Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Computing (User Fundamentals) (Level 2)

Qualification number: 2591

Date of review: 5 and 6 September 2018

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 graduates being able to perform a range of basic tasks independently in familiar situations, and in a supervised work environment. They will be able to:

- Use the main features, functions and settings of common digital devices and software to create, access, organise, present and store information and data relevant to the context
- Use internet and common digital devices and software to connect with other users and devices
- Demonstrate knowledge of the types and purpose of common computing hardware, software and terminology to assist with choosing the right tool for the task.
- Recognise basic security risks and compliance requirements when using digital devices and software and identify procedures and solutions to implement basic security in a home, work, or study context.
- Trouble-shoot and fix simple or routine computing and connectivity problems.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

Education Organisation	Final rating
Eastern Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology	Sufficient
EmployNZ Limited	Sufficient
Te Wananga O Aotearoa	Sufficient
Activate Training Centre (ATC) New Zealand (Vision College)	Sufficient
People Potential Limited (including Education Action)	Sufficient
Whitireia Community Polytechnic	Sufficient
Southern Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Capital Training Limited	Sufficient
Horowhenua Learning Centre Trust	Sufficient
Trade and Commerce Centre Limited	Sufficient

Introduction
The purpose of this qualification is to provide Aotearoa New Zealand organisations and communities with graduates who have attained a range of introductory digital technology skills, and who can be employed in a range of general entry-level roles and contribute to community outcomes.

Graduates will be capable of using digital technologies at an introductory level, to produce and process information, and operate with a range of skills that will be internationally relevant. They will be able to perform a range of basic tasks independently in familiar situations, and in a supervised work environment.

The pathways leading from this qualification include further study in a range of higher-level qualifications at level 3 or above, or obtaining entry-level positions in a range of industries. It may also complement other qualifications in specific industries. This qualification may also assist graduates in improving digital literacy and capabilities in whanau/families and communities.

This qualification was developed jointly by the Institute of IT Professionals NZ (New Zealand's body for software and IT professionals) and NZQA.

There were 21 education organisations with approval to award the qualification. Fourteen providers had graduates. One of these providers - Education Action - had merged with People Potential, and they reported on the graduates as one entity at the meeting. Two providers were no longer in business (in liquidation) at the time of the review meeting and did not report or present. Seven providers did not have graduates at the end of 2017 or had not yet delivered their programme.

There were over 500 graduates, during the period, from the education organisations. Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology and Te Wananga O Aotearoa between them had the largest number of graduates, whilst the other providers had significantly lower graduate numbers.

Most providers were using their programmes to provide graduates with improved digital literacy and capabilities, to assist with their whanau/families, and communities. One provider, Whitireia Community Polytechnic, was purposefully using the qualification as a staging point for higher level study and preparation for a career in the IT Industry.

The review meetings were attended by the educational organisations presenting their evidence, observers from those providers who have yet to have graduates, and a representative from NZQA's National Qualification Service.

Evidence

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

The criteria used to judge the evaluation question were:

- The nature, quality and integrity of the evidence presented by an educational 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 educational 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.

Evidence presented for the review included:

- Mapping of graduate programme outcomes (GPO) against programme assessments, learning outcomes and unit standards.
- Internal and external moderation reports.
- Evidence of capstone assessments including a qualification award quality checking process and graduate work examples (a presentation handout).
- Students work experience and contribution to community events and organisations.
- Graduate destination data.
- Graduate feedback via surveys and focus groups.
- Employer/next user, including higher study tutorial staff, feedback via surveys and interviews.
- Community and employer attestations.

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

The 11 providers presented a range of evidence. There was some variability in the presentation of the evidence and analysis, and in some cases, applicability of the evidence submitted. However, overall the providers were able to make a convincing case that their evidence demonstrated that their graduates matched the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

All submissions contained some programme evidence, including mapping of outcomes, programme development and review processes, and moderation reports or evidence of moderation activities.

Programme mapping demonstrated that programme learning outcomes/unit standards and assessments had been aligned to the graduate profile outcomes. Evidence of robust processes for programme development, consultation with community groups and other end users, including employers, was also supplied. This was most useful where self-assessment processes established that the range of data and feedback collected was used to inform programme changes and enhancements.

All, but one of the providers, presented evidence of internal moderation activities, providing confidence that assessment materials were well designed. There were some inconsistencies in external moderation, and in some cases providers had not been involved in external moderation, as either, the unit standards had not been included in the moderation annual cycle (in one case, once every 4 years), or their programmes were now based on components or courses and as such, required establishing a relationship with an external moderation partner to conduct post-assessment moderation of assessor judgements. Providers to which this applied, acknowledged that this was a gap and presented plans to rectify this in their post-review reflections.

Some providers had used capstone assessment activities or an end of programme quality process, to provide confidence that their graduates had achieved the graduate outcomes and were able to demonstrate this. One provider had a graduate (who was now an employee) prepare a presentation handout for use at the review meeting. This was positively received by the review participants and was clear evidence that this graduate had met the relevant graduate outcomes for this qualification.

All providers had made significant efforts to seek quality feedback from their graduates, including destination data and commentary on the value of the skills and competencies achieved during the programme that lead to the award of the qualification. A range of surveying strategies had been implemented with good response rates and feedback that not only informed the consistency review but will also contribute toward future programme and delivery enhancements.

Given the nature of the student cohorts - small groups of 'at risk youth' for some providers, and for others, a range of adult learners for whom this was their first opportunity to acquire basic computing skills; gathering feedback from next users was challenging. As many graduates used this qualification to improve their digital literacy and capability to contribute to their whanau/families and communities there were few direct next-users, and in these cases, there was greater reliance on the feedback from the graduates themselves. Where graduates had pathwayed to employment or higher level of study, feedback was obtained from employers or tutorial staff. However, in some cases providers noted that feedback from employers on graduates meeting graduate outcomes was limited, as students seemed unwilling to share employer details and where details have been obtained, it has been difficult to get the employer to feedback.

Examples of good practice

Good practice demonstrated by some providers included:

- Comprehensive external moderation of assessment providing confidence that the students were achieving the learning outcomes that contributed to the graduate profile

- The use of community agencies to provide work experience opportunities and feedback to demonstrate the appropriateness of student work and contributing processes, including the graduate preparation of the presentation handout.
- Well-designed, administrated and presented graduates surveys. Questions aligned to the graduate outcomes, feedback on the graduates' levels of confidence, and high response rates all contributing to the value of this evidence.

Issues and concerns

Some of the provider's submissions contained an excessive number of documents. These would have benefited from a more focussed approach towards self-assessment including the analysis, summary and provision of evidence. The review process and group discussions provided valuable learning opportunities for all review participants, particularly those who had not been supported by their organisation in preparation for the consistency review meeting. There is an expectation that the self-assessment report and supporting evidence is reviewed and signed off by a senior member of staff, or a person with the delegated authority.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

The review participants agreed that the wording of the Community pathway in the qualification document should be amended from, "This qualification *may* assist graduates in improving digital literacy and capability in society" to "This qualification *will* assist graduates in improving digital literacy and capability in society …" Feedback from graduates resoundingly supported this minor change.

Note

Avonmore and The College of Future Learning awarded the qualification in 2016 and are now no longer trading. Graduate numbers from these organisations were very low and are not believed to have impacted on the Consistency of the Qualification.