



Te Tāhuhu o
te Mātauranga
Ministry of Education

Options for the future of Work-based Learning

Consultation Document



Te Kāwanatanga
o Aotearoa
New Zealand Government

Published by the Ministry of Education, New Zealand, January 2025.

Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga | Ministry of Education

1 The Terrace, Mezzanine floor
Wellington 6011
New Zealand

www.education.govt.nz



Crown copyright © 2025

Except for the Ministry of Education's logo, this copyright work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence. In essence, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to the Ministry of Education and abide by the other licence terms. In your attribution, use the wording 'Ministry of Education', not the Ministry of Education logo or the New Zealand Government logo.

ISBN 978-1-77697-819-9 (Online)

Contents

Introduction	4
What are Industry Skills Boards (ISBs)?	6
What are the two models?	8
The Independent Work-based Learning Model	9
The Collaborative Work-based Learning Model	12
Transitioning to a New Model.....	18
The Consultation Process and Questions	20
Glossary of Key Terms and Abbreviations	21

Introduction

Over 2024, the Government considered the future design of New Zealand's Vocational Education and Training system. This included consulting with the public during August and September. Further information on the redesign and consultation is available on the Ministry of Education website: www.education.govt.nz.

The Government is now undertaking another short round of targeted consultation with industry on the future of work-based learning (apprenticeships and traineeships). Final decisions are expected in April 2025.

This consultation document outlines the two models for work-based learning that the Government is considering. One was consulted on in 2024, and the other is a new model. A targeted set of mainly industry representatives have been invited to participate and provide feedback on which model they prefer.

Consultation closes at 5pm on Friday 21 February. Consultation questions are at the end of this document, along with how to provide a written submission. Also included is a glossary of key terms and abbreviations on pages 21 and 22.

What has been decided so far?

In December 2024, the Government confirmed its decision to disestablish Workforce Development Councils (WDCs) and Te Pūkenga. Legislation, preparation, and implementation of these decisions will now be progressed. The new system and new structures will be operational from 1 January 2026.

Replacing Te Pūkenga

Te Pūkenga's polytechnic business divisions will be replaced with a new network of Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs). Standalone ITPs will need to be financially and academically viable, while a federation structure will support those that face challenges in operating as fully standalone entities.

The work to decide which ITPs can be set up, what changes are needed to make them viable, and which ones will need federation support has already started. The new ITPs will be set up in 2026, once legislation has been passed. Te Pūkenga itself will be disestablished by the end of 2026. This document describes what could happen to the Work-based Learning divisions of Te Pūkenga as this happens.

Replacing Workforce Development Councils

The WDCs will be replaced with new Industry Skills Boards (ISBs). The ISBs will take on some functions that WDCs currently perform, including investment advice to the Tertiary

Education Commission (TEC).¹ More information on ISBs is in the information box on pages 6 and 7.

The number of ISBs is yet to be determined. To ensure each one is of sufficient scale and viability there likely won't be more than eight, and each one won't necessarily cover the same collection of sectors that WDCs currently do. In addition, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) will take on standards-setting for some industries, although every sector that currently has work-based learning will be covered by an ISB.

There will be further consultation on the number and industry coverage of ISBs in the first half of 2025.

What is being consulted on now?

Following the 2024 consultation, the Government has identified two possible models for work-based learning. Work-based learning covers the apprenticeships and traineeships that industry training organisations used to arrange.² As only one of the potential models was consulted on in 2024, this targeted consultation will help us understand industries' preferences between these two options.

The first model is Independent Work-based Learning. In the 2024 consultation this was referred to as 'Option B' for standards-setting and work-based learning. The second model is called Collaborative Work-based Learning. The Minister for Vocational Education identified this as a possible new model following stakeholder engagements during the 2024 consultation.

Each model has different implications for what happens to the Work-based Learning divisions of Te Pūkenga (the former ITOs), and the learners and programmes they manage. It also has implications for other providers – ITPs, private training organisations, and Wānanga – who currently offer, or might want to offer, work-based programmes. And the final decision will also affect the role of ISBs.

While the 2024 consultation was broad and captured a diverse range of stakeholders' views on changes to the vocational system, this is a targeted consultation process to get specific industry stakeholder views on these two models. This is so decisions on the future of work-based learning can be made at pace, be well-informed, and be aligned to industry needs.

¹ Workforce Development Councils will continue until the replacement ISBs are established and take over their functions.

² There are other types of work-based learning, such as placements and practicums. This consultation relates to apprenticeships and traineeships undertaken by people learning in the workplace in which they are employed (see Glossary).

What are Industry Skills Boards (ISBs)?

Under both models of work-based learning, ISBs will manage standards-setting for the vocational education and training system. Each Board will be a statutory body with strong industry involvement, set up by the Minister for Vocational Education, with responsibility for a broad set of sectors (e.g. *Building and Construction* or *Food and Fibre* industries). They will ensure that employers and learners can be confident in the consistency and industry relevance of vocational programmes no matter who offers them. As discussed below, industry will be predominant in their governance structure.

For the industries and sectors in their coverage area, an ISB will:

- Develop the industry qualifications and standards that underpin vocational programmes.
- Quality assure how qualifications and standards are used via consent requirements for providers (ITPs, private providers, and Wānanga) and external moderation of assessments.
- Endorse the vocational programmes that providers develop. An ITP, private provider, or Wānanga will not be able to offer these programmes without an ISB's endorsement.

These powers will apply to both work-based and provider-based programmes. Anyone offering a vocational programme will need to use an ISB's qualifications and standards, and will be subject to the ISB's quality assurance processes. If an industry wants, an ISB can also manage a final 'capstone' assessment that an apprentice or trainee must pass before getting a qualification.

They will also keep some current strategic functions of Workforce Development Councils (WDCs) which many industries have said they value. These are:

- *Strategic Workforce Analysis and Planning*. This is a refinement of the current Skills Leadership function of WDCs. It will focus on workforce planning and labour market analysis, and support the qualification and standards development functions of ISBs.
- *Investment Advice*. The ISBs will provide advice to the Tertiary Education Commission on where it should invest its funding in vocational and education and training.

How are Industry Skills Boards different from Workforce Development Councils?

Industry Skills Boards will be more focused than WDCs on delivering what their industries want and need, they are intended to be more directly accountable to their industries, and there will be more consistency between them. This will include key differences in how they are set up, how they are governed, and potentially how they are funded.

How Industry Skills Boards will be set up

Like a WDC, each ISB will be set up through a document called an Order in Council. Like a company constitution or a charity's Rules, these Orders will set out what each Board does, how its governing members are appointed, the industries it covers, and similar matters.

The Orders for ISBs will be very similar. This means every industry can expect the same way of working and services from their ISB. The Orders will also be written to ensure that ISBs concentrate on delivering value to their industries.

How Industry Skills Boards will be governed

Each ISB will be governed by eight Board members. Two will be appointed by the Minister for Vocational Education, and six will be appointed to represent industry through an industry-led process. Appointment processes will be largely the same for each ISB and set out in their Order in Council.

There will be no statutory requirement for ISBs to have a Board member representing Māori employers. Māori inclusion in governance can be achieved through the appointment process, including Ministerial appointments.

What are the two models?

The Government is considering two models for work-based learning. These are:

- **Independent Work-based Learning.** In this model, the work-based learning divisions in Te Pūkenga would be moved to a separate transitional entity, then become a number of separate providers with industry or other private ownership. This was presented as Option B in the 2024 consultation.
- **Collaborative Work-based Learning.** In this model all apprenticeships and traineeships would involve both a provider to manage the education of the learner, and an ISB to provide pastoral care. The work-based learning divisions of Te Pūkenga would be dissolved, with their programmes and learners moving into the ITPs that are established out of Te Pūkenga (or in some cases to a PTE or Wānanga). Their assets and staff would be split across a provider and an ISB.

The Table on pages 16 and 17 compares some key features of each model.

Under both models, any provider – the new ITPs, private providers, and Wānanga – will be able to offer both work-based and provider-based programmes. They will still need to use ISB-developed qualifications and standards, have their programmes endorsed and externally moderated by ISBs, and meet appropriate TEC and NZQA requirements.

Will there be changes to how standards-setting and work-based learning are funded?

The funding system for work-based learning could be different depending on which model the Government adopts. However, in both cases the Government will fund ISBs for standards-setting work. An ISB will also be able to charge fees to providers for the quality assurance functions and services they undertake, like moderation, and programme endorsement.

We are operating in a constrained funding environment, and so changes to the system need to be cost-neutral or result in savings. Public funding for ISBs' standards-setting work will be reallocated from the total amount of funding available for work-based learning subsidies, and it will be lower than the funding currently received by WDCs.

The WDCs are currently able to request that the Minister for Vocational Education introduces an industry levy to fund their work. The ISBs will keep this ability, and some of the barriers to introducing a levy will be lowered.

Detailed decisions on funding levels, including per-EFTS/STM (see Glossary) subsidy rates for work-based learning, will be made as part of the annual Budget and funding determination processes.

The Independent Work-based Learning Model

Independent Work-based Learning was consulted on as 'Option B' in August and September 2024. Work-based learning would be managed in most cases by a single provider (a former WBL division of Te Pūkenga, ITP, private provider, or Wānanga). In this model, ISBs are not directly involved in arranging work-based programmes.

Potential benefits of this model include:

- a more straightforward transition that has less potential to disrupt current apprenticeship and traineeship relationships; and
- ISBs' role would be focused on standard-setting.

Possible downsides and risks of this model include:

- ISBs would have a limited range of funding sources; and
- turning work-based learning divisions into standalone entities would mean more actors in the system and so more competition for public funding.

What would Independent Work-based Learning look like?

A provider would enrol an apprentice or trainee and manage all aspects of their programme. This includes programme design, assessing competence, awarding standards and qualifications, and supporting the learner to complete their programme.

Unlike the previous industry training organisations, a provider could offer both work-based and provider-based programmes. Where a work-based programme had off-job components like block courses or night classes they would not be required to sub-contract that provision – though they might still choose to do so.

Vocational education programmes – provider-based, work-based, and those that combined both – would still need to be endorsed and quality assured by the ISB that developed the qualification.

What would happen to Te Pūkenga's Work-based Learning divisions?

This model would involve two steps to manage the future of the Work-based Learning divisions currently in Te Pūkenga.

In step one, the divisions would be moved as a group out of Te Pūkenga and into a standalone transitional work-based learning provider. One model for this could be a 'Schedule 4A' company under the Public Finance Act 1989, that has shareholding Ministers and operates in most respects like a private organisation. This step can

happen before Te Pūkenga itself is disestablished, and it removes the divisions from ties to the Te Pūkenga structure and timeline.

This transitional body would be recognised as a private training establishment, and take on the programmes, learners, and assets of the work-based learning divisions. Each division would continue operating as a distinct part of the organisation, as they currently do within Te Pūkenga. Most of these divisions' current staff would be offered employment in the same division within this new entity.

Once this shift has occurred, step two would involve the Government negotiating with industry how each division could be re-established as an independent private provider. For example, a group of industry stakeholders may establish a charitable trust to acquire a given division's assets and programmes, take on relevant learners, and begin operating as a standalone private training establishment.

The Government's would not intend to see a return to the industry training environment of the early 2000s, where there were a large number of small providers of uncertain viability. It would instead expect to agree a transition of up to eight industry divisions as standalone entities, corresponding largely to the current work-based learning divisions in Te Pūkenga.

What would happen to other providers of work-based learning?

Other providers of work-based learning would not be directly affected by implementing this model. In some cases an ITP, private provider, or Wānanga could end up receiving learners, programmes, and assets from the transitional work-based learning entity.

What would this mean for current employers and learners?

Employers and apprentices/trainees would in most cases continue to engage directly with only one organisation.

Current enrolments with a Te Pūkenga Work-based Learning division would remain with them through the transition process. Current training agreements would transfer along with the enrolment.

Learners could expect to see some changes to their programmes during transition, especially if their programme uses Te Pūkenga facilities for off-job training. However, the transition would be designed to minimise disruption to learners and employers.

What would this mean for Industry Skills Boards?

Industry Skills Boards would have a single role, like WDCs do now. They would develop qualifications, quality assure programmes for consistency and industry relevance, do strategic workforce analysis and planning, and provide investment advice to the TEC.

Unlike the Collaborative Work-based Learning model, an ISB would not directly work with individual employers, apprentices, and trainees in the training process. They would retain the ability to develop and run a final capstone assessment for learners if industry believed this was necessary.

How would funding for work-based learning be organised?

Organisations that offered work-based learning would continue to be funded by the TEC on a per-EFTS/STM (see Glossary) basis. They would be able to charge student fees and generate income from any campus-based programmes and other sources.

An ISB would only need funding to support standards-setting. It would receive some direct funding from the Government for this, could charge providers fees for quality assurance functions, and in some cases might be supported by an industry levy.

The Collaborative Work-based Learning Model

Instead of one organisation managing all aspects, this model requires a provider (an ITP, a private provider, or a Wānanga) and an ISB to work closely together to manage a work-based programme and support the learner to succeed.

Potential benefits of this model include:

- a direct feedback loop from employers and apprentices/ trainees to the standards-setting ISBs; and
- potential positive impacts on learner success from an ISB having a dedicated pastoral care function.

Possible downsides and risks of this model include:

- a more complex transition for learners and employers, and for the new ITP network; and
- shared roles could cause duplication, blur accountability and create a disconnect between pastoral care and education.

What would Collaborative Work-based Learning look like?

This model distinguishes between ‘education’ elements – designing a programme, enrolling learners, assessing competence, and awarding standards and qualifications – and ‘pastoral care’ elements – supporting an apprentice or trainee to complete their programme. A provider would be responsible for the education side of an apprenticeship, while the relevant ISB would deliver pastoral care.

For example, a building apprentice would enrol in a local provider’s programme, which was endorsed by the ISB for the construction sector. A learning agreement would be signed between the apprentice, their employer, the provider, and the ISB; this would set out the obligations and commitments of each party. During the apprenticeship, the ISB would provide non-academic support to help the apprentice complete their programme. The provider would assess the apprentice, provide academic support, and award standards and the final qualification.

Both the provider and the ISB would monitor the apprentice’s progress and put in place interventions to overcome any obstacles or problems they are having. The provider would be responsible for designing the overall apprenticeship programme and organising ‘off-job’ elements like block courses or night classes. An ISB’s standards-setting function means that they would have responsibility for ensuring that these programmes were fit for purpose from an industry perspective.

The diagram on page 15 illustrates how this would work in practice. There are currently cases where providers of work-based programmes contract other organisations to

provide pastoral care to their learners. And in the early 2000s Modern Apprenticeship Coordinators were funded to provide additional pastoral care services for younger apprentices enrolled with industry training organisations.

What would happen to Te Pūkenga's Work-based Learning divisions?

The Work-based Learning divisions of Te Pūkenga would have their programmes, including Trades Academy and Gateway, and the apprentices and trainees they manage transferred to a regional ITP, or in some cases a PTE or Wānanga. Assets associated with education and training, such as learning resources, would also be moved to these providers. Assets associated with pastoral care would move to the relevant ISB.

While the intention would be for most programmes and learners to shift to a local regional provider, in some cases an ITP in another region may need to take on those learners, or a PTE or Wānanga could take over responsibility. This would likely be the case for smaller and specialised programmes.

Depending on their role, staff currently employed in the Work-based Learning divisions could be offered employment in either the provider that takes on a programme or as part of the pastoral care workforce at an appropriate ISB.

What would happen to other providers of work-based learning?

The Collaborative model would apply to all providers of work-based learning, including private providers and Wānanga. Those who currently offer work-based learning programmes could continue doing so, but they would no longer be funded to provide pastoral care. They would also need to adapt their current programmes and training agreements to include the appropriate ISB as the provider of pastoral care.

To ensure stability, there may be a case-by-case moratorium on new work-based learning providers until the new Collaborative work-based learning model took effect. Providers taking on programmes and learners from a Work-based Learning division of Te Pūkenga would be an exception to this.

What would this mean for current employers and learners?

Employers and apprentices/trainees would engage directly with, and receive support from, two organisations: the local education provider a learner is enrolled with, and the national ISB that provides them with pastoral care.

Current enrolments with a Te Pūkenga Work-based Learning division would shift to the designated provider, and this provider would take over assessing the learner and awarding credentials. An ISB would take over providing the pastoral care. To reflect this, a revised training agreement between all four parties would be developed.

Learners and employers would see some changes to their relationships and possibly their programmes. However, the transition process would be designed to minimise disruption.

What would this mean for Industry Skills Boards?

Industry Skills Boards would have a dual role, similar to the former industry training organisations but clearer and more tightly defined. They would be both standards-setters and directly involved in supporting learners through their training. However, instead of having a broad 'arranging training' function, they would focus specifically on supporting learners to succeed.

An ISB would engage directly with employers and employees, creating a feedback loop to their standards-setting work. They could also use insights from these relationships in their quality assurance of providers.

Each ISB would need to develop a viable business and service model for providing pastoral care. This could range from field staff to a comprehensive contact centre and online support, depending on cost, learner and employer characteristics, and what works for industry.

How would funding for work-based learning be organised?

Each role in the Collaborative model would be directly funded by the TEC. The total per-EFTS/STM funding for each apprentice and trainee enrolment would be split between the provider and the ISB; there would not be additional funding. The Government would decide on an appropriate split of funding rates as part of further design work.

Both providers and ISBs would have access to additional sources of income to support their work. They would each be expected to meet the costs of all their functions and systems from the total income they received.

Providers would be able to charge student fees, and generate income from any campus-based programmes and other sources as normal. An ISB would not be able to charge learners or employers fees for pastoral care, but would receive public funding for its standards-setting activity, could charge providers fees for the quality assurance functions it performs (e.g. moderation or granting consent to assess), and in some cases might be supported by an industry levy.

Figure 1: The learner and employer journey in Collaborative Work-based Learning




Table 1: Summary of key features in Independent and Collaborative models

Area	Independent Work-based Learning	Collaborative Work-based Learning
How do industries exercise leadership?		
Who represents industry voice?	An Industry Skills Board (ISB).	An Industry Skills Board (ISB).
Nature of industry body	ISBs are independent statutory bodies established by the Minister through standardised Orders in Council.	ISBs are independent statutory bodies established by the Minister through standardised Orders in Council.
Role of industry body	ISBs only have a standards-setting role.	ISBs have both a standards-setting and a pastoral care and coordination function.
Governance of industry body	- Eight members: six industry appointees and two ministerial appointees. - Other governance elements set in Order in Council.	- Eight members: six industry appointees and two ministerial appointees. - Other governance elements set in Order in Council.
Coverage of industry body	- Set by the Minister and outlined in an Order in Council. - Sectors with no ISB are covered by NZQA.	- Set by the Minister and outlined in an Order in Council. - Sectors with no ISB are covered by NZQA.
How is work-based learning organised?		
Who can offer work-based learning programmes?	Any provider, but the programme must be endorsed by an ISB.	Any provider, but the programme must be endorsed by an ISB and involve that ISB as provider of pastoral care.
Who enrolls the learner?	A provider.	A provider, but the learner's enrolment must also be recorded by an ISB.

Area	Independent Work-based Learning	Collaborative Work-based Learning
Who does an employer deal with?	• The provider who owns the programme and enrolls the learner.	• The provider who owns the programme and enrolls the learner (for education matters). • The appropriate ISB (for pastoral care).
Who provides pastoral care?		• The appropriate ISB.
Who arranges education and assessment		• The provider who owns the programme and enrolls the learner.
Who is responsible for learner success?		• Responsibility is shared between the provider and the ISB.
How are standards-setting and work-based learning funded?		
Funding for standards-setting	• ISBs receive public funding to operate. • ISBs can charges fees to providers for quality assurance functions, dependent on individual business models. • Barriers to introducing industry levies are reduced.	• ISBs receive dedicated public funding for their standards-setting role. • ISBs can charge fees to providers for quality assurance functions, dependent on individual business models. • Barriers to introducing industry levies are reduced
Funding for work-based learning	• Providers receive per-EFTS/STM subsidies. • Providers can charge fees for enrolments.	• Per-EFTS/STM subsidies are split between providers and ISBs. • Providers can charge fees for enrolments.

Transitioning to a New Model

The timeline and process for transitions will be different depending on which model is adopted. In both cases, it will need to involve negotiation and planning between different parties. Over 2025 there will also be more operational design and policy work on specific questions, such as the definition of pastoral care activities in the Collaborative model, or setting up the transitional organisation in the Independent model.

Transitioning to Independent Work-based Learning

Under the Independent model, the Work-based Learning divisions could move out of Te Pūkenga once the new entity was set up. No decisions have been made on when that would occur, but it would likely be by early 2026 (following legislation being passed in late 2025). There would need to be planning within Te Pūkenga as to which specific assets moved with the divisions; the Government would be responsible for approving final decisions on this.

Through this process, an employer, apprentice, and trainee engaged with a Te Pūkenga division would maintain that relationship. Apprenticeships and traineeships with a private provider would not be affected by introducing this model.

The Government would then negotiate how each division would become an independent organisation. The goal of this would be to return the divisions to a form of industry ownership. If this was ultimately not possible then that division's programmes could eventually move to an existing private provider, ITP, or Wānanga. The Government's current intention is for there to be up to eight standalone providers.

Different divisions would likely take a different amount of time to transition to industry or other ownership. Where organised industry backing already existed some could move early in 2026, while others may require more work with industry bodies. However, the transitional entity would have a limited life and be wound up once all destinations were confirmed.

Transitioning to Collaborative Work-based Learning

Under the Collaborative model, determining where the programmes and assets of the Work-based Learning divisions move to would also involve significant planning and negotiation between Te Pūkenga, possibly other providers, ISBs, and industries. The Government would be responsible for approving final decisions on who received which programmes, learners, and assets. Because programmes and learners would move to providers, the timeframe for finalising this would be linked to the pace at which ITPs are stood up.

Once the Collaborative model came into effect, programmes, assets, and learners would shift to the destinations that had been confirmed over 2026, and ISBs would take on

responsibility for pastoral care. The Work-based Learning divisions would stay operating within Te Pūkenga until then.

Providers would receive assets and potentially some staff from Work-based Learning divisions to support taking on responsibility for their programmes. Providers will likely also need to make some additional investment in systems, processes, and people. To minimise disruption for current employers, apprentices, and trainees, the Government would need to be confident that a provider was appropriately prepared to take on programmes. The Government would be responsible for approving these shifts.

Particular attention would be paid to planning transitions for more specialised areas with fewer or more nationally dispersed learners, and solutions for when no ITP could viably offer a programme. Private providers of work-based learning will also need time to plan how they can integrate the pastoral care of an ISB in their programme(s).

The Consultation Process and Questions

This consultation opened on **27 January 2025** and closes on **21 February 2025**. It is a targeted consultation, which means that specific stakeholders – mainly organisations and associations that represent key industries and sectors that use work-based learning – are being invited to take part.

The results of this consultation will be analysed and presented to Cabinet in the first half of 2025, so the Government can decide to adopt one of these models. This decision will be informed by both findings from consultation and other considerations, such as the need to ensure a sustainable system and quality learning outcomes.

The Consultation Questions

The questions we are asking are intended to provide the Government with the information it needs to decide between the two models.

Specifically, we would like to know:

- 1. Which of the two models – Independent or Collaborative work-based learning – does your organisation prefer?**
- 2. Why will your preferred model work best for employers and learners in work-based learning?**
- 3. What does your organisation think are the main benefits, costs and risks of each option for employers and learners in your industry?**
- 4. Both models will involve a transition process but this will be different for each. What will be the critical factors in making transitions work for your industry?**

We welcome any other comments you might have on the two models. But structuring your submission around these questions will help the Government clearly understand your position on the two models and which you would prefer them to introduce.

How to Make a Submission

Written submissions addressing the four consultation questions can be submitted by email to the Ministry of Education at vocationaleducation.reforms@education.govt.nz. We will accept submissions until **5pm on 21 February**. Unfortunately we cannot accept non-written submissions.

All industries, employers, organisations and the public will have the opportunity to submit on legislative changes through the select committee process.

If you have a query about the consultation process, please contact us at vocationaleducation.reforms@education.govt.nz.

Glossary of Key Terms and Abbreviations

These definitions relate to how terms are used in the context of this consultation document. They may have different meanings in other contexts.

Apprentice/ Trainee	An employee engaged in work-based learning who develops competence through their work. An apprentice is undertaking a larger and longer learning programme , often in a traditional trade.
Equivalent Full Time Student (EFTS)/ Standard Training Measure (STM)	A unit used to quantify learning for funding and monitoring purposes. One EFTS represents a learner taking on a standard full-time course load for a year; an STM is the same concept but is used for work-based learning . Part-time students and work-based learners complete less than one EFTS/ STM per year.
Industry Skills Board (ISB)	The new entities that will take over the standards-setting functions of Workforce Development Councils .
Industry Training Organisation (ITO)	The industry-owned bodies that used to do standards-setting and manage most work-based learning . They were disestablished in 2020, with their standards-setting functions shifting to WDCs and their work-based learning functions moving to work-based learning divisions of Te Pūkenga or PTEs .
Institute of Technology or Polytechnic (ITP)	A publicly-owned provider of vocational education and training and applied higher education. These were disestablished in the 2020 reforms, and will be re-established over 2026.
Moderation	Ensuring consistency in assessment across different assessors. Internal moderation is managed within a provider , while external moderation is conducted from outside (e.g. by a standards-setter).
Private Training Establishment (PTE)	A privately-owned education provider . There are many PTEs offering a range of programmes, including foundation, vocational, and higher education.
Programme	A structured course of learning that a learner enrolls in and, when successfully completed, leads to a qualification . In vocational education and training these are usually made up of multiple standards .
Programme Endorsement	A standards-setting process whereby an organisation attests to NZQA that a provider's programme is appropriately designed and relevant to industries.

Provider	An ITP, Private Training Establishment , Wānanga , Te Pūkenga, or a university that designs programmes , enrolls learners, and awards qualifications .
Provider-based Learning/ off-job learning	Vocational learning that takes place mainly at a provider . This might involve some workplace experience but is mainly taught and assessed by tutors through classes, online, and in simulated work environments.
Qualification	The credential that a learner receives once they have successfully completed their programme , such as the NZ Certificate in Automotive Engineering or the NZ Diploma in Forest Management.
Standard	A specific group of knowledge, skills, and/ or attributes, against which a learner can be assessed as competent. For example, <i>Install ceiling framing</i> or <i>Provide basic emergency care</i> . Further information is available at www.nzqa.govt.nz
Standards-setting	A collection of system-level functions that ensure vocational education and training is relevant and credible. These functions include developing qualifications and standards that providers use to design programmes , and quality assuring their use.
Wānanga	Education institutions characterised by Mātauranga Māori, te reo Māori, and tikanga Māori. The specific characteristics of Wānanga are set out in section 398D of the Education and Training Act 2020.
Work-based Learning (WBL)/ on-job learning	Vocational learning that takes place mainly in the firm where a learner is employed, like an apprenticeship . In some cases this might involve attending some classes or online work, but most learning happens through work.
Work-based Learning divisions	The parts of Te Pūkenga that focus on providing work-based learning . Each is based on a former ITO that moved its programmes , learners, and assets into Te Pūkenga.
Workforce Development Councils (WDC)	The current standards-setters in vocational education and training, set up during the 2020 Reform of Vocational Education. There are six of these, each of which has coverage for a broad group of industries.



**Te Tāhuhu o
te Mātauranga**
Ministry of Education

He mea tārai e mātou te mātaurangakia rangatira
ai, kia mana taurite ai ōna huanga.

We shape an education system that delivers
equitable and excellent outcomes.



**Te Kāwanatanga
o Aotearoa**
New Zealand Government