

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 provide sufficient evidence to show that you are able to respond to regional, national or global trends.
SI	04. Your organisation has a history of low performance and your Plan does not provide sufficient evidence of improvement.
SI	05. We are not confident your financial position will enable you to deliver successfully to your learners.
SI	06. You have not met the TEC's minimum Prudential Financial Standards.
SI	07. For TEIs: Your plan does not adequately describe how your organisation gives effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
SI	08. Your Plan does not show sufficient evidence of stakeholder engagement and how the Mix of Provision proposed in the plan would meet the needs of your stakeholders.
SI	09. Your Plan does not adequately demonstrate how your organisation would contribute to achieving the relevant priorities described in the TES and those set by TEC in its Plan Guidance and Investment Briefs.
SI	10. Your Plan does not provide sufficient information on how your organisation would meaningfully report its progress to key stakeholders.
SI	13. The proposed Mix of Provision does not demonstrate adequate alignment with national and regional tertiary education needs.
SI	14. The proposed Mix of Provision does not align with your organisation's strategic intent.
SI	16. We are not satisfied that the performance commitments in your Plan are relevant and/or provide sufficient information about how you will measure the performance of your organisation against the proposed outcomes.
SI	17. We are not satisfied that the performance commitments in your Plan are achievable.
SI	18. We are not satisfied that the performance commitments in your Plan show a meaningful improvement on your organisation's past performance.
SI	19. 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.
SI	20. <i>[New provider UFS or SAC7+]</i> We are not satisfied that your proposed delivery is in an area of strategic importance.
LSP	01. Your Learner Success Plan does not adequately set out your vision for learner success.
LSP	02. You have not demonstrated sufficient understanding of current issues and barriers that result in poor outcomes for your learners, or a commitment to build a better understanding.
LSP	03. Your Learner Success Plan does not demonstrate sufficient commitment to improving the outcomes for all learners, and in particular learners who are under-served.
LSP	04. Your Learner Success Plan has not set out a viable plan to implement a learner success approach with clear linkages to the TEC's Learner Success Framework.
LSP	05. Your Learner Success Plan does not demonstrate that your organisation's governance and management have sufficient understanding of or commitment to learner success.
LSP	06. Your Learner Success Plan does not give us confidence that you have a viable medium to long-term approach to learner success.
LSP	07. Your Learner Success Plan does not give us confidence that you have a sound roadmap for the successful implementation of the next stage of the Learner Success Framework.

External Rationale for Plan Assessment	
LSP	08. Your Learner Success Plan does not provide adequate evidence of stakeholder engagement or how that engagement has informed your vision for learner success.
DAP	01. Your Disability Action Plan is not consistent with best practice standards as described in Kia Ōrite toolkit.
DAP	02. Your Disability Action Plan does not provide adequate evaluation strategies and appropriate allocation of responsibility within the organisation.
DAP	03. Your Disability Action Plan does not set out sufficient communication policies and programmes, goals and targets to support disabled learners.
MOP	01. The proposed programmes and activities do not appear to align with your organisation's Strategic Intent.
MOP	02. The proposed programmes and activities include new areas of delivery and there is insufficient evidence of alignment with TES and Plan Guidance priorities for us to support this change.
MOP	03. The proposed programmes and activities do not appear to align with your current delivery and there is insufficient evidence of demand for us to support this change.
MOP	04. The proposed programmes and activities do not demonstrate adequate alignment with national and regional tertiary education needs.
MOP	05. (SAC7+) The proposed programmes and activities are not consistent with priorities identified by RSLGs regarding tertiary education needs.
MOP	06. Your Plan does not respond to the priorities set by TEC for ACE.
UFS	01. Your Plan does not adequately describe how you intend to carry out apprenticeship training activities.
UFS	02. The proposed programmes and activities include new areas of delivery and there is insufficient evidence of alignment with TES, WDC or RSLG priorities for us to support this change.
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 2023.
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.”
14. We are not confident you can deliver this provision due to previous under-delivery. Should demand eventuate in 2023 you can submit a new additional funding request, which we will consider through the standard in-year additional funding process.
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.
16. We are not confident you can deliver the requested provision as there is insufficient evidence of delivery in 2022. Should demand eventuate in 2023, you can submit a new additional funding request, which we will consider through the standard in-year additional funding process.
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.
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 parity gap.
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.
20. You have not provided evidence of consultation with the relevant Workforce Development Council(s) or Regional Skills Leadership Group(s).
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.
22. The proposed provision is in one of the areas in which we do not support further growth in 2023 as previously communicated to the sector. These include Level 3 Home-based ECE/Level 3 Youth Guarantee.
23. You are seeking funding for new work-based provision. In 2023, TEC is prioritising funding to providers that have previously delivered this type of training or to the TEOs identified in TITO transition plans.
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.
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].