

**Qualification Title:** New Zealand Certificate in Retail (Level 3)

**Qualification number:** 2235

**Date of review:** 3 August 2020

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification between: **1 January 2016 – 31 December 2019**

**Final decision on consistency of the qualification: National consistency is confirmed**

#### **Threshold:**

The threshold to determine sufficiency with the graduate profile was determined as evidence of:

That the graduates will be able to work in entry-level positions in a retail environment:

- Using communication, retail and customer service skills and their product and inventory knowledge
- Applying health, safety and security practices
- Following standard operating procedures to respond to familiar problems.

#### **Education Organisations with sufficient evidence**

The following education organisations have been found to have sufficient evidence.

<b>MOE Number</b>	<b>Education Organisation</b>	<b>Final rating</b>
6004	Unitec Institute of Technology Limited	Sufficient
6006	Ara Institute of Canterbury Limited	Sufficient
6008	Wellington Institute of Technology Limited	Sufficient
6014	Whitireia Community Polytechnic Limited	Sufficient
6025	Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology Limited	Sufficient
8252	MSL Training Limited	Sufficient
8661	New Zealand Management Academies Limited	Sufficient
9068	ServiceIQ	Sufficient
9231	Academy of Diving Trust	Sufficient

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this Level 3 60-credit qualification is to provide competent employees able to work in entry-level positions in the retail sector. The qualification provides a credential for those individuals working in these entry level positions to support their career opportunities in the retail sector. The qualification establishes standards of professional practice for retail and customer service skills that can give customers confidence in the service they receive. Two review sessions were conducted via video conference over two days. Nine education

## Final Consistency Review Report

organisations reported 3990 graduates during the review period from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2019. ServisIQ is the qualification developer and a representative attended the review.

### Evidence

The education organisations provided a range of evidence to demonstrate that their graduates met the graduate profile outcomes.

The criteria used to judge the evaluation question were:

- The nature, quality and integrity of the evidence presented by the education organisation
- How well the organisation has analysed, interpreted and validated the evidence, and used the understanding gained to achieve actual or improved consistency
- The extent to which the education organisation can reasonably justify and validate claims and statements relating to the consistency of graduate outcomes, including in relation to other providers of programmes leading to the qualification.

### Programme evidence:

Most organisations provided often sound evidence of the graduate profile outcomes mapped against the learning outcomes, unit standards and/or assessment tasks.

The organisations provided a variable range of moderation-related evidence. Some provided samples of moderation reports which showed the processes being conducted. Some provided a schedule of moderation activity. Fewer provided the results and analysis of the moderation coverage of assessments, assessors and/or campuses and workplaces where pertinent. Some organisations provided minimal evidence, minimal coverage of assessment and/or concerning results that did not give confidence in the assessments that underpinned the graduate profile outcomes. A few outlined the improvements that had been made. The analysis of the evidence was often limited. There was little interpretation of the extent the moderation demonstrated the assessment underlying the GPOs was sound and reliable.

There was generally sound evidence of training taking place while many of the graduates had been working in retail roles and others had the graduates temporarily running a retail outlet. Some others had graduates on work placements in the retail industry.

### Graduate evidence:

The graduate feedback evidence was of variable quality. All organisations had used surveys. Mostly there was a low proportion of graduates who had participated. Some education organisations had conducted the surveys belatedly in 2020, which reduced the reliability of the respondents' recollection if they graduated multiple years previously. The robustness of the questionnaire design varied: a few were directly related to the GPO capability of the respondent using a clear rating scale supported by qualitative commentary. A few submissions provided persuasive evidence.

### Destination evidence:

There was a wide range of graduate destination related evidence provided. Some provided detailed supporting evidence, the analysis undertaken was mostly sound, showing how many had progressed onto related training or employment. Others were reliant on graduate survey data that had low response rates. A few had some evidence of graduate succeeding in related higher-level study, which was persuasive evidence. There was often little, or no employer feedback collected and analysed.

## Final Consistency Review Report

### Other:

Some education organisations had undertaken sound analysis of all the key evidence. Monitoring was robust in some cases. Few submissions had triangulated different evidence to strengthen their justification. Often analysis was limited and in one case, the evidence and the analysis were seriously inadequate. Typically, there was limited justification of how well each evidence source and the evidence, overall, had shown the graduates were demonstrating the graduate profile outcomes at the expected threshold.

### **How well does the self-assessment and supporting evidence provided by the education organisation demonstrate that its graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold?**

Many education organisations provided sound programme related evidence. Most organisations provided documents mapping the graduate profile outcomes against the assessments undertaken. Those organisations rated as sufficient typically showed internal and external moderation that covered the assessment undertaken with results generally confirming the assessor judgements and/or any gaps were not serious and were being addressed. Most organisations had evidence of the graduates gaining real-world experience through their training. A few organisations reported the majority of their graduates rating themselves as demonstrating their graduate profile outcome capability, but many had feedback from small proportion of their graduates. Some organisations provided detailed destination evidence showing a significant proportion of graduates progressing onto related work and/or further study. There was little employer feedback provided. The stronger submissions clearly identified the significance of the gaps and provided credible plans to address them. Overall, those organisations found sufficient had provided supporting evidence and sound self-assessment that demonstrated that their graduates meet the graduate outcomes at the determined threshold.

### **Special Focus**

None

### **Issues and concerns**

None.

### **Recommendations to Qualification Developer**

Significant proportions of graduates were undertaking a range of related further training (e.g. Level 4 training in hospitality or business management). However, these programmes were not identified as the expected education pathways in the qualification document. Similarly, graduates were getting employment in customer-service type roles that were not directly related to the retail industry. This was viewed as related employment as the graduates were using at least some of the capabilities gained in their retail training. This conclusion was particularly pertinent for a Level 3 programme where students could be exploring a potential career option.