Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Infrastructure Works (Level 2)

Qualification number: 2522

Date of review: 7 August 2017

Final decision on consistency of the qualification: National Consistency Confirmed

Threshold:

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

That the graduates can perform basic infrastructure works activities (using hand tools and maintaining basic machinery) while:

- applying safe work practices and
- complying with the environmental requirements on site.

These activities occur under direct supervision.

Tertiary Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

Tertiary Education Organisation	Final rating
Western Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Personalised Education Ltd (Solomon Group)	Sufficient
Whitireia Community Polytechnic	Sufficient
The Infrastructure ITO (Connexis)	Sufficient

Introduction

This qualification is for people entering the infrastructure works industry from school or another industry or they may be already working as labourers without a qualification in civil works, rural contracting, surfacing operations or underground utilities work situation. Graduates require 40 credits to be awarded this qualification and unit standards may be used to assess each graduate profile outcome. Four tertiary educational organisations had graduates in the 2016 year. Representatives of these organisations verbally presented their case that their graduates met the graduate profile outcomes at the review meeting. The meeting participants agreed that the above threshold represented the important graduate outcomes in a real-world work situation. Connexis, as the qualification developer, had a separate representative at the meeting. The review of 2523 the New Zealand Certificate in Infrastructure Works (Level 3) also took place in this meeting.

Evidence

The education organisation 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 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

The key evidence provided included:

1. Programme related evidence
   o Programme documentation: Documents included clear and relevant mapping of the programme learning outcomes against the graduate profile outcomes and the unit standards used to demonstrate competency. Some organisations provided the programme approval documents. Presentations at the meeting gave a useful description of the programme delivery context and the level of engagement the organisations had with industry stakeholders.
   o Moderation processes: Assessment and moderation plans and policies were provided by some organisations. Most of the organisations used ITO developed pre-moderated assessment materials. Some samples of moderated assessment were provided. Some included a record of the number of assessors and their participation in internal moderation processes, which was strong evidence. Most provided of a summary of the external moderation activity.
   o Moderation results: Some organisations provided evidence of the internal moderation results by an independent moderator and/or the external moderation results. This is relevant evidence that the assessment of the graduates matching graduate profile outcomes, was valid and reliable.
2. Graduate destination related evidence
   o All organisations included lists of graduates and the infrastructure companies where they were employed at the time of their graduation. This was relevant real-world evidence of consistency.
   o One organisation had a list of 2522 graduates who had progressed onto the Level 3, 2523 qualification; that was also relevant evidence.
3. Stakeholder feedback evidence
   o Graduates evidence mostly came from surveys. Some surveys provided good consistency review evidence when respondents were asked to express their level of confidence that they matched the required graduate profile outcomes. Other surveys were more generic course satisfaction surveys, which has limited relevance and value as evidence. The response rates to the surveys varied but were sufficient to give confidence in the results.
   o Businesses: Some had a sample of comments from employers. One provider asked businesses similar questions to those posed to their graduates, that is, their level of confidence that the graduates matched the required graduate profile outcomes. This was strong triangulation of evidence. Generic customer satisfaction survey results have limited value as consistency evidence. Phone surveying seemed to be effective in gaining more employer responses. One provider had a video where a key employer, and a few

graduates, expressed confidence in ability of the qualification graduates; this was relevant evidence.

How well does the evidence provided by the education organisation demonstrate that its graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold?

The quality of the evidence provided by the education organisations varied in demonstrating that the graduates matched the graduate profile outcomes at the appropriate threshold. There were three key sources of consistency review evidence: programme related, graduate destinations and stakeholder feedback. There was direct evidence provided that the graduate profile outcomes were being achieved and indirect evidence of the underlying processes the organisations were using that gave confidence that graduates were achieving these outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

The programme related evidence for some education organisations was detailed and showed clearly the delivery and assessments were directly linked to the graduate profile outcomes and occurring and in real world environment. Pre-moderated ITO materials were used in most cases. For some, the moderation undertaken of assessments represented well both the units being assessed and the pool of assessors. The moderation results sighted generally confirmed the assessor decisions. For other education organisations, one or more of these important programme components were absent. However, there was consistent and relevant evidence with sufficient details, from the organisations showing that many graduates were working in industry related roles. These employing organisations required graduates/employees to follow standard operating procedures, which strongly overlapped with the graduate profile outcomes (such as applying safe work practices and complying with the environmental requirements on site). The evidence of stakeholder feedback was mixed quality. Some organisations had a high level of industry engagement in the programme design and delivery. Industry representatives were involved in verifying the performance of the students on the job. Some organisations had surveyed a representative sample of both graduates and employers, where they expressed their level of confidence that the graduate demonstrated the graduate profile outcomes. A common gap was there was no feedback or the feedback was about the programme and not the performance of the graduates.

Overall a convincing case was made across the education organisations represented that the graduates matched the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

Examples of good practice

Surveys for both the employer and graduate mapped the survey questions against the graduate profile outcomes, where the respondents expressed a level of confidence in the graduates' performance. These results provided well triangulated evidence.

An independent moderator carried out a well organised internal post-moderation process where all the relevant qualification units and all assessing tutors were reviewed.