



Finalising the design of the integrated quality assurance framework (iQAF) - Summary of submissions October 2025

NZQA

Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive summary	4
Purpose of this document.....	5
Introduction.....	5
Public consultation process.....	6
Who we heard from.....	6
How we analysed the submissions.....	7
Summary of submissions	8
Question 1. Do you agree with the proposals to simplify approval and accreditation processes? If not, what would you change?	8
Question 2. Do you agree with the proposed self-review process? If not, what would you change?	8
Question 3. Do you agree with the proposed approach to monitoring degrees, graduate certificates and diplomas, and postgraduate qualifications? If not, what would you change?.....	9
Question 4. Do you agree with the proposed approach to monitoring programmes leading to sub-degree qualifications at Levels 1-7? If not, what would you change?	10
Question 5. Do you agree with the proposed approach to monitoring micro-credentials? If not, what would you change?	11
Question 6. Do you think the combination of compliance monitoring and education performance monitoring will provide sufficient assurance of an organisation's overall capability to deliver high-quality education? If not, what would you change?	12
Question 7. Do you have any comments or suggestions for the proposed changes to review periods for qualifications, micro-credentials and standards?	12
Question 8. Do you have any comments or suggestions for the proposed Rule changes to support streamlining approval processes?	13
Question 9. Do you have any comments or suggestions for the proposed Rule changes to specify the nature and frequency of monitoring activities?	14
Question 10. Do you have any comments or suggestions in relation to the purpose or scope of the Quality Assurance Rules?.....	14
Question 11. Do you have any comments or suggestions in relation to consequential changes to the Private Training Establishment Registration Rules?.....	15

Question 12. Do you have any suggestions for matters NZQA needs to consider in Rules for ISBs?	15
Question 13. Do you have any suggestions for matters NZQA needs to consider in Rules for WBT?	16
Question 14. Do you agree with the proposal to increase the student fees exemption to \$1000 (GST inc)? If not, please provide your reasons.....	16
Additional comments:	17
Consultation outcomes and Next steps	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In August 2025, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) released a consultation document, [*Finalising the design of the integrated quality assurance framework*](#). This consultation sought feedback on the detailed design of the integrated quality assurance framework (iQAF), including the Approve, TEO Review, and Monitoring levers. It included proposed changes to NZQA Rules to support both the iQAF and the Government's Vocational Education and Training (VET) reforms.

NZQA received 59 submissions from groups and individuals involved in the tertiary education sector.

Overall, consultation feedback highlights broad support for the proposed iQAF. Submitters viewed the proposed changes as positive and necessary, but emphasised the need for clear transition planning, robust provider support, transparent risk assessment, and ongoing collaboration with the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), Standard Setting Bodies (SSBs), Industry Skills Boards (ISBs), and the sector.

Key areas of endorsement included:

- Simplification of approval and accreditation processes
- Shift to continuous TEO self-review and annual meeting with NZQA
- Risk-based, proportionate monitoring (with relevant updates in the Programme Approval, Recognition, and Accreditation Rules and the Micro-credential Approval and Accreditation Rules)
- Consolidation of Quality Assurance Rules
- Streamlining programme approval processes
- Rules for ISBs and work-based training (WBT)
- Updates to the Private Training Establishment (PTE) Registration Rules and increase in the student fees exemption threshold to \$1000 (GST included).

Key concerns raised from submissions included NZQA's risk assessment, responsiveness to differing sector and cultural contexts, the removal of External Evaluation and Review (EER) categories and associated recognition of high-performing tertiary education organisations (TEOs), concerns about NZQA's capability and consistency to deliver fair and timely monitoring, and the proposed timing of iQAF implementation.

The extensive feedback NZQA received through this consultation has provided valuable insights and will be considered as we develop operational processes to implement iQAF in 2026.

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This report summarises the key themes from the submissions received for the consultation on [*Finalising the design of the integrated quality assurance framework*](#), which ran from 18 August to 26 September 2025.

The consultation document confirmed some of the matters set out in the 2024 consultation document, provided more details on the Approve, TEO Review, and Monitoring levers, and proposed changes to NZQA Rules to support iQAF and the implementation of the Government's Vocational Education and Training reforms.

This report draws on the feedback received but does not reflect every response made by each submitter. NZQA will consider all the feedback received when planning for the implementation of iQAF.

INTRODUCTION

NZQA is one of the government agencies that manage and regulate education in New Zealand. We are responsible for making sure that tertiary education (outside of universities) is high quality, and that New Zealand qualifications and credentials are accepted as credible and robust, both nationally and internationally.

In response to the changing tertiary education environment and sector feedback, we reviewed the current evaluative quality assurance framework (EQAF) and proposed the iQAF based on research and engagement with stakeholders.

The iQAF is designed to provide confidence that learners are achieving robust, credible and relevant qualifications and credentials that prepare them to meet employer, industry, professional association, iwi/hapū/whānau, and community needs in New Zealand and internationally.

We consulted on the high-level design of the draft iQAF in October 2024 (see [*Consultation: draft integrated Quality Assurance Framework \(iQAF\) - NZQA*](#)). In general, the draft iQAF and its key components were well received.

Details of the proposals to finalise the design of the iQAF can be found in the consultation document [here](#).

Following this, we undertook a second round of consultation, focusing on the detailed design and implementation of the iQAF.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

In August 2025, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) published the consultation document [*Finalising the design of the integrated quality assurance framework*](#) and invited submissions from stakeholders and the public.

The consultation document contained 14 questions that focused on proposed activities under the iQAF and the Rules changes which would be required to implement iQAF and the Government's Vocational Education and Training reforms.

People were invited to submit their views on the proposals by email or via an online questionnaire.

During the six-week public consultation period from 18 August to 26 September 2025, we held three online public information sessions (105 attendees) and two targeted sessions (69 attendees) with an agency and a peak body respectively.

WHO WE HEARD FROM

We received a total of 59 submissions. These submissions came from individuals, TEOs, peak bodies, standard setting bodies (SSBs), and an agency. Figure 1 outlines the number of submissions received by type of submitter.

Figure 1: Demographics of submissions received

Organisation	Number of submissions
Private Training Establishment	27
Regulator or peak body	4
Standard setting body	5
Te Pūkenga business division	15
Other	6
Wānanga	1
Agency	1
Total	59

HOW WE ANALYSED THE SUBMISSIONS

The project team reviewed all submissions received through the online questionnaire platform and consultation inbox. The questions from the consultation document were used to structure the analysis and collate themes.

Each submission was read and categorised according to the relevant consultation question. Microsoft CoPilot was then used to group and summarise the feedback under each category.

We reviewed the accuracy of the summarised feedback under each category, further synthesising or refining the text to ensure it reflected the content of submissions.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submissions are summarised below by each consultation question.

QUESTION 1. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSALS TO SIMPLIFY APPROVAL AND ACCREDITATION PROCESSES? IF NOT, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?

There was strong support for NZQA's proposals to simplify approval and accreditation processes. Stakeholders welcomed efforts to reduce duplication, improve efficiency, and reward providers with a positive compliance history. Submitters requested clear criteria for what constitutes a 'positive compliance history' and 'provider capability', published service levels and timeframes, and retention or enhancement of guidance materials. Sector-specific expertise was also seen as essential, particularly for evaluators working with specialised areas such as first aid, English language, and seasonal or community-based delivery.

Feedback emphasised support for extending simplification to Type 2 changes¹ and diverse programme types while maintaining quality and consistency. It was also requested that Rule interpretation should remain logical and equitable. There was broad support for integrating Consent to Assess (CTA) with programme approval and some submitters suggested whole-domain CTA to reduce costs. Stakeholders requested practical support from NZQA for implementation, including exemplars, templates, professional development, predictable rule review cycles, and improved planning tools.

Equity and market impact were key concerns, with some submitters cautioning against the risk of low-quality providers entering the market under simplified Rules. Submitters highlighted the need for clarity, fairness, sector-specific support, and robust quality assurance to ensure the changes are effective and equitable.

QUESTION 2. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED SELF-REVIEW PROCESS? IF NOT, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?

There was broad support for NZQA's proposal to shift from episodic, high-stakes reviews (such as EER) to a continuous, reflective self-review process. Many providers welcomed the opportunity to hold greater ownership of quality assurance and appreciated the integration of learner wellbeing outcomes (through the Code

¹ A Type 2 change refers to one or more changes to components of an approved programme that impact on the programme as a whole.

of Pastoral Care) into broader educational quality assurance processes. However, stakeholders emphasised the need for clear guidance and sector-specific relevance, recommending thematic questions and conversations that are tailored to different delivery models. The relationship between self-review and external monitoring was also viewed as unclear. Stakeholders requested dedicated NZQA contacts or sector teams to build contextual understanding.

Views were mixed on the purpose and value of annual 'conversations', especially for high-performing TEOs and the compliance burden this may pose on small TEOs. There were calls for clear guidance, a flexible summary report template to reflect different provider contexts, and adequate resourcing to ensure the process is meaningful and sustainable for both TEOs and NZQA. Stakeholders requested clarity on how self-review content might inform compliance decisions and whether NZQA would ensure that improvements are not automatically linked to increased scrutiny. Submitters also cautioned against NZQA imposing a one-size-fits-all approach that could undermine provider autonomy and existing self-review practices.

Many providers highlighted the potential for increased workload due to the annual self-review and monitoring. Timing and scheduling emerged as a concern, particularly around alignment with existing data cycles (e.g. April SDR) and TEC reporting requirements. Recommendations included staggered submission dates, aligning NZQA reporting with TEC's Learner Success Plans, early notification of thematic topics, and exemptions for recently EER-reviewed providers.

There was also uncertainty about the removal of Category Ratings, which many saw as important public markers of quality. Some submitters were concerned about the loss of public signals of quality and potential branding and marketing impacts, especially in the international education market. Stakeholders requested transition guidance and messaging to help TEOs communicate their quality status in the absence of ratings.

QUESTION 3. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED APPROACH TO MONITORING DEGREES, GRADUATE CERTIFICATES AND DIPLOMAS, AND POSTGRADUATE QUALIFICATIONS? IF NOT, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?

Most submitters welcomed the proposed shift to a three-year monitoring cycle for Level 7 and above programmes, with checks after the first year of delivery and following the first cohort of graduates. This approach was seen as proportionate and strategic, helping to reduce administrative burden while supporting continuous improvement. There were suggestions to align with university practice and

to maintain depth and verification of monitoring through evidence-based review and stakeholder input.

Submitters emphasised the need for flexibility, especially for non-cohort models like part-time learners. Submitters also asked for operational clarity, including questions about the future of annual programme evaluation report (APER) submissions, whether self-monitoring would be permitted, and the costs associated with monitoring.

There was strong support for a risk-based monitoring approach, including early intervention mechanisms and transparent criteria for triggering out-of-cycle reviews. Concerns were raised about potential oversight gaps due to the removal of EER and consistency reviews. Concerns were also expressed about the value of five-year Comprehensive Course Reviews (CCRs) under a three-year monitoring cycle. Submitters suggested evidence-based reviews and stakeholder input for verification purposes, and a shared dashboard of risk signals to encourage co-ownership of risk between NZQA and providers.

QUESTION 4. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED APPROACH TO MONITORING PROGRAMMES LEADING TO SUB-DEGREE QUALIFICATIONS AT LEVELS 1-7? IF NOT, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?

There was broad support for a tiered, risk-based approach to monitoring sub-degree programmes, particularly where it reduces duplication, supports continuous improvement, and is applied fairly across different provider types and programme structures. Stakeholders emphasised the need for transparency, proportionality, performance history and sector-specific support. There was also a strong call for including clear criteria for risk profiling, advance notice of monitoring activities and thematic reviews, and consistent communication to help providers plan and respond effectively.

Submitters requested greater clarity around how risk and triggers are defined and assessed profiles, and cautioned NZQA against potential bias toward smaller, newer, or providers serving priority learners. Some expressed concern that sub-degree, short-course providers, and standards-based programmes may face more frequent scrutiny than degree-level providers and programmes. Stakeholders supported recognising the role of SSBs and standards, including National External Moderation (NEM). Incentives were recommended to accelerate the development and adoption of skill standards

Views were mixed on the timing and scope of monitoring newly approved programmes. While some supported checks after the first cohort of graduates,

others preferred earlier intervention to identify issues before they affected learners. A staggered or sample-based approach was suggested to manage workload, and a dialogue-based approach was preferred over checklist-style evaluations.

Stakeholders also recommended mechanisms for recognition and support, such as acknowledging good practice, offering pre-enforcement support, and promoting sector-wide examples of “what good looks like.” Cluster moderation was also suggested to build capability and consistency.

QUESTION 5. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED APPROACH TO MONITORING MICRO-CREDENTIALS? IF NOT, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?

The proposed risk-based approach to monitoring micro-credentials was broadly supported, with many submitters agreeing it was reasonable and should apply consistently across all TEOs. Submitters emphasised the importance of robust moderation, especially for micro-credentials without skill standards. There was also a request for NZQA to ensure subject matter expertise is involved in moderation, potentially through contracted specialists, and clear communication on how this approach will be operationalised. There were concerns that waiting until after the first graduating cohort may delay detection of quality issues in short-duration micro-credentials.

Submitters raised concerns about inconsistent monitoring intensity between micro-credentials with and without standards, which could incentivise providers to design credentials strategically to avoid deeper scrutiny. Overlapping responsibilities between NZQA and SSBs may lead to duplication or conflicting advice. Additionally, transparent risk criteria were requested to prevent providers from facing unpredictable compliance expectations. Submitters also requested that NZQA ensure that monitoring considers teaching quality, learner support, and industry relevance, alongside assessment and programme approval.

Some providers, particularly English language providers, questioned the relevance of the proposed approach to their sector and suggested leveraging existing audit mechanisms like English New Zealand’s annual self-audits. Other providers called for clearer monitoring cycles to reduce compliance burden and allow better resource planning.

QUESTION 6. DO YOU THINK THE COMBINATION OF COMPLIANCE MONITORING AND EDUCATION PERFORMANCE MONITORING WILL PROVIDE SUFFICIENT ASSURANCE OF AN ORGANISATION'S OVERALL CAPABILITY TO DELIVER HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATION? IF NOT, WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?

There was general support for combining compliance and educational performance monitoring, with many viewing it as a logical way to balance regulatory assurance with educational quality and learner outcomes. However, stakeholders stressed that the success of the model depends on clear implementation, proportionality, and sector engagement.

Clarity and transparency were key concerns. Submitters called for clear definitions of risk indicators, compliance expectations, and monitoring triggers. Real-time access to risk profiles and the underlying data was seen as essential for provider confidence and responsiveness. Questions were raised about NZQA's capability and consistency, including its resourcing, data accuracy, and ability to deliver fair and timely monitoring. There were calls for NZQA to monitor its own performance and engage more actively with the sector.

Concerns about proportionality and burden were raised, particularly for larger or multi-programme providers. Sector-specific needs were also emphasised, particularly by wānanga and English language providers. Feedback highlighted the importance of equity and learner voice, with strong support for consistently monitoring Māori and priority learner outcomes. Embedding learner and community perspectives into performance monitoring was widely endorsed and submitters stressed the importance of cultural responsiveness and tailored risk indicators to avoid generic or inappropriate assessments.

Common recommendations included that NZQA should publish monitoring themes and schedules in advance, developing a shared risk 'dashboard' and national rubric, using RAG or heatmap models instead of binary compliance checks, and ensuring the system remains focused on improvement rather than punishment. Continued engagement with providers was recommended to ensure monitoring remains fair, transparent, and supportive of quality improvement.

QUESTION 7. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO REVIEW PERIODS FOR QUALIFICATIONS, MICRO-CREDENTIALS AND STANDARDS?

There was general support for shifting from fixed five-year review cycles to a more flexible, risk-informed approach. Flexibility was seen to better reflect qualification relevance, industry pace, and sector needs. However, stakeholders emphasised the importance of clarity, predictability, and coordination. Submitters requested

details on what “within a period acceptable to NZQA” means. Submitters also requested baseline timeframes e.g. 5–7 years, published review schedules, 12–18 months’ notice before expiry or review, and clear criteria for triggering early reviews or expiry. Better coordination between qualification reviews and programme development timelines was recommended.

Submitters supported the role of SSBs and ISBs in advising on review timing but raised concerns about ISB resourcing and capability. Transparent processes for setting and adjusting review periods were requested. Issues with version control were also raised, with stakeholders suggesting that versioning should only occur when substantive changes are made, to avoid unnecessary cost and workload.

Sector-specific needs were emphasised, particularly for English language courses, first aid, and regulated sectors. Support was expressed for deferment options for niche or low-volume qualifications and alignment with legal or demand cycles.

Concerns about data integrity and transparency included the accuracy and currency of data used to inform review decisions. Recommendations included protocols for data validation, annual risk profile summaries, and consultation before expiry decisions. Stakeholders also called for system integration, suggesting that review periods should align with system-wide risk scans, thematic reviews, industry engagement, and graduate outcomes analysis to ensure coherence and relevance.

QUESTION 8. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROPOSED RULE CHANGES TO SUPPORT STREAMLINING APPROVAL PROCESSES?

There was widespread support for the Rule changes to streamline approval processes. However, stakeholders cautioned that efficiency must not come at the expense of clarity or quality. Past attempts at streamlining and the reduction in guidance documentation were seen as insufficient, and submitters viewed detailed and well-structured guidance as essential. Many submitters agree that a single application covering both programme approval and CTA would reduce duplication, and that trusted providers should benefit from reduced evidential burdens. Many also endorsed a “trusted provider” pathway for TEOs with strong compliance histories.

Concerns were raised about the potential loss of holistic programme assurance due to the removal of key approval criteria. Submitters highlighted that streamlining must not compromise support for priority learners, especially Māori, Pacific, disabled or foundation learners, who require strong scaffolding and holistic support.

Submitters requested transitional support, including professional development in skill standards, a roadmap for coverage and sequencing, and interim simplification for non-standard approvals. Reuse of operational data through TEC/ Ngā Kete and prior NZQA submissions was also encouraged.

QUESTION 9. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROPOSED RULE CHANGES TO SPECIFY THE NATURE AND FREQUENCY OF MONITORING ACTIVITIES?

There was broad support for the nature and frequency of monitoring proposed in the Rules for degree, sub-degree and micro-credential programmes.

Comments under this question further reflected general support for an overall reduction in the monitoring frequency for degree-level programmes, tailoring monitoring to provider performance, programme type, and risk profile, and endorsing annual conversations and self-review models as useful tools for continuous improvement.

Submitters continued to ask for clarity and transparency of monitoring frequencies, risk triggers, and how risk levels influence monitoring intensity.

Recommendations were provided on the frequency, scheduling, and publishing of monitoring activities. Suggestions included publishing standardised evidence expectations, sampling frames for non-standards moderation, a 12-month forward schedule with options to bundle activities, and basing frequency on delivery volume or completions, rather than time alone. For micro-credentials and sub-degree programmes, submitters requested baseline monitoring frequencies (e.g. every three years unless risks arise), clarification on differences between provider-developed and SSB-developed micro-credentials, and recognition of existing SSB/ ISB moderation outcomes to reduce duplication.

QUESTION 10. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS IN RELATION TO THE PURPOSE OR SCOPE OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE RULES?

Submitters agreed that consolidating administrative and compliance requirements into a single Rule set would improve clarity, consistency, and usability. Integration of Code monitoring, thematic reviews, and annual reporting were also welcomed.

Feedback emphasised the need for clear guidance and support, including templates and exemplars. Providers requested clarity on evidence expectations, early publication of annual themes, and training, particularly for smaller or less-

resourced TEOs. Submitters also asked NZQA to consider how the new Rules interact with other frameworks, such as those used by ISBs.

Some submitters suggested that requiring NZQA agreement on Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) timeframes undermines provider autonomy. It was recommended that QIPs remain TEO-owned, and that NZQA apply its 'educate–direct–enforce' approach if expectations are not met.

QUESTION 11. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS IN RELATION TO CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES TO THE PRIVATE TRAINING ESTABLISHMENT REGISTRATION RULES?

There was broad support for the proposed changes to the PTE Registration Rules. Submitters were generally supportive of the introduction of biennial financial returns as the default, with flexibility for annual returns based on risk. These changes were seen as helping to streamline compliance, reduce administrative burden, and align with the broader iQAF, provided they are implemented with fairness, clarity, and sector engagement.

Submitters requested clear, published criteria for when annual returns would be required. Many submitters also requested clarity on how the Rules will accommodate non-traditional delivery models and whether different provider types meet the same quality expectations.

QUESTION 12. DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR MATTERS NZQA NEEDS TO CONSIDER IN RULES FOR ISBs?

There was broad support for the development of clear, robust, and transparent rules for ISBs. Submitters recognised the critical role ISBs will play in standard-setting, qualification development, programme endorsement, and moderation, and agreed that consistent expectations are needed. Submitters asked for clear role definitions, consistent and timely processes, support for diverse industries and delivery models, collaborative engagement with stakeholders, and ongoing reviews to ensure the rules remain fit-for-purpose.

Many submitters welcomed the focus on assessment and moderation but stressed the need for ISBs to be adequately resourced to meet their responsibilities in a timely and effective manner. There was strong support for NZQA adopting a risk-based monitoring approach and for requiring ISBs to publish clear criteria for endorsement and moderation decisions, annual moderation summaries and service standards for turnaround times.

Concerns were raised about proposals for ISBs to develop national curricula or capstone assessments, arguing this could reduce responsiveness to regional and industry-specific needs and limit provider flexibility. Some submitters called for clearer delineation of ISB responsibilities to avoid duplication with NZQA and providers, and for mechanisms to ensure consistency and fairness across ISBs. There were also suggestions for ISBs to engage regularly with peak bodies, learners, iwi, and industry stakeholders, and to incorporate feedback into strategic planning and qualification development.

Some English language providers noted the limited relevance of ISB Rules and their sector and requested continued use of existing audit mechanisms.

QUESTION 13. DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR MATTERS NZQA NEEDS TO CONSIDER IN RULES FOR WBT?

There was broad support for the introduction of clear and consistent rules for work-based training (WBT), recognising its distinct nature from campus-based education. Many submitters noted that while they do not currently deliver formal WBT, they are interested in future developments. The proposed Rules were seen to safeguard learner outcomes and build industry confidence.

Some submitters emphasised the need for flexibility to accommodate diverse workplace contexts, including seasonal, remote, or high-risk industries, and to ensure cultural responsiveness for all – but notably kaupapa Māori and Pacific learners. There were also strong calls for NZQA to provide clear guidance on expectations for workplace support, assessment resources, and verification processes. Other submitters recommended mandatory training for workplace trainers and assessors to ensure quality mentoring and understanding of responsibilities.

There were also suggestions for NZQA to promote digital tools for moderation and reporting, and to ensure that funding for work-based training reflects the same standards and expectations as provider-based delivery.

QUESTION 14. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE STUDENT FEES EXEMPTION TO \$1000 (GST INC)? IF NOT, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR REASONS.

There was strong support for the proposal to increase the student fees exemption threshold from \$500 to \$1000 (GST inclusive). Submitters viewed the change as logical, pragmatic, and overdue, noting that the original threshold was set in 2005. The proposed increase was seen to align with inflation trends and restore the

original policy intent of exempting low-value programmes from trust deposit requirements.

While the proposal was widely supported, some respondents felt that it may cause unintended consequences, particularly for smaller providers, and that NZQA needs to ensure that the change does not weaken student protection for higher-value programmes. NZQA was encouraged to review the threshold periodically, ensure clear guidance and communication, and consider broader financial and policy implications.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

In addition to the questions, submitters also commented on other elements of the iQAF proposals and implementation and transition matters.

Submitters stressed the need for clarity on risk assessment, including transparent risk criteria, indicators, weightings, and how risk profiles would be constructed and used. Some submitters recommended including qualitative indicators, e.g. learner confidence, and community engagement in risk assessments for equity insights.

Submitters expressed that system assurance activities such as thematic reviews and scans should be methodologically robust, supported by integrated data, and timed to avoid gaps in visibility. While thematic reviews were generally supported, submitters requested advance notice of topics, a sampling approach to reduce administrative burden, and clear expectations for evidence of effectiveness rather than descriptive reporting.

Submitters expressed strong support for the iQAF's 'Educate and Inform' lever, recommending expansion of resources such as the Pūtake platform and development of a tertiary-relevant hub ahead of the iQAF rollout. A recognition framework was also suggested to highlight commendable examples and share case studies across the sector to promote quality practice.

Submitters also commented on equity and the importance of maintaining learner voice, integrated learning, and work-based practice within the framework. Some submissions emphasised the importance of recognising kaupapa Māori approaches within the framework, including alignment with Māori data sovereignty principles and space for Māori expression in templates and platforms. Submitters cautioned that any reduced visibility of learner progression and weakening of work-integrated learning requirements could disproportionately affect equity groups and undermine confidence in graduate readiness.

NZQA was commended for its collaborative and transparent consultation process and for incorporating earlier feedback to reduce duplication and streamline quality

assurance. Respondents emphasised that clarity, consistency, and collaboration throughout the transition to iQAF are important for successful implementation.

CONSULTATION OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

Overall, the iQAF is widely regarded as a significant step toward modernising New Zealand's quality assurance system, with strong potential to enhance quality, responsiveness, and equity.

The iQAF proposes a more risk-informed, tailored approach to quality assurance that reflects NZQA's strategic priority for utilising 'right size, right touch regulation'. This consultation focused on the proposed activities under each iQAF lever, key transition matters, and the Rules required to implement iQAF and the Government's changes to vocational education and training.

As we have received general support for the proposed activities, we are proceeding with the iQAF design as consulted. We have drafted and updated the associated Rules based on the intent stipulated in the consultation document.

The bulk of the consultation feedback were comments and suggestions for iQAF implementation. We have noted among many things the sector's desire for more information on the risk-informed approach, on recognition and communication of TEO quality, on the design of monitoring, or how proposed activities will be tailored for different provider contexts.

We recognise that success will depend on implementation support for providers, system integration, regular review mechanisms, and ongoing stakeholder engagement. We envisage ongoing stakeholder engagement throughout implementation to help us develop and improve operational processes, tools, and guidance for TEOs. We will also continue to work with agencies, such as the TEC, Immigration New Zealand, Ministry of Education, and regulatory bodies on transition matters and how the outcomes of future quality assurance activities under the iQAF may inform their operations.

Pending Rules approval, we anticipate the new and updated Rules to support iQAF and the VET reforms to be effective in January 2026. We will publish the Rules, update business processes, webpages and guidance materials, and begin the phased implementation of iQAF from January 2026.