the goals of the strategy.

It would have been helpful if these sub-sectoral expectation statements had led to some articulation in the document of the crucial importance of good preparation at primary and secondary level to achieving the goals of the Strategy.
The University of Otago and University of Waikato voiced some concerns about how performance is measured. The University of Otago commented that pure number increase measures may not be appropriate if they reflect broader demographic change, while the University of Waikato stated that:

*it continues to be important that performance is measured not only by qualification rates, but also by factors such as the profiles of graduates. Similarly, measures of research performance need to take into account quality as well as broader notions of value and benefit for the longer term, whether from an economic, social, cultural, or other perspective.*

The University of Canterbury, Massey University and Lincoln University did not comment on system expectations as outlined in the draft TES.

**University Other**

Te Tumu agreed with the roles/expectations for tertiary education organisations, providers, industry, and students, as outlined in the draft strategy.

The Massey University Council felt that there was “a lack of clarity around the role and expectations of the various types of institutions in the sector”.

**Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)**

All the ITPs that provided submissions disagreed with the role description of ITPs. They expressed concern over the ‘restrictions’ that were being placed on their provision and saw the table and descriptions as an unwelcome reintroduction of a hierarchy of provision. Many submitters indicated that ITPs play an important role in Levels 1-3, Level 7, and research – for example, Western Institute of Technology expressed a need for the TES to acknowledge that there are many professional vocational qualifications (teaching, nursing, and social work) that ITPs offer at degree level and above.

Manukau Institute of Technology suggested that a further point be added to the role description table for ITPs, relating to “research and technology transfer to business, foundation education and relevant higher education.” MIT also commented that care needs to be taken and the draft strategy amended to record the desire to ensure the “system is simple and not overly bureaucratic.”

Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec) agreed generally with the TES but had strong concerns about the descriptions of roles. It considered that the presentation of this section might suggest “reappearance… of the notion of a ‘hierarchy’ of tertiary education institutions”. As Wintec commented:

*In the past, there has been a clear recognition by government that the universities and ITPs are best regarded as “parallel” systems within New Zealand; both bringing their styles and features which allow various choices for students.*

Unitec noted that “inter-and-intra sector regional collaboration is only included as a role for ITPs and needs to be more widely focused.”

**ITP Other**

These groups also strongly disagreed with the role description of ITPs as currently outlined in the draft strategy. NZITP comment that the “linear and hierarchic structure and operating mode” implied by the draft TES is “at odds with the needs of accessible learning pathways”, including movement between work and tertiary education. The Metro Group commented that there should be no institutional hierarchy, as this:
implies that students will be starting at the bottom and might eventually work their way to the top. This just doesn’t happen in the tertiary education sector... Most students go to just one tertiary institute – whether it be a University, an ITP, a PTE or a Wananga. These institutions deliver specific outcomes for their students and all sit at the top of the education ladder.

NZITP commented that the specification of roles within the TES “perpetuates a policy emphasis on who is allowed to do what’, whereas there is a much greater need to focus on ‘who is best placed to meet needs for different groups’”.

Metro suggested that three further bullet points be added to the roles table:

- Provide a wide range of research-led degree and postgraduate education that is of international quality and delivers excellent employment outcomes.
- Undertake excellent research in a broad range of fields
- Engage with external stakeholders in the dissemination and application of knowledge and promoting learning.

NZITP recommended the section should reflect expectations that tertiary education “actively encourage closer collaboration with regional and sector industry groups, including a specific attention on fit-for-purpose vocation education and integration of applied research”.

NZITP also commented that the differentiation of TEOs appears to be largely on the basis of level of education provided “whereas different pedagogies provide a much more meaningful basis for differentiation”.

For ITPs, a distinctive pedagogy based on accessibility, strong tutor support, applied orientation and ‘proximity’ to work is directly links skill acquisition, innovation and knowledge transfer to the needs of business (and other employers) and facilitate efficient pathways to employment. This distinctive pedagogy applies across a wide range of learning (e.g. Level 2 to Level 9+) and underpins the choice made by more New Zealanders to study at ITPs than at any other class of TEO.

Private Training Establishments (PTEs)

Tectra Ltd thought the system expectations were not really defined enough and wanted to know where the data was and will MBIE collect information about new graduates in work or do the TEOs have to monitor this.

Wānanga

Te Wānanga o Aotearoa supported the direction in the draft strategy that all parts of the system must support Māori learners, mātauranga Māori and rangahau from a mātauranga Māori context. However, they proposed that this direction “be embedded in the text which discusses roles” across all TEO types.

Adult and Community Education Organisations

REAP Aotearoa New Zealand commented that in their view expectations for ACE providers, particular those in less urban areas, are quite high, and would like to see this acknowledged in funding.

The Draft TES should recognise in its funding mechanisms the higher levels of resources required on engaging at-risk groups, reaching hard-to-reach learners and sustaining support for community learners where isolation, low socio-economic realities and high cultural needs require sustained and flexible engagement.
Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)

NZITO questioned the nature of the skills leadership role suggested for ITOs. They commented that the first bullet point in the role of ITOs “would appear to reflect a skills leadership role that will not be a function for ITOs” once the Industry Training and Apprenticeships Amendment Bill is passed into legislation. They considered that this was a role that government would share, and that government intervention might be needed “to assist industries that do not have the capability for skills leadership and also include non-industry and government stakeholders.”

The ITF commented that division of tertiary education into four levels (higher education, vocational education, foundation education, and community education) was rigid and not outcome focused. They considered that the systems expectation section should be expanded to identify government’s role in supporting the strategy.

Cross Sector Submissions

The joint submission provided by the Metro Group, ITF and NZITP reflected the themes noted in the ITP submissions. In general, this submission commented that the draft “fails to carry through the outcomes perspective to the section on delivering the strategy,” and “compartmentalises” delivery in a way that “is the antithesis of what is actually required to deliver a more demand-driven, outcomes-based tertiary education system.” Their submission states that:

A tertiary system that is outcome focused will also be more focussed on the needs of individual learners and businesses, thus challenging the confines of the view of four main levels of education and the types of TEO presented in the Draft TES.
OTHER COMMENTS

While much of the feedback on the draft TES was provided specifically in relation to the draft strategy, submitters also provided broader feedback on issues around the strategy, or in relation to the general tone of the document. These responses have been incorporated in each section, where relevant. Comments which do not fit elsewhere in this summary have been summarised below.

Alternative or Additional Strategies Needed

The Tertiary Education Union appended to their submission their recently published document *Te Kaupapa Whaioranga: the blueprint for tertiary education*, which supports and expands on a number of the points made in their submission. The TEU describes the purpose of the document as follows:

*Te Kaupapa Whaioranga* sets a new direction for the tertiary education sector, one that seeks to rebuild the sector using five principles that focus on the wellbeing of the sector as a whole – staff and students, management and governance. *Te Kaupapa Whaioranga* also challenges each of us as citizens of Aotearoa New Zealand to reclaim tertiary education as a public good – the system belongs to all of us, we all contribute to it, we are all responsible for it, therefore we all have an interest in the decisions that are made for it. *Te Kaupapa Whaioranga* proposes a series of steps to implement the changes we believe are necessary for the total wellbeing of the sector. Some of these proposals require further investment in the system. We believe such an investment is vital if we are to have a sector that is accessible to all who wish to participate in tertiary education.

Some universities and the Otago University Students’ Association (OUSA) recommended that there be a separate strategy specific to universities – OUSA commented that this would reflect their uniqueness within a sector that is “otherwise strongly vocationally-focused.” This also reflects the theme identified across universities feedback, that the role of universities be more strongly represented within the TES.

Need for Joined up Government

A number of submitters, particularly in the ITP sector, identified issues with the intersection between tertiary education and government agencies. For example, Western Institute of Technology commented about the importance of working with Immigration NZ to improve access.

Unitec expressed expectations about how the tertiary education focused public sector could better service TEOs and TEIs. These included making information and data more available and useful, having clear contact information across agencies, having more explicit expectations and clearer incentives for collaboration and cooperation between and beyond the sector, and improving certainty of funding.

UCOL commented about the important role played by other agencies (eg NZQA and Studylink) not being reflecting in the “Delivering the Strategy” section of the TES. This point was also made by NZITP, who commented that government agencies’ roles should be stated, as their “collective actions have an enormous influence on the effectiveness of TEOs themselves”. UCOL also commented that engagement with these agencies can help to engage students in study (particularly at-risk students struggling with Studylink processes), but that resourcing can limit the assistance that agencies are able to provide.
The Metro Group of ITPs commented, in the context of Education New Zealand’s work on international education, that while having a single Minister responsible helps “policy coherence”, more coherence is needed.

This feedback, while strongly represented within the ITP sector, was also reflected by others.

_The real challenge is how the various operational systems and policy decisions will support or hinder the ability for the sector to implement the strategy_. [Primary ITO]

In the PTE sector, Tectra Ltd commented about the inconsistency of TEC requiring PTEs to show innovation, share resources and develop better relations with each other yet reducing opportunities to sub-contract.

The New Zealand Defence Force also identified this issue, particularly with regard to tertiary education agencies. They commented that students are “struggling to make meaning out of a system that is fraught with confusing choices (of qualifications and providers) with duplication remaining at every level and the document does not address this”.

**Funding**

A number of submitters commented that, to achieve the outcomes sought, the draft TES would need to be supported by the way funding is provided. In some cases mismatches were identified – for example, NZITO commented that current funding mechanisms encourage providers to be self-interested rather than collaborative and cooperative.

_One of the issues with the draft TES in general is that the funding models do not always match with the strategic outcomes sought – and they need to. This needs to be more explicitly addressed in the TES._ [CPIT]

ITI commented that there was a tension between the TES seeking to increase participation given the capped funding environment.

**Education Delivery**

LEARNPLUS Ltd and McZoom Ltd felt that the way NZQA assessments and programmes are designed broke skills and competencies down into too smaller parts and many PTEs lacked the knowledge or resources to provide a fully integrated teaching experience.

**Suggestions for improvement**

Some of the more specific feedback received in relation to the TES identified particular initiatives that some submitters considered would improve the operation of the tertiary education system. These suggestions included:

- Business NZ recommended that the final TES give more thought to “promoting and/or removing barriers between TEOs, policy makers, funders and industry/employers”, as a way of supporting development of skills, knowledge and research to support business and innovation.
- CERA suggested that an extra indicator be added to the international linkages priority – “international students consider greater Christchurch a desirable destination for study”.
- Federated Farmers recommended funding for forums to improve students’ contacts with industry, and for students to undertake industry training programmes, as a way of producing graduate suitable for industry.
- An employer recommended that basic financial education in Level 1 courses could be an important way to connect the tertiary education system with business and the economy.
- An individual recommend the establishment of a National Careers Development Strategy which has a cross-sectoral approach.
SUBMISSIONS
Consultation ran from 2 October to 15 November 2013. A total of 167 written submissions were received from:

- **Business**
  1. Aviation New Zealand
  2. Biodirectionz
  3. Business Central
  4. BusinessNZ
  5. Callaghan Innovation
  6. Christchurch Manufacturing Workforce Steering Group
  7. Employers and Manufacturers Association
  8. Ernslaw One Ltd
  9. Federated Farmers
  11. Game User Research Ltd
  12. Mighty River Power
  13. Moffat Ltd
  14. Motor Trade Association
  15. Rayonier Matariki Forests
  16. ReGear Learning
  17. Resene Paints
  18. SIBA New Zealand
  19. Smart Growth and Priority One
  20. Tait Communications
  21. Taranaki Pine
  22. Tenon Manufacturing
  23. Toyota
  24. Transpower
  25. Volcanic Plateau Logging

- **Council and Government Agencies**
  1. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)
  2. Comet Auckland
  3. Human Rights Commission
  4. Land Information New Zealand (LINZ)
  6. Office of the Prime Minister’s Science Advisory Committee

- **Iwi**
  1. Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua

- **Student Organisations**
  1. Auckland University Students’ Association (AUSA)
  2. New Zealand Union of Students’ Association (NZUSA)
  3. Otago University Students’ Association (OUSA)
  4. Te Mana Ākonga
  5. Victoria University Wellington Students’ Association (VUWSA)
- **Unions**
  1. NZ Council of Trade Unions (CTU)
  2. Tertiary Education Union (TEU)

- **Other Peak Bodies and Groups**
  1. Age Concern New Zealand
  2. Australasian Campuses Towards Sustainability
  3. ChangeMakers Refugee Forum
  4. Early Childhood Council
  5. Emerge Supported Employment Trust
  6. Grey Power NZ
  7. New Zealand Association for Cooperative Education
  8. NZ Playcentre Federation
  9. NZ Red Cross / Refugee Services
  10. Research and Education Advanced Network
  11. The NZ Biotech Association (NZBIO)
  12. Tikanga Māori Governance Group

- **Individuals [39]**

- **Universities**
  1. Auckland University of Technology (AUT)
  2. Lincoln University
  3. Massey University
  4. University of Auckland
  5. University of Canterbury
  6. University of Otago
  7. University of Waikato
  8. Victoria University of Wellington

- **University other**
  1. Massey University Council
  2. Te Poutama Māori (Māori Academic Staff Collective), University of Otago
  3. Te Tumu, School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies (Otago)
  4. Universities New Zealand
  5. University Careers Association of New Zealand

- **Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs)**
  1. Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology (CPIT)
  2. Manakau Institute of Technology
  3. Open Polytechnic
  4. Otago Polytechnic
  5. Unitech
  6. Universal College of Learning (UCOL)
  7. Waiairiki Institute of Technology
  8. Waikato Institute of Technology (WINTEC)
  9. Wellington Institute of Technology and Whitireia Community Polytechnic (joint sub)
  10. Western Institute of Technology at Taranaki
• **ITP Other**
  1. Industry Training Federation (ITF)
  2. Metro Group (ITPs)
  3. NZITP

• **Private Training Establishments (PTEs)**
  1. Adult Literacy Education and Consulting (ALEC) Limited
  2. Agribusiness Training Ltd
  3. Ashton Warner Nanny Academy
  4. Auckland Institute of Studies
  5. English Language Partners New Zealand
  6. Enrich +
  7. High Tech Youth Network
  8. Intueri Education Group
  9. LearnPlus Ltd and McZoom Ltd
  10. Matapuna Training Centre
  11. Medical Research Institute of New Zealand
  12. NZ Management Academies
  13. NZ School of Dance
  14. Tachelle Training Services 2001 Ltd
  15. Te Kura Motuhake o Te Ataarangi Inc
  16. Tectra Ltd
  17. Vet Nurse Plus
  18. Waikato Aero Club

• **PTE Other**
  1. Independent Tertiary Education New Zealand (ITENZ)
  2. Independent Tertiary Institutions (ITI)

• **Wānanga**
  1. Te Wānanga o Aotearoa
  2. Te Wānanga o Raukawa
  3. Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi

• **Adult and Community Education Organisations (ACE)**
  1. ACE Sector Strategic Alliance
  2. Adult and Community Education Aotearoa
  3. Community Learning Association in Schools
  4. Kapiti WEA
  5. Literacy Aotearoa
  6. Pasifika Education Centre
  7. REAP Aotearoa New Zealand
  8. SeniorNet Bream Bay
  9. SeniorNet Federation
  10. SeniorNet Mac
  11. SeniorNet Wellington
- **Government Training Establishment (GTE)**
  1. New Zealand Defence College

- **Industry Training Organisations (ITOs)**
  1. Competenz
  2. NZ Marine Industry Training Organisation
  3. NZITO
  4. Primary ITO

- **Cross Sector Submissions**
  1. Ako Aotearoa
  2. Metro Group, ITF, and NZITP (joint submission)

Eleven submissions did not provide identifying information and therefore could not be categorised by respondent type. These submissions were analysed collectively and the feedback included in the summary report as appropriate.