# TEI Financial Monitoring Framework review – feedback form

We are seeking feedback from tertiary education institutions (TEIs) on the TEI Financial Monitoring Framework review. Please email your completed online form by **21 February 2017** to: Kirralee Mahoney, Senior Analyst, Monitoring and Crown Ownership, email: kirralee.mahoney@tec.govt.nz

## General information

Name (optional): .

Position (optional): .

Organisation: .

|  |
| --- |
| 1. I am responding as: (please indicate)
 |
| An individual |  |
| On behalf of my organisation |  |
| On behalf of a collective group – please indicate collective group (i.e. Universities New Zealand) |  |

## General feedback

#### 3) The FMF is a fit-for-purpose tool for use in identifying potential financial risk.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 4) The FMF is an appropriate measure for determining if the Risk Assessment Criteria apply.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

## FMF terminology

#### 5) The viability and sustainability categories should be removed, and replaced with alternative groupings. Please offer any suggestions of categorisations in the comments field below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 6) The FMF terminology of low, moderate, and high risk should be replaced. If you agree, please answer question 7. If you disagree, please move to question 8.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 7) The proposed new terminology should be adopted. If you disagree, please provide feedback or propose additional terminology in the comments section below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 8) The proposed new category of immediate or extreme risk should be added.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 9) The FMF should move to terminology that rates performance, rather than risk – i.e. strong, moderate, poor.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

## FMF measures and methodology

#### 10) The 3-year average viability measure should be removed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 11) The trend and variability in average viability measure should be removed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 12) The FMF should include a staff student ratio measure.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 13) The FMF should include a capital assessment management capability score measure.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 14) The FMF should include a single score measure relating to an investigation (which found areas of concernor resulted in funding recoveries), statutory intervention, or material departure from funding conditions in the last five years.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 15) Please feel free to comment on other performance measures, or offer additional measures in the space provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

#### 16) The FMF should move to a points accumulation system.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 17) The proposed criteria for including undrawn borrowing in liquidity calculations should be adopted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 18) Undrawn borrowing should automatically be included in liquidity calculations if a TEI is meeting its borrowing consent covenants.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 19) A tiered risk assessment framework, with different low-risk thresholds should be adopted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Comments: |

#### 20) If a tiered system is adopted, TEI should be grouped by:

|  |
| --- |
| TEI should be grouped based on:  |
| subsector (i.e. university, ITP, wānanga) |  |
| number of EFTS delivered ( under 7,000 , over 7,000) |  |
| net assets (under $200m, over $200m) |  |
| by total revenue (under $100m, over $100m) |  |
| Something else (please detail below) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

#### 21) Please indicate your preference for receiving FMF reports.

|  |
| --- |
| FMF reports should be issued |
| Annually |  |
| When risk ratings change |  |
| Something else (please detail below) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: |

#### 22) Any other feedback or comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

