

NZWG Submission to the NZ Qualifications Authority

Simplifying New Zealand Qualifications & Other Credentials

PROPOSAL ONE:

Consultation question 1.1: Under proposal 1, do you support Option A (implementing the current legislative settings) or Option B (further simplification) or another option? Please tell us the reasons for your response.

NZWG supports Option A – this has been through the consultation process of RoVE, and for the Creative sector meets the needs without further legislative change. Additionally, any new programmes develop for qualification achievement will have to be considered and endorsed by WDC, reiterating the valuable work that has already been done in setting up these councils.

Consultation question 1.2: For Option A, are there improvements that could be made, or issues that need to be addressed?

Option A best supports the intended purpose of this reform. As any new programmes will need to be approved by the WDC, the cost of programme development will be borne by the provider with no guarantee of such approval. A simpler approval process could be put in place – based on an outline of the programme submitted in advance of the full development for example – to avoid additional costs.

Consultation question 1.3: For Option B, do you have any comments about how the WDCs and providers could collaborate on a ‘national curriculum’ (or core content) for specification in the qualification?

The costs and ‘time to market’ for such collaborations would be prohibitive and seems more suited to other industries than the creative sector. The ‘across the board’ approach to a set national curriculum is not conducive to creative thought and productivity. The nature of work and broad cross section of different disciplines and skills in the creative sectors mean a one size fits all approach is too restrictive.

Consultation question 1.4: For Option B, do you have any comment on how this option may work for non-WDC developed New Zealand qualifications at levels 1 – 7 on the NZQF (e.g. those developed by NZQA, regulatory bodies, government training establishments, and providers)?

Given the many sector specific changes that are currently in process this would seem to add an additional layer of complication, with potentially a lack of broad creative sector oversight.

Consultation question: 1.5: For Option B, what would the impact be on your organisation?

The impact would be negative, additional time and resources dedicated to engaging members and advocating for the training needs within the screen sector. Advocacy through consultation and

working groups feeding into the WDC, requires many additional resources, that are not currently budgeted for, to meaningfully engage.

Consultation question 1.6: For Option B, what do you see as the implementation challenges?

To implement such fundamental change, providers would have to invest time and money into a system that is unwieldy at best, and slow to change. This would be further complicated by the requirement of industry, providers and WDCs working together.

Consultation question 1.7: What other impacts do you foresee arising from Option B? Impacts could be on tertiary learners, school students, providers (including universities, wānanga, Te Pūkenga, PTEs, and schools), industry, and communities. How could these impacts be measured?

The impact of Option B would not be measurable for years, due to a combination of slow implementation and a further delay to the 'real world' industry effects after completion of the education process.

Consultation question 1.8: For Option B, do you anticipate any risks? If so, please describe.

Yes, pushback from providers if their current programme is made obsolete and push back from the industries they support. Lack of time and resources from industry to engage in development. Challenge of providers and WDCs to work together (time, resources, differing views).

Consultation question 1.9: For Option B, do you anticipate any costs? If so, please describe.

Yes, there would be significant costs in developing a 'national curriculum' for each qualification. The least of which would be the amount of time involved. This would be an entire system change.

Consultation question 1.10: How could the system encourage greater collaboration by providers? (e.g. developing shared teaching and learning resources for use by all).

Financial and administration support to ensure that providers are encouraged to work together to develop changes rather than compete. This could be through shared resource or even shared locations.

Consultation question 1.11: Do you have anything else you would like to say about this proposal?

NZWG Support Option A. Providing the necessary flexibility to adapt to future needs and maintaining WDC and NZQA oversight.

PROPOSAL 2:

Consultation question 2.1: Do you support replacing training schemes with micro-credentials? Please give us the reasons for your response.

NZWG support a multi model approach, not a “one or the other” approach. The creative sector requires both training schemes AND micro-credentials to assist in training and education from emerging to mid-career practitioners. Retraining and learning new skills progress careers in the creative sectors, and due to the needs of the different sector disciplines, this will require different educational models.

Consultation question 2.2: What impacts do you foresee for your organisation arising from the proposed changes?

This will have a positive impact for screenwriters, as they may have an opportunity to access officially recognised and supported training, which translates to career opportunities. That is a positive for our membership.

What impacts do you foresee for others arising from the proposed changes?

This could include consideration of impacts on industry, communities, iwi/hapū, tertiary learners, school students, providers, including universities, wānanga, Te Pūkenga, PTEs, schools.

Currently creative industries are inconsistently covered by vocational education. For example, screenwriters are not covered by any supported training schemes. There will be a mix of impacts depending on current offerings available.

Consultation question 2.3: Do you anticipate any risks associated with replacing training schemes with micro credentials? If so, please describe.

NZWG believe there should be a multi-model approach to vocational education, and there should be space for both training schemes AND micro-credentials. Without different models, the risk is what we see in the creative industry not, underserving certain learners and craft specialties.

Consultation question 2.4: Are there any costs, associated with this proposal, that have not been anticipated? If so, please describe.

The costs appear to be primarily consultation and legislation changes.

Consultation question 2.5: Do you have anything else you would like to say in relation to training schemes and micro-credentials?

NZWG support a multi-model approach.

PROPOSAL 3

Consultation question 3.1: Do you support further legislative change separating approval from accreditation of micro-credentials, which will enable WDCs to develop micro-credentials for use by providers?

NZWG prefer Proposal One, but do not oppose WDCs being able to develop their own micro-credentials. If this does not restrict providers from developing and seeking accreditation on their own micro-credentials.

Consultation question 3.2: What impacts do you foresee for your organisation and others arising from the proposed changes? This may include the impact for tertiary learners, school students, wānanga, schools, providers, universities, industry, and communities, including iwi and hapū.

The ability for the CCR&T WDC to engage with stakeholders and develop relevant training and curriculum for future learners. Creative has not had an ITO in the past, so this could be a welcome change.

Because the CCR & T WDC is so broad, it will be a challenge for them to develop credentials that specifically cater to the needs of each industry and discipline that fall under their umbrella. Because of this, it may be more efficient for providers in these coverage areas to create micro-credentials, then seek WDC endorsement.

Consultation question 3.3: Do you think non-providers (e.g. WDCs) should be able to seek NZQA approval of micro-credentials for providers to deliver (subject to NZQA accreditation)?

NZWG not oppose WDCs developing micro-credentials, as this allows for more flexibility when required. Should not be a priority for WDCs. Governance should be their priority. Developing the right training and qualifications should be, in most cases, done by the provider with consultation with industry and sector.

Consultation question 3.4: Do you anticipate any risks with proposal 3?

This proposal's intention is to make things more efficient, but WDCs creating micro-credentials creates more work for the WDC. This is particularly true for the CCR&T WDC, which covers a broad range of disciplines and sectors that have very different needs.

Consultation question 3.5: Are there any costs, associated with this proposal, that have not been anticipated? If so, please describe.

Yes, costly consultation costs. Providers seeking endorsement from WDCs, then the qualification getting endorsed by NZQA, streamlines the process, and better caters to the needs of industry and learners, which is why NZWG support Proposal 1, Option A. It is my understanding that WDCs can already develop qualifications, so, is legislative change and a change in wording required?

Consultation question 3.6: Do you have any comments on how micro-credentials could play a greater role in supporting the intent of RoVE?

Micro-credential will allow for more flexibility, and the ability to adapt to future needs. And matches the creative industries needs of multi-disciplined artists, creators, and practitioners.

As the CCR&T WDC covers such a broad range of industries and disciplines, it should not be a mandate of the WDCs to develop micro-credentials. This should primarily be done by providers, who will, by design, have more specific knowledge of the requirements of their field. Especially as, in the creative sector, many educators are also working in the industry themselves. And currently under RoVE, WDCs can already develop qualifications for NZQA approval. Unsure why this change is required.

Consultation question 3.7: Do you have anything else you would like to say in relation to training schemes and micro-credentials?

Here NZWG quote the WeCreate submission, as it captures the NZWG perspective well:

“The creative sector is complex and diverse, and career pathways within the sector encompass both those employing their creative skills and talent, and those who support creatives to realise their work (in service, administrative or technical roles). Skills required range from the very hands-on to the very high-tech, and creative people often work in teams.”

AND

“From a sectoral perspective we feel that it is premature to make a final decision on how qualifications and other credentials are developed for the creative sector without greater industry consultation, and prior to the CCR&T WDC being established and gaining the confidence of the sector. Our fourteen creative and cultural sectors (and their sub-sectors), have not historically had a centralised connection to the tertiary education system (such as an ITO) which can be drawn on for evidence and analysis. A ‘one-size fits all’ system which is not swift to adapt and evolve will not be fit-for-purpose for vocational education in our sector.”

NZWG Officially submitted through the NZQA website June 2021: <https://www.tec.govt.nz/news-and-consultations/simplifying-nz-qualifications/>

Links to the proposals: <https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/assets/Providers-and-partners/RoVE/RoVE-NZQA-Consultation-Doc-FINAL-Digital.pdf>