

External Rationale for Plan Assessment	
SI	01. Your Plan does not adequately describe how your organisation's mission and role enables positive outcomes for learners and contributes to the education system as a whole.
SI	02. Your Plan does not provide sufficient evidence of strong governance, management, and leadership capability.
SI	03. Your Plan does not present a sustainable plan for fulfilling your specified mission and role through the proposed programmes and activities.
SI	04. You have not met the TEC's minimum Prudential Financial Standards.
SI	05. Your Plan does not sufficiently demonstrate that you have consulted with the appropriate range of stakeholders in its development.
SI	06. We are not satisfied that the Mix of Provision proposed in your Plan will adequately address the needs of your stakeholders or region(s).
SI	07. Your Plan does not provide sufficient information on how your organisation would meaningfully report its progress to key stakeholders.
SI	08. Your Plan does not adequately demonstrate that you are responding to the priorities set in Plan Guidance, Investment Briefs and other strategic documents to implement the Tertiary Education Strategy.
SI	09. The proposed Mix of Provision does not demonstrate adequate alignment with national and regional tertiary education needs.
	10. Your Plan does not provide evidence that you will give effect to an honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi during the term of the proposed Plan.
	11. Your organisation has a history of low performance as evidenced by your EER and your Plan does not provide sufficient evidence of improvement.
SI	12. <i>[New provider DQ3-7 or DQ7+]</i> We are not satisfied that your proposed delivery aligns with our investment priorities.
LSP	01. Your organisation's vision for learner success does not give TEC confidence in your commitment to achieving equity for all learners.
LSP	02. Your Learner Success Plan does not give TEC confidence that you understand the current issues at your organisation that are resulting in poor outcomes for learners.
LSP	03. Your Learner Success Plan does not present a coherent roadmap for the TEO's learner success journey.
DAP	01. Your Disability Action Plan does not give TEC confidence that you understand the barriers and experiences of learners with disabilities at your organisation.
DAP	02. Your Disability Action Plan does not give TEC confidence in your commitment to achieving equity for learners with disabilities.
DAP	03. Your Disability Action Plan does not present a coherent roadmap for the TEO towards improving the experience and outcomes for learners with disabilities.
MOP	01. The proposed programmes and activities do not appear to align with your organisation's Strategic Intent.
MOP	02. The new programmes and activities you have proposed do not demonstrate sufficient alignment with the priorities set in Plan Guidance, Investment Briefs and other strategic documents.
MOP	03. There is insufficient evidence that the proposed programmes and activities will support the success of all learners, and in particular, learners who have been traditionally underserved.
MOP	04. We are not satisfied that you can successfully deliver the proposed programmes and activities based on your past delivery levels.
MOP	05. Your organisation has repeatedly delivered over 105% of its allocation for DQ3-7 or DQ7+.

External Rationale for Plan Assessment	
MOP	06. Your Plan does not adequately describe how you intend to carry out apprenticeship training activities.
TP NRSP	01. Your Plan does not demonstrate a sustainable network of provision which responds to the National and Regional Skills Priorities.
TP PDMF	02. There is insufficient evidence that the proposed programmes are innovative, flexible, and responsive to strategic priorities.
Wānanga PDMF	03. There is insufficient evidence that the proposed programmes improve the innovation and relevance of delivery.
Wānanga PDMF	04. Your proposal does not demonstrate clearly articulated outcomes or plan for this funding that reflect the objectives of RoVE.
Learner Component Performance	05. Your Plan does not give TEC confidence that your organisation is responding to the Minister's priorities for the learner component.
EPIC	01. We are not satisfied that the performance commitments in your Plan are relevant and complete.
EPIC	02. We are not satisfied that the performance commitments in your Plan are achievable.
EPIC	03. We are not satisfied that the performance commitments in your Plan show a meaningful improvement on your organisation's past performance.
EPIC	04. We are not satisfied that the performance commitments in your Plan show a meaningful improvement on your organisation's past performance, particularly with respect to outcomes for priority learner groups.

External Rationale for Additional Funding Request Decision
01. Your organisation does not qualify for additional funding due to having a Category 4 External Evaluation and Review (EER) rating which does not give TEC confidence in the quality of your education delivery.
02. We are concerned about the quality of provision as evidenced by your Category 3 External Evaluation and Review (EER) rating.
03. We have concerns about your organisation's financial viability and performance.
04. We are not confident your financial position will enable you to deliver successfully to your learners.
05. You have not met the TEC's minimum Prudential Financial Standards.
06. We are not satisfied that there is sufficient demand compared to existing supply in your proposed regions of delivery.
07. You have not adequately demonstrated evidence of industry or employer demand for this provision.
08. You have not adequately demonstrated evidence of learner demand for this provision.
09. You have not adequately described your organisation's readiness to deliver the proposed provision.
10. The proposed increase in delivery is substantial and we are not confident your organisation would be able to scale its delivery quickly enough while maintaining quality.
11. Your organisation does not yet have the necessary NZQA accreditation for the programme(s) and the application process is still in the early stages. We are therefore not confident that you would be ready to begin delivery at the start of 2024.
12. Your Educational Performance Indicators (EPI) are below our published thresholds for additional funding or the sector average. We would like to see the performance outcomes for your learners improve before we consider additional funding.
13. Your organisation has a history of low performance against its commitments. We would like to see your performance improve before we consider additional funding.

<p>14. We are not confident you can deliver this provision due to previous under-delivery. Should demand eventuate in 2024 you can submit a new additional funding request, which we will consider through the standard in-year additional funding process.</p>
<p>15. We do not have a full year of performance data for your delivery of this provision. If there is evidence of high educational performance following a full year of delivery, you can submit a new additional funding request, which we will consider through the standard in-year additional funding process.</p>
<p>16. We are not confident you can deliver the requested provision as there is insufficient evidence of delivery in 2023. Should demand eventuate in 2024, you can submit a new additional funding request, which we will consider through the standard in-year additional funding process.</p>
<p>17. We are not satisfied that you require additional funding based on apparent under-delivery which may allow re-prioritisation of your existing Mix of Provision.</p>
<p>18. We are concerned about the participation and achievement gaps between your Māori and Pacific learners, compared to other learners. Your request has not provided sufficient evidence that strategies have been put in place to close this equity gap.</p>
<p>19. The programmes and activities for which you are seeking additional funding do not have adequate alignment with TES and TEC strategic priorities, as outlined in our Plan Guidance documents and Investment Briefs.</p>
<p>20. You have not provided evidence of consultation with the relevant Workforce Development Council(s) or Regional Skills Leadership Group(s).</p>
<p>21. Although you have evidenced demand, the proposed programmes and activities are not priority areas for investment at this time, as outlined in our Plan Guidance documents and Investment Briefs.</p>
<p>22. We are not satisfied that your application to delivery work-based learning for the first time has adequately demonstrated that the proposed provision will address an unmet need as outlined in Plan Guidance.</p>
<p>23. The proposed provision is in one of the areas in which we do not support further growth in 2024 as previously communicated to the sector.</p>
<p>24. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient funding available to approve all requests for additional funding. We have prioritised other requests that better meet our strategic priorities.</p>
<p>25. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient funding available to approve all requests for additional funding. We have prioritised other requests that best meet our strategic priorities. Accordingly, the total amount of additional funding we can offer beyond your indicative allocation is [X].</p>