

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Infrastructure Works (Level 3)

Qualification number: 2523

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 graduates can perform a range of infrastructure works activities including:

- operating and maintaining basic machinery and
- securing and transporting materials, plant and equipment,

while:

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

These activities occur under limited supervision.

Tertiary Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

Tertiary Education Organisation	Final rating
The Infrastructure ITO (Connexis)	Sufficient
Western Institute of Technology	Sufficient

Introduction

The purpose of this qualification is to provide the infrastructure works industry with people who have a broad range of infrastructure works skills, including the safe and effective operation of basic plant and equipment. Graduates require 50 credits to be awarded the qualification and unit standards may be used to assess each graduate profile outcome. The tertiary educational organisations that had graduates in the 2016 year and were represented at the meeting. These representatives verbally presented the case they had developed that their graduates met the graduate profile outcomes. The meeting participants then agreed that the above threshold represented the important graduate profile outcomes in a real-world workplace. Connexis, as the qualification developer, had a separate representative at the meeting. The review of 2522 the New Zealand Certificate in Infrastructure Works (Level 2) also took place at this meeting.

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.

The key evidence provided included:

1. Programme related evidence
 - Programme documentation: This included clear and relevant mapping of the programme learning outcomes against the graduate profile outcomes and the unit standards used to demonstrate competency. Some provided formal programme approval documents. Presentations at the meeting gave a useful description of the context where the programme was delivered and the relationships organisations had with industry stakeholders.
 - Moderation processes: Some organisations provided their Consent and Moderation Requirements (CMR) and/or their assessment and moderation policies. The organisations provided relevant evidence of their moderation activity including the number of assessors and their participation in internal moderation processes.
 - Moderation results: The organisations provided detailed evidence of their assessors, the unit standards that had been moderated by an external industry moderator, in one case all the relevant units, the results and a brief commentary. This is important evidence that the assessment of graduates matching profile outcomes is valid and reliable.
2. Graduate destination related evidence
 - 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.
3. Stakeholder feedback evidence
 - Graduate surveys: One survey provided sound evidence where the graduate respondents expressed their level of confidence that they matched the required graduate profile outcomes. A generic course satisfaction survey was of limited value as evidence of graduates being competent. The response rates to both surveys were sufficient to give confidence in the results.
 - Business survey: 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 or general feedback on the course has limited value as consistency evidence. Phone surveying seemed to be effective in gaining more employer responses.

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

The evidence provided by the education organisations varied in demonstrating that the graduates matched the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold. The consistency review evidence came from the three key sources: programme related, graduate destinations and stakeholder feedback. The evidence directly supported that the graduate profile outcomes were being achieved and/or indirectly that the underlying processes the organisations were using gave confidence that graduates were achieving these outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

The programme documentation provided showed clear mapping of learning outcomes against the graduate profile outcome. Documentation showed formal assessment and moderation policies and plans were in place. The training and assessment materials used were all pre-moderated by the ITO. These are effective processes. The evidence provided showed that workplace assessors were participating in moderation practices and the results of these moderation practices. Evidence of moderation activity was of significance for this review. Destination evidence was of consistently good quality and was also significant for demonstrating consistency in this review context. It showed that all the graduates were working in the infrastructure works roles when they graduated, where they would be required to follow the standard operating procedures of those organisations. The evidence of graduate and employer feedback supported to varying extents that the graduates matched the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold. The employer and graduate survey response rates were high, giving confidence that the survey results could be generalised for all the graduates. However, while some surveys had questions mapped closely to graduate profile outcomes, others were more generalised and of limited use in demonstrating consistency. Comments collected from the employers provided evidence of variable quality and relevance. The tertiary educational organisations had plans in place to manage most of the identified gaps.

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

Examples of good practice

There was one example of a well organised and comprehensive internal post-moderation process carried out by a commissioned independent moderator. All the qualification units and assessing tutors had been recently moderated. Most results were confirmed and plans were in place for addressing errors.

The example of good practice was a survey where the questions to both the employer and graduates, were mapped against the graduate profile outcomes. This provided well triangulated evidence.

Issues and concerns

A general question was raised about the quality assurance of workplace verifiers. It was noted that the scrutiny of the judgments that verifiers make is much lower than the range of formal assessment and moderation processes that support assessors to make robust and consistent judgments. Yet the verifiers are the making judgements of the student performing in a real-world context.