

From: 9(2)(a)
To: 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: Urgent advice re approval of new social work qualification
Date: Monday, 26 January 2026 12:04:00 pm
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Hey 9(2)(a)

Here's my notes from the catch-up with 9(2)(a)

- Why is there only one-year reviewing point? Is it down to potential concerns re: the provider's ability to deliver/their quality?
- 9(2)(a) - done in response to move to 3-year degree from 4 year, there will be review at end of the year as to how transition is going for those still studying four year pathway while 3 year is in pilot. No issue with any TEOs approved to deliver, no concern identified re: Bethlehem.
- Wording of SWRB approval raised issues with us that raised doubt as to their continued support in quals delivered b approved TEOs. Risks to both TEOs and learners with this.
- Need guarantee from Bethlehem in response to this to ensure there is appropriate provision elsewhere in network of provision.
- Wording is reasonable from SWRB but raises risks on TEC side that need to be accounted for.
- Academics are concerned about truncation of degree length, SWRB responding by keeping close watch on those moving to 3 year structure
- Placement requirements - SWRB has loosened these in response to consultation. Learners were often turned away in status quo. In recognition of distance learners, those from smaller communities, flexed requirements to allow for more than one placement in same org as long as subject matter is distinct each time, getting varied learning/exposure.
- Changed flexibility around number of placements, previously two long placements, only one needs to be prescribed long length, other can be broken out into smaller chunks. Overall hours requirement remains the same. They have also done this in acknowledgement of pressure on placements that will come with shorter qual lengths but same placement hours.
- Some providers talking about having small taster placement in first year, social work cannot rely on simulation in same way as other disciplines such as nursing however.
- Couple of TEOs are raising concerns, however these will be part of federated model post-TP. Will be delivering Open Polytechnic's 3 year degree.
- UoW running social work GEM programme, advised SWRB that review of 9(2)(f)(iv) [REDACTED]
- SWRB inputting into MSD's project re: alternative pathways, mooting ideas re: earn as you learn pathways, have advised on or previous advice re: feasibility concerns of going down this route, precedent it may set for other professions.
- After SWRB go through board approval process, they go through NZQA, they have proposed to send this through to TEC, we have requested an email at least confirming approval of Bethlehem's programme, rationale behind one year review period.
- Further requests will come through soon from other providers, some of which we may not be aware of yet. Will give heads-up to CCT so they're aware.

Thanks

9(2)(a)

9(2)(a)

Kaitohutohu Matua | **Senior Advisor**

Putanga Ākonga me te Haumi | **Learner & Investment Outcomes**

Aramahi me te Haumi | **Careers and Investment Design**

Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua | **Tertiary Education Commission**



9(2)(a)

9(2)(a)@tec.govt.nz

PO Box 27-048, Wellington 6141, New Zealand

www.tec.govt.nz

This email is only intended to be read by the named recipient. It may contain information which is confidential, proprietary or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must delete this email and may not use any information contained in it. Legal privilege is not waived because you have read this email.

From: 9(2)(a)@tec.govt.nz>

Sent: Monday, 26 January 2026 9:34 am

To: 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>; 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>; 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>

Cc: 9(2)(a)@tec.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Urgent advice re approval of new social work qualification

Kia ora 9(2)(a)

Thanks for coming back to me so quickly, apologies I did not respond on Friday, I was only working for a couple of hours in the morning.

We can talk more about it today, but it is useful for us to have some of your context to help make decisions. We can take a nuanced approach if we have some reassurance of your confidence in the provider and the qualification.

Ngā mihi,

9(2)(a)

MA (she/her)

Kaiwhakahaere Rōpū Putanga Ākonga me te Haumi | **Team Manager, Learner and Investment Outcomes**

Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua | **Tertiary Education Commission**

9(2)(a)

From: 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 23 January 2026 9:54 am
To: 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>; 9(2)(a)@tec.govt.nz>; 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>
Cc: 9(2)(a)@tec.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Urgent advice re approval of new social work qualification

Kia ora 9(2)(a)

Thanks for raising this potential issue. As 9(2)(a) notes below, it is more of a caveat in checking that the first year has gone well, with a light-touch check at the end of the first year prior to full confirmation.

But if the manner in which we are wording our confirmation is calling their funding approval into question, it may be that we need to address this in wording and approach so this does not happen with future prescription reports, of which there maybe others this year. I would appreciate speaking to you if you are free, as I have 10-11am free this morning and can send an email invite if you wish?

Otherwise I am free Monday as well.

Ngā mihi

9(2)(a)

From: 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 23 January 2026 9:24 am
To: 9(2)(a)@tec.govt.nz>; 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>; 9(2)(a)@swrb.govt.nz>
Cc: 9(2)(a)@tec.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Urgent advice re approval of new social work qualification
Importance: High

Good morning, 9(2)(a), good to hear from you and Happy New Year.

I have cc'd in our Registrar, 9(2)(a) and our Deputy Registrar Education, 9(2)(a) who runs the prescription process for our qualifications.

I suspect they put in a caveat as it is a new programme. Also noting that we do not want to jeopardise funding a full programme in any way – so yes, I think a conversation would be best to tease that out.

I am not involved in the detail of this side of our business – so will dip out of further correspondence – unless you feel it would be useful as we know each other????

Many thanks 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(a) Lin over to you.

9(2)(a)

From: 9(2)(a) [redacted] <[redacted]@tec.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 23 January 2026 8:54 am
To: 9(2)(a) [redacted] <[redacted]@swrb.govt.nz>
Cc: 9(2)(a) [redacted] <[redacted]@tec.govt.nz>
Subject: Urgent advice re approval of new social work qualification

Kia ora 9(2)(a) [redacted]

I hope you had a great break and are having a good start to the new year!

I'm reaching out as some of my colleagues have asked for advice/context regarding the approval of a new 3-year social qualification from the Bethlehem Tertiary Institute. Their request to us for funding is unique as the approval information from yourselves notes they are approved for one year, with a review to take place next year. It's unusual for us to fund a 3-year qualification that only has approval from the regulator for one year, so I wanted to reach out and see if you were able to provide more context for this to help us reach a solution on funding.

It might be helpful to meet to talk through the context a bit. I'm only working a couple of hours this morning, so if you had time on Monday that would be really helpful as we need to sort it quite urgently.

I am free on Monday between 11.30-2.30 and 3-4pm if any of those times work for you. And of course if you aren't quite the right person to talk to, I would greatly appreciate it if you could send this on to whoever is!

Thank you.

Ngā mihi,

9(2)(a) [redacted] MA ([she/her](#))

Kaiwhakahaere Rōpū Putanga Ākonga me te Haumi | **Team Manager, Learner and Investment Outcomes**
Ngā Aramahi me te Hoahoa Haumi | **Careers and Investment Design**
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua | **Tertiary Education Commission**

I work a nine-day fortnight and am off every other Friday

9(2)(a) [redacted]
9(2)(a) [redacted] <[redacted]@tec.govt.nz>

PO Box 27-048, Wellington 6141, New Zealand
www.tec.govt.nz



