

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Plumbing, Gasfitting and Drain Laying (Level 3)

Qualification number: 2660

Date of review: 16 and 17 May 2022

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification prior to: 31 December 2021

Final decision on consistency of the qualification: National consistency is not yet confirmed

It was agreed at the review that the threshold, for the purposes of this consistency review, was aligned with the graduate profile outcomes of version two of the qualification since all graduates worked on version two. This version of the qualification is entitled New Zealand Certificate in Plumbing, Gasfitting and Drain Laying (Pre-Apprenticeship) (Level 3).

Threshold:

The threshold to determine sufficiency with the graduate profile was determined as evidence of graduates who will be able to:

- Present themselves appropriately for work, follow instructions, and work within limits of own knowledge while recognising the consequence of actions on work relationships and performance.
- Communicate using oral, written, and digital formats to clarify and report on work-related tasks; to interact respectfully with colleagues and clients; and to work effectively as part of a team.
- Use recognised methods and processes to perform basic trade-related tasks to assist with work undertaken by a licensed Plumber, Gasfitter or Drainlayer.
- Accept responsibility for actions and ask relevant questions about workplace processes to ensure correct understanding of supervisor instructions and expected work outputs.
- Apply safe working procedures and practices; identify and control hazards in a working environment; and use understanding of basic electrical principles relevant to plumbing, gasfitting and drainlaying work contexts to keep oneself safe.
- Work with understanding of the roles and the regulatory environment for plumbing, gasfitting, and drainlaying.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
6008	Wellington Institute of Technology Limited (Weltec)	Sufficient

Final Consistency Review Report

6010	Manakau Institute of Technology Ltd (MIT)	Sufficient
6006	Ara Institute of Technology Ltd (ARA)	Sufficient
8661	New Zealand Management Academies Limited (NZMA)	Sufficient
6017	Western Institute of Technology at Taranaki Ltd (WITT)	Sufficient
6019	Te Pukenga trading as Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec)	Sufficient
6009	Universal College of Learning (UCOL) Limited	Sufficient
6004	Unitec New Zealand Limited (Unitec)	Sufficient
6007	Eastern Institute of technology Ltd (EIT)	Sufficient

Introduction

The purpose of this Level 3, 75-credit qualification is to provide the plumbing, gasfitting and drainlaying industries with people who have basic skills and knowledge in these industries in accordance with the requirements of the regulatory legislation and who are ready to work. The qualification is common to all three trades and is suitable for those who wish to enter the industry.

Graduates will be capable of assisting with work undertaken by a licenced Plumber, Gasfitter, or Drainlayer under supervision and will be ready to enter into an apprenticeship that will lead to a New Zealand Level 4 trade qualification in one or more of the plumbing, gasfitting or drainlaying trades [Refs: 2661, 2662, 2663].

The New Zealand community will benefit from having graduates able to assist in ensuring public safety in the provision of gas and water services and removal of foul water.

This qualification provides one of two entry pathways into the plumbing, gasfitting or drainlaying industries and is intended for persons who do not have an apprenticeship agreement in any of these trades. It provides learners the opportunity to progress to a fully credentialed tradesperson level with further study on one of the Level 4 New Zealand Certificates in these three trades.

As this qualification is not a prerequisite for the Level 4 New Zealand Certificates noted above, the other entry pathway is through an apprenticeship agreement where learners will be signed directly into the New Zealand Certificate in Plumbing (Level 4) [Ref: 2663] or the New Zealand Certificate in Gasfitting (Level 4) [Ref: 2662] or the New Zealand Certificate in Drainlaying (Level 4) [Ref: 2661].

This qualification does not enable graduates to practice as a plumber, gasfitter or drainlayer. Graduates will not be eligible to seek licensing. Examples of roles that this qualification may lead to are plumbing apprentice, gasfitting apprentice, or drainlaying apprentice. Graduates may also be able to work in areas such as plumbing, gasfitting or drainlaying wholesaling or retailing as a counter sales person.

The qualification was first developed in 2015 as version one, by The Skills Organisation in collaboration with the sector and education organisations. Version two of this qualification

Final Consistency Review Report

was published in April 2017, after an early review. A further early review was conducted in 2021 and version three was listed on the framework in August 2021. The purpose of this review was to have a qualification and aligned programmes of study that provided improved alignment to the Level 4 apprenticeship qualifications, programmes of study and industry training.

As noted earlier, this consistency review relates to version two of the qualification. There were nine education organisations with graduates from the programmes of study, leading to the award of this qualification. These organisations had a total of 1185 graduates over the reporting period.

The consistency review was held via video-conference meetings on 16 and 17 May 2022, and was attended by representatives of the education organisations, the Wahanga Ara Rau (Construction & Infrastructure) Workforce Development Council (WDC) that has responsibility for qualifications relating to construction and infrastructure industries, and several observers.

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 evidence included:

- Confirmation that each education organisation had a coherent programme of study which ensured that programme components were aligned to and led to the graduate profile.
- Evidence of learners being provided with real world learning in simulated environments providing opportunities to practice skills.
- Internal and external moderation evidence that assured the programme was assessed at an appropriate level, and assessment was valid.
- Feedback from graduates, employers, and next level tutors confirming that the programme had provided graduates with a range of skills aligned to the graduate profile of the qualification, and that they were work-ready and prepared to enter into an apprenticeship.
- Destination data including progression to apprenticeships and next level study, or into related trades employment.

Final Consistency Review Report

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?

Education organisations submitted a good range of evidence that in most cases could be triangulated to demonstrate that their graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

The education organisations provided good evidence relating to their approved programmes of study and how the course, and unit standards are embedded in programmes, how learning outcomes are mapped against the qualification graduate profile outcomes and the quality and suitability of assessments. The education organisations' programmes involved learners participating in full time learning, and evidence was provided, often via photo evidence, that the programmes included opportunities for learners to practice their skills in a simulated workplace environment.

Generally, evidence relating to moderation was sound, demonstrating good internal moderation processes, external moderation conducted with partners, or in cluster groups with mainly positive results. Some planned external moderation had been interrupted by Covid-19 lockdowns. Moderation evidence confirmed the validity and consistency of assessment practices, and that graduates had been assessed appropriately and at the correct level, and this supported claims that graduates met the graduate outcomes.

Graduate, next level tutors and employer survey results and feedback generally confirmed that graduates had gained, and were using, the skills and knowledge outlined in the graduate profile. However, a small number of education organisations had low response rates to institutional surveys, and this impacted on the validity of results and the value of this evidence to support consistency of graduate outcomes. Some education organisations are exploring other data collection methodologies.

Destination data showed that the graduates had varying success in securing apprenticeships in the industry, with a variation of twenty to eighty percent of graduates following the education and employment pathway of the qualification. Those education organisations with the most success in progressing graduates were well connected with their local industries or offered managed apprenticeship programmes at Level 4. Other graduates were moving into construction or related trades, some to non-related employment and some were looking for work opportunities.

The stronger submissions robustly analysed, interpreted and triangulated their evidence and made clear and convincing arguments for how well each evidence source and the evidence, taken as a whole had shown the graduates were demonstrating the graduate profile outcomes.

Overall, the self-assessment and supporting evidence supplied, by those organisations found sufficient, demonstrates that their graduates meet the graduate outcomes at the determined threshold.

Special Focus (includes special focus on a strand or outcome)

N/A

Final Consistency Review Report

Issues and concerns

Refer to comments in the section below relating to credit transfer arrangements for the new version of this qualification, and the related programme of study.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

Waihanga Ara Rau (Construction & Infrastructure) Workforce Development Council participated in the consistency review. As a review of the qualification has recently been completed there was no specific recommendations relating to the qualification. However, the education organisations expressed their concerns that the arrangements for credit transfer from the new version of the Level 3 qualification to the Level 4 qualification have not yet been confirmed and communicated. The representatives urged Waihanga Ara Rau to resolve this matter as soon as possible, in order for this information to be shared with learners/apprentices and to implement appropriate credit transfer processes.

Final Consistency Review Report

Education Organisation sufficiency rating

Education Organisation	Rating	What evidence is good and what gaps are there in the evidence? (feedback for the education organisation)	What is needed for evidence to become sufficient?
<p>Wellington Institute of Technology Limited (Weltec) 6008</p>	<p>Sufficient</p>	<p>Wellington Institute of Technology Limited (Weltec) reported 183 graduates in the reporting period: 41 in 2018, 46 in 2019, 52 in 2020 and 44 in 2021.</p> <p>The reviewer notes that 58 of graduates completed the training at Wellington Regional Prison. Weltec understands the benefit for Corrections graduates is “learning basic skills required for future learning, gaining self-worth, building resilience to failure, and developing improved self- control over their behaviour, enabling them to participate in a learning environment”. As there was limited evidence available for this cohort, WelTec reported on the 125 graduates from the face-to-face delivery at the Petone campus.</p> <p>The report included an explanation of how general conditions are met in the programme.</p> <p>The self-assessment and evidence provided gives a good level of confidence that graduates meet the Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPO). A range of data had been collected and used to support the conclusion.</p> <p>The presenter shared the full report on screen at the review meeting, and soon realised that this was not a suitable presentation mode.</p>	<p>No further evidence required</p>

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>The post-review reflection indicates that there have been some useful learnings from the consistency review process, and ideas gathered from the meeting and reviewer feedback to change and enhance self-assessment practices. The presenter has acknowledged that preparing a summary presentation is the most effective way to present evidence and conclusions at the review meeting and will recommend this to the Academic Advisory team.</p> <p>Programme evidence:</p> <p>Good programme evidence was included in the submission, and this demonstrates that the programme has been designed and delivered to develop the graduate outcomes in the learners. This section would have been strengthened with a summary of moderation results including any actions and the completion of these showing how they attest to the validity of assessment.</p> <p>A good range of formative and summative assessments methodologies are used. Mapping demonstrates good alignment of the courses, learning outcomes, and assessments to the GPOs, and shows that learners are provided with multiple opportunities to demonstrate they have met the learning outcomes and GPOs.</p> <p>A moderation plan and samples were provided. External moderation was conducted by EIT. Moderation files were appended, and whilst results were mainly positive for both pre- and post-assessment moderation, the Self-assessment Summary report lacked a commentary or a summary of these results and how they attest to the validity of assessment.</p> <p>Ongoing improvements have been made to the programme through the Annual Programme Evaluation Reporting (APERs) process and examples were provided.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>Graduate evidence:</p> <p>WelTec has made concerted efforts to collect feedback and understand destinations. Overall, this is evidence that graduates had the capabilities as required by the qualification.</p> <p>Institutional surveys were conducted for each year's cohort. Whilst results were generally positive, the response rates were not always representative (2018 - 29/41, 2019 and 2020 were below institutional targets, 2021 28/39 responses). Programme staff followed up the survey with phone calls, however this was resource intensive and Weltec has realised that they need alternative data collection methodologies, such as sampling.</p> <p>Destination evidence:</p> <p>Overall there were reasonably good transitions to employment and apprenticeships (Level 4 in work programme), and positive feedback from employers and next-level tutors (Block courses). This evidence supports the claims that graduates met the qualification's GPOs.</p> <p>Weltec indicated in their report, that "employment outcomes for graduates were particularly good with significant numbers working in the plumbing industry and others employed in construction and infrastructure-based roles". This was backed up with destination data collected from the internal data base information, and graduate survey responses.</p> <p>A small number of responses from employers were collected with the average response to the survey questions being positive, (rating 5 or higher on a 1-10-point scale). Feedback was well analysed, and limitations (e.g. select on-site materials), explained in the context of the course and industry.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>Next level tutor feedback indicated that “graduates typically are confident communicators (GPO 2), have above average knowledge on the relevant legislation, are aware of current health and safety best practices and can competently use hand tools”.</p> <p>Additional evidence included a personal story of transformation provided by a graduate’s parent and success stories of two Maori and Pasifika Trades Training learners.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Action those points as reflected in the Post-review reflection document to improve WelTec’s consistency review process. 2. Clearly articulate data results in WelTec’s Self-assessment Summary (SA) report to allow for more clarity and efficiency. For example, statistics/percentages relating to graduate and employer response rates are not always clear (refer pages 8-9 of SA report). 	
<p>Manakau Institute of Technology Ltd (MIT) 6010</p>	Sufficient	<p>Manakau Institute of Technology Ltd (MIT) reported 142 graduates in the reporting period: 34 in 2018, 42 in 2019, 34 in 2020 and 32 in 2021.</p> <p>The programme includes five 15-credit courses that are run concurrently.</p> <p>The self-assessment used a good range of evidence, and this was well summarised and presented at the meeting. The triangulation of evidence was persuasive and supports the conclusion “that the abilities and skills displayed by graduates of the New Zealand Certificate in Plumbing, Gasfitting and Draining at MIT are consistent with the qualification’s graduate outcomes”.</p>	No further evidence required

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>The Post-review Reflection was provided, and no changes were proposed to self-assessment as the result of the review.</p> <p>Programme evidence</p> <p>Good programme evidence was provided. This demonstrates the programme was designed and delivered to develop the qualification's outcomes in the learners.</p> <p>The Programme Map shows alignment of Graduate Profiles Outcomes (GPO), learning outcomes and assessment. All GPOs are covered in every course.</p> <p>A moderation plan was provided, along with samples of external moderation conducted by Unitec and Wintec - all met the standard. A moderation tracker showed outcomes, including positive moderation results from Skills. These results were summarised in the presentation (slide 13) and well explained. This evidence attests to the validity of assessment.</p> <p>Annual programme evaluations were provided as evidence of ongoing programme improvements.</p> <p>Graduate evidence:</p> <p>Whilst MIT had reservations about whether the survey results were sufficiently representative of the 142 graduates, taken together with the destination evidence, this evidence supports the conclusion that the graduates had the capabilities as required by the qualification.</p> <p>Thirty-eight of the 142 (27 per cent response rate) responded to MIT's institutional level survey (shown by cohort). Follow-up conversations were also held. Most of the graduates rated themselves as 'very capable' and 'mostly capable' (on a 3-point scale) for all of the graduate outcomes. Results were presented in</p>	
--	--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>a bar graph for GPOs 1 to 3 in the report, and all were presented in pie graphs in the slide presentation. MIT reported that graduates “gained confidence in their ability to study at the next level, or to go into employment related to their study”.</p> <p>Destination evidence:</p> <p>A good range of destination evidence was provided.</p> <p>Destinations of the 38 survey respondents showed 32 per cent (12) were in employment, 15 per cent (5) were undertaking further studies, 48 per cent (18) graduates were currently employed and undertaking further studies (secured apprenticeships), and five per cent (2) were not employed or had lost their jobs due to Covid-19.</p> <p>A lecturer of the graduates who were in further study at MIT was surveyed and were rated as ‘very capable’ on all outcome statements.</p> <p>Twenty-four employers were surveyed, and they rated the graduates as ‘very capable’ or ‘mostly capable’ with a few ratings of ‘sometimes capable’ for the outcome statements.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Ensure that statistics are consistent across documentation for clarity and efficiency purposes. For example, the destination data is not consistent across documentation including the PowerPoint.</p>	
Eastern Institute of Technology Ltd (EIT)	Not Sufficient	Eastern Institute of Technology Ltd (EIT) reported 55 graduates in the reporting period: 15 in 2018, 14 in 2019, 16 in 2020 and 10 in 2022. It is noted that the ‘Examiner Results Summary’ in Folder 5	<p>Further evidence is required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A revised Self-assessment Summary report using the

Final Consistency Review Report

<p>6007</p>	<p>regarding the approval of results corroborated the graduate statistics for 2020.</p> <p>A desk evaluation was undertaken on the submission provided by EIT.</p> <p>The summary section of the report template was populated by the qualification’s strategic purpose, graduate profile outcomes etc. This section is intended to be a summary of the evidence that demonstrates graduates met the qualification’s Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPO).</p> <p>EIT’s self-assessment has not demonstrated how well the graduates met the graduate outcomes of the qualification. The relevant supporting evidence has not been used to answer the evaluation question: <i>‘How well does the self-assessment and supporting evidence provided by the education organisation demonstrate that its graduates match the graduate outcome at the appropriate threshold?’</i> It would appear the tutors need some support from the centralised academic quality team to understand the evidence and how to present this as a convincing case.</p> <p>Programme evidence</p> <p>This section of the report referred to the work experience required by the programme, and that the tutors are constantly in touch with the industry to see how learners are progressing.</p> <p>Moderation is identified as another indicator that the programme is on track. Some evidence was appended however this was not used in the report to attest to the validity of assessment. It would also be useful to review the moderation templates to include the date of moderation and whether any follow-up actions have occurred as a result of moderation outcomes.</p> <p>EIT has Weltec as their external moderation partner.</p> <p>Some moderation files were appended (moderation folder 3). The nine files of post-moderation of individual student work were</p>	<p>available evidence (and analysis) to demonstrate that EIT’s graduates have met the graduate outcomes of the qualification, in the context of the programme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Programme evidence to demonstrate how the programme has been designed and delivered to develop the graduate outcomes in the learners (this <i>should</i> include a mapping document), and how internal and external moderation results attest to the validity of the assessments. This <i>could</i> include a summary table of internal and external moderation results and any associated actions taken. 3. Feedback from graduates to demonstrate that they have the confidence and capabilities that are fully aligned to the graduate outcomes. 4. Destination data to show where the graduates progressed to and feedback from stakeholders such as employers to demonstrate that the programme has prepared their students and / or employees for their roles (relevant study or employment) and that they are
-------------	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

	<p>reviewed. Eight of nine requirements were met, and the moderator agreed with the assessors' marking. A moderation plan, and the moderation template were included in the folder.</p> <p>Examiners results (folder 5) contained eight files confirming eligibility of graduates. There is no commentary showing how this evidence supports consistency of graduate outcomes.</p> <p>Graduate evidence:</p> <p>The Self-assessment Summary report notes “a key indicator is feedback from students and that this provides a check the programme is meeting the outcomes and students’ expectations of the programme”. However, there is nothing further provided to support this statement.</p> <p>In the report it is noted that surveys have changed “to make sure that the graduates have the opportunity to give specific feedback in the areas of the Graduate Profile outcomes for this qualification”. However, there is no commentary on the survey methodology, when these were conducted, nor about the results and what these meant to EIT.</p> <p>The relevant sections of the survey results showed the following ratings (note this may have been from students at the end of the course, or from graduates). Other questions appear to be related to the programme and delivery.</p> <p>The 2019 survey had 12 responses, more ‘agreed’ than ‘strongly agreed’</p> <p>The 2020 survey had 12 responses, ratings were split with six ‘strongly agreed’ to all statements and six ‘agreed’.</p> <p>The 2021 survey had nine responses, rating skills as ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’. EIT needs to understand these results and explain in their self-assessment report how these contribute towards demonstrating that graduates have met the GPOs.</p>	<p>confident and have the capabilities aligned to the graduate outcomes.</p> <p>5. Areas of weakness in the evidence to be identified and how these are being managed or improved.</p>
--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>Destination evidence:</p> <p>In the report a statement is made that “Graduates have generally ended up with employment both in the industry or with industries aligned to industry”. But there is no evidence to support this claim.</p> <p>The report also says: “... feedback from employers and industry is often on an informal level ...” and “... this gives EIT a clear indication of how the graduates and/or students are going”. This informal method of collecting evidence is not sufficient to demonstrate that graduates have met the GPOs of the qualification.</p> <p>Tutor feedback (folder 4 appended) was reviewed. This evidence relates to ratings of tutor’s delivery and the programme by students and is therefore not relevant to answering the evaluation question.</p> <p>Graduate/industry evaluation (folder 2) was reviewed. This contains feedback from four employers, with ratings generally positive while one rated all responses ‘strongly disagree’. However, as this did not align with comments made, and the reviewer suspects the respondent may have incorrectly ticked the first box in the survey. While this is relevant evidence; the ratings and qualitative feedback need to be analysed and interpreted and used to support claims that graduates have met the outcomes of the qualification.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Ensure all necessary evidence (e.g. presentation) is submitted in accordance with the NZQA Self-assessment Report template for the purposes of completeness and transparency of evidence.</p>	
<p>Ara Institute of Canterbury Ltd (ARA) 6006</p>	<p>Sufficient</p>	<p>Ara Institute of Canterbury Ltd (Ara) reported 144 graduates in the reporting period: 29 in 2019, 62 in 2020 and 53 in 2021.</p>	<p>No further evidence required.</p>

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>The programme is made up of five 15-credit courses with health and safety and work-readiness skills embedded across the five courses and is run over 22 weeks.</p> <p>Overall the self-assessment and evidence provided, gives a reasonable level of confidence that graduates meet the graduate profile outcomes. The Self-assessment Summary report would have been strengthened with commentary about the evidence collection methodology, and more effective use of the results to support claims that graduates match the Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPO).</p> <p>The PowerPoint presentation was well presented, and the presenter was able to respond to the reviewer's questions. It is evident that Ara understands the performance of this programme well, including completions, and will use this intel to inform the programme leading to version 3 of this qualification. Areas for improvement included scheduling regular external moderation and tracking student outcomes, including those who did not complete.</p> <p>Post-review reflections were not provided. However, completing this exercise should encourage further reflective thinking post the consistency review meeting and lead to improvements in self-assessment activities.</p> <p>Programme evidence:</p> <p>Good evidence relating to the programme was provided. This demonstrates that the programme was designed and delivered to develop the graduate outcomes in the learners.</p> <p>Programme mapping demonstrates that learning outcomes, teaching, and learning activities and assessments are aligned to the graduate profile.</p> <p>Pre-assessment moderation was conducted before the programme began in 2019. The moderator carried out some observations and moderated a sample of assessments for the first delivery. External post-assessment moderation was completed on the assessments at Unitec in June 2021. Some changes were made to the</p>	
--	--	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>assessments, in relation to personal protective equipment and answers needing to be more specific. Overall the moderation results were mainly positive. Ara acknowledged that external moderation needs to be conducted more regularly.</p> <p>The annual programme evaluation conducted in 2021 for the 2020 year was appended. It indicated areas for improvement and the actions being taken.</p> <p>Graduate evidence:</p> <p>Graduate feedback provides some confidence that graduates match the GPOs.</p> <p>An on-line survey was conducted, with 59 of 144 graduates responding (41 per cent response rate). It was not clear when this survey was conducted. Survey results were appended in Appendix 3. These showed that graduates were 'extremely satisfied' that they had met the GPOs. These results did not appear to have been analysed and interpreted and were not used effectively in the self-assessment report.</p> <p>Another survey was included in Appendix 6 from 2020, with seven of 62 responding (11 per cent response rate). As there is no commentary about this survey or the results, the reviewer assumes this may have been due to the low response rate and therefore limited value of results.</p> <p>Destination evidence:</p> <p>Good information on destinations has informed self-assessment.</p> <p>Destination data was shown in a table on page 3 of the self-assessment report, indicating that 80 graduates were in employment and continuing with study, i.e. doing their apprenticeship. Sixteen of these graduates are completing their managed apprenticeship through Ara, and an estimated 60 to 70 are completing their ITO managed apprenticeship and attending off-job training through Ara.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>Graduate survey responses indicated they were satisfied the programme prepared them for further study or advanced skills for employment.</p> <p>Feedback from next level tutors who teach the Level 4 Plumbing, Gasfitting and Drainlaying programmes: “find the pre-trade students more relaxed, more familiar with life at Ara. ...They have used a lot of the tools/equipment and as a result they seem more confident”.</p> <p>An employer survey had eight responses that showed they were satisfied their employees (graduates) had met the GPOs.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Further develop Ara’s processes for analysing and reflecting on feedback from stakeholders. Analysis of graduate and employer feedback has not been included in the self-assessment report to show year-by-year comparative analysis and to identify any learnings gained to inform self-assessment. Note too that surveys need to identify the dates they were completed.</p>	
<p>New Zealand Management Academies Limited (NZMA) 8661</p>	<p>Sufficient</p>	<p>New Zealand Management Academies Limited (NZMA) reported 264 graduates over the reporting period: 25 in 2018, 33 in 2019, 64 in 2020 and 142 in 2021.</p> <p>The programme that has been delivered for the reporting period was owned by MIT. NZMA now has gained approval for its own programme.</p> <p>Overall, the submission generally supports the conclusion that graduates meet the qualification outcomes. The strongest evidence is the graduate destinations, and the trend that indicates an increasing number of graduates are moving into relevant employment pathways.</p> <p>Post-review reflections were thoughtful and included a number of areas that will be changed in self-assessment as a result of participating in the consistency review.</p>	<p>No further evidence required</p>

Final Consistency Review Report

	<p>Programme evidence:</p> <p>Programme evidence generally demonstrates that the programme is designed and delivered to develop the graduates' outcomes in learners. Increasing moderation sampling, conducting regular cross-campus moderation, continuing to make improvements in external moderation, and addressing moderation findings will strengthen this evidence source and provide greater assurance of the validity of assessment.</p> <p>Programme mapping shows alignment to the Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPO). A more detailed map (appendix 2) illustrates the alignment of key parts of the learning process e.g. verb agreement, across the programme elements and level descriptors.</p> <p>The moderation summary shows positive outcomes for internal and one external moderation over the four years of delivery, across campuses and the 264 graduates, and leads NZMA to conclude that this gives confidence in the validity of assessment and in turn, is good evidence for consistency. One further external moderation result was included and discussed in the presentation. NZMA evidenced how internal moderation outcomes are followed through including any necessary actions taken. As discussed at the meeting, and noted above, the moderation process and evidence need to be continually strengthened to support such conclusions.</p> <p>Graduate evidence:</p> <p>The feedback from graduates provides some confidence that graduates match the GPOs.</p> <p>A graduate survey was conducted (Appendix 11). NZMA reported that "the overall confidence rating of graduates is between 4 – 5, meaning they are more than confident in applying the qualification GPOs in the workplace".</p> <p>The report did not include the response rate. This was obtained from Appendix 11 and showed 48 of 264 graduates responded (18 per cent response rate). Further responses were collected after the</p>	
--	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>submission was made and updated in the PowerPoint to 73 graduate responses (28 per cent response rate).</p> <p>NZMA concluded that the qualitative feedback from graduates (some examples given in slide 20) shows graduates applying the skills and knowledge of the GPOs in relevant contexts in the workplace. However, there is no evidence of how this feedback is used to change or improve the programme delivery.</p> <p>The reviewer noted that there were some inconsistencies in measures such as median and average ratings, in the analysis of the statistical data.</p> <p>Destination evidence:</p> <p>Good information on graduate destinations has informed the self-assessment. However, NZMA has yet to deliver on its intentions made in previous consistency reviews to collect next level tutor feedback. Further work is also necessary to increase the sample size of employer feedback. NZMA reported that a meeting was to be held about this in June, and in the post-review reflection reported, “we now have in place a central tool for inputting and analysing this feedback, and are clarifying the delegations and training for staff gathering the feedback.”</p> <p>Destination data was collected from 78 per cent (206 of 264) of graduates, across the four-year reporting range. NZMA’s analysis shows year-on-year increases in the proportion of graduates entering industry-relevant employment, with 85 (41 per cent) in relevant employment, 55 (27 per cent) in generic employment, 33 (16 per cent) unemployed and looking for work, 30 (15 per cent) going on to further study and 3 (1 per cent) not seeking work. NMZA was pleased to report there is a continuing trend of decreasing graduate unemployment, e.g. from 38 per cent in 2019 down to six per cent in 2021, and they will be monitoring and</p>	
--	--	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>continuing the trend of the last few years of increasing rates of industry-specific employment.</p> <p>Closer links with employers and related stakeholders, collecting feedback and showing how this feedback is valued and influences programme delivery, will support the achievement of increasing relevancy of outcomes.</p> <p>Other evidence</p> <p>Photos illustrating students' engagement in a real-world learning environment were included. NZMA points out that it is conducive to learning the applied skills and enables authentic learning and acquisition of the GPOs.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Clarify how delivery staff are involved in the self-assessment process, and how their insights are reflected in the programme evaluation process, and how all analyses and interpretation of evidence is used to improve or change the programme to achieve actual or improved consistency.</p>	
<p>Western Institute of Technology at Taranaki Ltd (WITT)</p> <p>6017</p>	Sufficient	<p>Western Institute of Technology at Taranaki Ltd (WITT) reported 38 graduates during the reporting period: 13 in 2020 and 25 in 2021.</p> <p>WITT had their programme approved in 2020, with a Type 2 change made soon after, to embed the unit standards which were omitted in the original design. The start-up phase was challenging with staffing issues and resources and facilities needing to be purchased or upgraded. Student and graduate feedback, in the evidence provided, reflected these challenges and the frustrations for the learners at the time.</p> <p>WITT programme staff have been working with local industry to gain their support for the programme and to encourage them to take on apprentices, as there has not previously been a pre-trade programme offered in the region. This was a useful context, particularly in relation to the destination information, which showed</p>	No further evidence required:

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>that only one of the first cohort and eight of the 2021 cohort moved into apprenticeships. WITT explained that these outcomes are much lower than they would like to see and getting this programme established is a work in progress.</p> <p>The submission, supported by the additional information and clarification provided in the presentation and the discussion at the meeting, when taken together, provides a reasonable level of confidence that the graduates met the qualification outcomes. The report would have been strengthened with better use of the appended evidence, such as moderation results and the graduate feedback.</p> <p>The post-review reflection was provided but some work is necessary to clarify the improvements that will strengthen WITT's internal consistency review process.</p> <p>Programme evidence:</p> <p>A limited range of programme evidence was provided. This was expanded on during the presentation.</p> <p>Mapping shows that all Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPO) are covered in each of the five courses. A variety of assessment methods are used including tests, portfolio and practical projects.</p> <p>The moderation section at the end of the Self-assessment Summary report would have been more convincing had the results of the moderation activity (in the files appended) been better used to show how these attested to the validity of assessment. Files appended included the WITT moderation plan, an internal moderation for gasfitting, and three Skills moderation activities. Two of these were approved, one required modification, as it included an expiring Health and Safety unit standard and a recommendation that assessment updates align with current legislation. Other 2021 moderation included engagement with</p>	
--	--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>Wintec for external moderation (gasfitting - 3/3 scripts agreed with), another with Wintec (sufficient) and UCOL (awaiting results).</p> <p>Programme self-assessment is conducted annually.</p> <p>Graduate evidence:</p> <p>Graduate feedback provided some confidence that graduates match the GPOs.</p> <p>Internal course evaluations were included in the submission. As these related to students not graduates, this is not relevant evidence for consistency purposes. However, the reviewer noted some negative comments relating to course organisation, workshop space, lack of tools, issues relating to quality of learning materials etc.</p> <p>Twenty of the 38 graduates responded to a survey (53 per cent response rate). The results were reported as follows: “The overall response from the graduates was that they felt they were at an above average level in relation to their skills within each of the GPOs”. Results could have been used more effectively to support the commentary in the report and used graphically in the presentation.</p> <p>The issues referred to in the student surveys were also apparent in the graduate’s qualitative feedback.</p> <p>Destination evidence:</p> <p>Destinations were clarified at the meeting, and the challenges relating to support from stakeholders, in particular an industry association. The table in slide 8 provided the destinations for the 2020 (positive destination - one employed) and 2021 graduates, with eight securing apprenticeships and two going on to further study (one in a related field).</p> <p>WITT sought feedback from employers, however none was received.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>The list of stakeholder engagements and events attended were provided and explained that these had given the programme and students good exposure and resulted in some students gaining apprenticeships.</p> <p>The data and discussion were transparent and acknowledged the challenges involved.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to consider how data (e.g. destination data) is presented and analysed while ensuring consistency of data across documentation. 2. Consider how the industry events held can allow the opportunity to collect feedback (from employers) to align with the qualification's GPOs and to further evidence that graduates have met the GPOs. 	
<p>Te Pukenga trading as Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec) 6019</p>	<p>Sufficient</p>	<p>Te Pukenga trading as Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec) reported 162 graduates in the reporting period: 29 in 2018, 30 in 2019, 56 in 2020 and 47 in 2021.</p> <p>The programme was approved and first delivered in 2018. It consists of five 15-credit courses and includes four unit standards.</p> <p>Wintec's submission presented some evidence to support their claim that graduates met the Graduate Profiles Outcomes (GPO), however the self-assessment was not comprehensive, and some claims were not directly corroborated with the relevant evidence.</p> <p>A rating of sufficient has been given on the basis that Wintec has acknowledged the areas of weakness in the evidence and they have provided some useful ways to improve submissions for future consistency reviews that should be implemented.</p> <p>Further evidence in relation to the role of the Wintec work broker, and the destinations as a result of work experience arranged by Wintec was provided. Wintec stated they convert around 80 per</p>	<p>No further evidence required</p>

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>cent of their pre-trades plumbing students into work. This claim should have been corroborated by data.</p> <p>Please note it is preferable for supporting evidence to be attached as files rather than copied into the body of the report. This makes it easier to reference the evidence whilst evaluating the report, and also retains the formatting of the original documents, and in some case is extended over many pages rather than being illustrated in a one page attachment, for example Appendix 6 (mapping) extended over 16 pages of the report.</p> <p>Wintec has led the development of a unified programme for version 3 of this qualification, which is now being offered, or is soon to be offered, by the ITP subsidiaries.</p> <p>Programme evidence:</p> <p>Limited programme evidence was provided.</p> <p>The programme mapping shows the alignment of the modules and assessments to the GPOs.</p> <p>Photos of practical tasks were provided to illustrate the link between the modules and assessment.</p> <p>The moderation commentary as a basis for evidence was not clear and did not provide a comprehensive report on the quality of assessments nor the consistency of assessor decisions that could be used to attest to the validity of assessment.</p> <p>Examples of statements and evidence included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It was stated in the summary section of the report that Wintec has done some internal moderation and this activity needs to continue in the future.	
--	--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Another statement regarding moderation in 2021: “Moderation results demonstrated the need to update our Moodle space and make it more interactive as well as provide regular knowledge checks to recap and ensure students are prepared for assessment’.• In the concluding summary Wintec stated: “The moderation records show that the programme of research, assessments, activities, and delivery are appropriate for assessing the qualification of GPOs.”• External moderation was conducted in April and June of 2020 with MIT and Unitec; however, it appears that this session functioned as a sharing session rather than strictly for moderation purposes.• Two sample moderations were appended on page 56 - 63, one appeared to be internal but very difficult to read as a computer-generated file, and the other was external, moderated by LB. <p>Slides 5 and 6 in the presentation about moderation tracking and action plans provided some useful information on the moderation activity, issues identified, and actions taken.</p> <p>In the presentation and in the post-meeting reflection Wintec acknowledged that moderation has been a weakness and that external moderation in particular needs a more ‘concrete schedule’.</p> <p>Graduate and destination evidence:</p> <p>Appendix 3 and slides 8 and 9 of the PowerPoint presentation provided a good overview of the feedback at the GPO level, from 31 graduates, 5 next-level tutors and 18 employers, and clarified some of the information in the report, particularly in relation to response rates. The feedback was generally positive and supports the claim that the GPOs have been met. This information and data could have been used more extensively in the report.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>Wintec noted: “The feedback showed students [graduates] successfully gained plumbing employment in the Waikato as well as some who were in work experience, others travelled to Tauranga and Australia”.</p> <p>The ‘Graduate Destination Survey 2021 Centre for Trades Report’ (page 4) provides a good summary table noting that 12 graduates responded to the survey and indicates that 75 per cent of these graduates went into employment and 16.7 per cent went on to further study. However, this sample is not representative of the total number of graduates. It is noted however, that slide 8 states there were 31 graduate responses. Clarity is required to understand which survey this relates to.</p> <p>Wintec’s next level tutor feedback, “suggested through the graduate’s performance in the next level programme it is clear that the graduates met the GPOs of the Level 3 programme”. Tutors, however, showed less confidence in graduates’ achievement of GPOs 3, 4 and 6 (refer slide 8). This could have served as a point of discussion in the self-assessment report.</p> <p>Programme satisfaction data was included as evidence, however as this is not feedback from graduates it is generally not considered relevant for consistency purposes. The reviewer did however note that some of this feedback was not very favourable, such as “more modern, less people in class, tutors having more engagement with students, hand tools not working properly”.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Implement changes in self-assessment practices as recorded in the post-review reflection. In addition to these proposed changes: include in your ‘Moderation Tracking’ table, the completion dates of any actions required and the impact of these changes; and secondly, ensure that the survey sample is representative of the specific group numbers for graduates and employers.	
--	--	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>2. Engage programme assistance from the Wintec academic quality support team to support the collection, analysis, interpretation, and triangulation of evidence (and present data in a cohesive and concise manner). Use the understanding gained through this support to achieve actual or improved consistency. Note too that when the opportunity arises, attendance at a NZQA Consistency Review training workshop would be helpful.</p>	
<p>Universal College of Learning Limited (UCOL) 6009</p>	<p>Sufficient</p>	<p>Universal College of Learning Limited (UCOL) reported six graduates in 2021.</p> <p>UCOL's programme was approved in July 2020 in preparation for delivery in 2021. It consists of five 15-credit courses delivered across 24 weeks, with first aid, working at heights and working in confined spaces unit standards embedded in programme.</p> <p>A good range of evidence was provided in the submission. Survey results were well analysed, interpreted and presented in the Self-assessment Summary report and in the PowerPoint presentation at the meeting.</p> <p>Programme evidence:</p> <p>Good evidence in relation to the programme was provided. UCOL has taken steps to ensure the programme has been designed and delivered to develop the graduate outcomes in learners.</p> <p>Programme mapping shows that the learning outcomes and assessments are aligned to the graduate profile.</p> <p>To ensure validity of assessment UCOL accessed assessment material from other providers, pre-moderated it and made</p>	<p>No further evidence required</p>

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>improvements prior to use. A five-year moderation plan has been approved with WITT as the external partner. UCOL will be participating in post-assessment moderation of unit standards by Waihanga Ara Rau Workforce Development Council.</p> <p>The report provides evidence of the continuous focus on quality, e.g. annual programme evaluation.</p> <p>Graduate evidence:</p> <p>Graduate feedback provides confidence that graduates match the Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPO).</p> <p>All six graduates completed the survey conducted via a phone call and rated their confidence with the six GPOs on a 9-point scale. The average rating for each of the GPOs ranged from 7.33 to 7.83, with an overall average rating of 7.58.</p> <p>UCOL concluded that this is a solid result from this programme and demonstrates all graduates felt confidence well above the neutral marker of 5.00.</p> <p>Results were well analysed and interpreted in the Self-assessment Summary report.</p> <p>UCOL commented that they had found phone surveys the most successful way to contact graduates and conduct surveys. This was discussed at the meeting, and it was agreed that this is manageable with smaller numbers, it may be more difficult to continue when programme numbers grow.</p> <p>Destination evidence:</p> <p>Good information on the destination of graduates has informed the self-assessment.</p> <p>UCOL had a good understanding of destinations and graduates' motivators for doing the course and what their aims were in relation</p>	
--	--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>to employment. One graduate had secured an apprenticeship, two were working within the industry and looking for an apprenticeship, another graduate was working outside of the industry until he can gain employment in the industry with an apprenticeship. The other two graduates had enrolled in the programme to gain skills and knowledge for personal gain, and for 'home-handly persons' skills, rather than to seek employment in the industry.</p> <p>All three employers of the graduates working in the industry responded to the survey. Their responses supported what the graduates had indicated as to their confidence in achieving all the graduate outcomes, with average ratings ranging from 7.00 to 7.67, and an overall average of 7.39. UCOL concluded that whilst marginally less confident, this is an indication that the employers' expectations of a graduate from this programme is at the right level.</p>	
<p>Unitec New Zealand Limited 6004</p>	<p>Sufficient</p>	<p>Unitec New Zealand Limited (Unitec) reported 191 graduates in the reporting period: 49 in 2018, 40 in 2019, 38 in 2020, and 64 in 2021.</p> <p>Unitec first offered the programme in 2018, which consisted of five courses offered via blended mode, over a 22-week period.</p> <p>Unitec has now moved to the new unified programme leading to the award of version 3 of the qualification, however, it will not continue to offer the managed apprenticeship programme after this year, which has provided a pathway for the graduates of this programme.</p> <p>Unitec presented a well evidenced report, with relevant examples used effectively to demonstrate practice and results in the presentation. Effective self-assessment was demonstrated with a thorough gap analysis undertaken for each evidence source, and actions provided.</p>	<p>No further evidence required</p>

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>Although not all the survey results were representative of the cohort there is sufficient evidence across the three areas of evidence to justify and support claims.</p> <p>Gaps are openly acknowledged, and actions being taken to improve in the areas presented. Thoughtful post-review reflections were provided and demonstrated the value of the consistency review process for the presenter and team.</p> <p>Programme evidence:</p> <p>Mapping evidence demonstrated the constructive alignment of the course learning outcomes and assessments to the Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPO).</p> <p>All assessments were pre-assessment moderated prior to use. An explanation of changes made to improve validity of on-line assessments was provided.</p> <p>Post-assessment moderation occurs prior to the release of grades to students to provide consistency of marking. An example was provided to show how grades are amended and enhancements made to the marking guide as a result of this quality assurance process.</p> <p>Unitec has an external moderation relationship with MIT and Wintec. Two cluster meetings were held in 2020 and 2021. An example of the clarification and changes made to questions regarding work-readiness learning outcomes was provided as an outcome of external moderation.</p> <p>The evidence supports Unitec's conclusion that they are "confident that the GPOs are validly, fairly, reliably and sufficiently assessed". A summary table was presented showing all internal and external</p>	
--	--	--	--

Final Consistency Review Report

	<p>moderation. Note this would have been enhanced with the inclusion of the actual results e.g. met requirements, modifications required, marking consistent, and date when various actions were completed.</p> <p>Unitec undertakes an annual Programme Evaluation and Planning (PEP) report. Several good examples of improvements to the programme were provided in the Self-assessment report to support this as an effective ongoing improvement process.</p> <p>Unitec acknowledged the gaps relating to a lack of recording moderation evidence, and external moderation in the early stages of the programme, with associated actions.</p> <p>Graduate evidence:</p> <p>Graduate feedback provides some confidence that graduates match the GPOs.</p> <p>A survey was sent to 198 graduates (note there were only 191 graduates), with 37 replies (18 per cent response rate), including four graduates from 2018, five from 2019, nine from 2020 and fourteen from 2021 cohorts. Unitec acknowledged that the results are not necessarily representative and have used these tentatively.</p> <p>Graduates rated the relevancy of GPOs to their job and their ability in performing these competencies. Results had been well analysed and interpreted and were presented by GPOs in the body of report.</p> <p>The positive qualitative commentary showed that graduates valued the usefulness of the GPOs in their everyday work.</p> <p>Unitec acknowledged the gaps in their graduate evidence based on the low response rate, some errors in the wording of several survey</p>	
--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>questions, and only conducting the survey in 2022, which was too late for the cohorts graduating 2018-2020.</p> <p>Destination evidence:</p> <p>Thirty-six of the 37 graduate survey respondents were employed in the industry, eight in non-apprenticeship pathways in trades, 29 in higher level study or apprenticeships (24 of the 29 were with Unitec managed apprenticeship scheme, and the other five with Skills). These are excellent outcomes, notwithstanding this is a small sample of graduates.</p> <p>Unitec maintains regular contact with industry through its Industry Advisory Group and relationships with employers through its managed apprenticeship scheme.</p> <p>The next user/employer survey received five replies. It was noted that on average each employer will employ around ten apprentices each, so survey results relate to about 50 graduates (~26 per cent). The same questions relating to relevance and capability of GPOs that graduates show in the workplace were used in this survey.</p> <p>Unitec was pleased with the positive results for GPO 1 as they use the results of the GPOs as a benchmark which is critical, and a major focus for ensuring the programme is preparing the graduates to engage in their future workplace.</p> <p>Employers' feedback showed they wanted graduates to be equipped better with work-related skills and knowledge, relating to GPOs 2 and 3, including communication, following instructions and basic trades' tasks.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Final Consistency Review Report

		<p>Six next-level lecturers were surveyed, and the results showed they have observed that these graduates are well equipped for higher level study and they agreed the GPOs are relevant.</p> <p>The tutors' results were compared with employers' ratings and found that in general they share similar understandings with employers in terms of GPO relevance and capability. Unitec concluded that GPOs 2 and 3 are the areas that need longer periods for graduates to fully develop while in employment.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. As noted in Unitec's 'Post-review Reflection', continue to work on strengthening graduate destination evidence through regular evidence collection and achieving a representative sample.2. As also reflected on, continue to strengthen industry relationships.	
--	--	--	--