

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Aeronautical Engineering (Production Control) (Level 6)

Qualification number: 2899

Date of review: 3 November 2022

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

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 who are equipped with a comprehensive set of skills required to carry out the administration and management of aeronautical engineering production control for an aviation engineering organisation.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
9068	Te Pūkenga - New Zealand Institute of Skills and Technology trading as Service IQ	Sufficient

Introduction

The purpose of this 55-credit qualification is to provide the aeronautical engineering industry with graduates who can carry out the production control function specific to an aeronautical engineering environment. The qualification is intended for learners who are experienced aeronautical engineers and who want to broaden their work role to encompass the production control function. This qualification can pathway from the various New Zealand certificates and diplomas in Aeronautical Engineering.

The qualification was initially designed and approved on the New Zealand Qualification Framework in 2015. The Ringa Hora Services Workforce Development Council is the current qualification developer, and a representative attended the online review meeting.

One education organisation had a total of 275 graduates during the reporting period. Most graduates were from the New Zealand Defence Force.

Evidence

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

Final Consistency Review Report

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.

Evidence provided included:

- the programme of Industry Training is unit standards based and the Qual Link mapping (mapping existing workplace training programmes to New Zealand qualifications and PITs)
- moderation processes and samples of moderation reports
- graduate destinations data and graduate feedback
- letters of support and GPO related feedback from employers

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?

The education organisation submitted a range of evidence that could be triangulated to support confidence that their graduates met the graduate outcomes. This included programme information, including assessment and moderation evidence, programme matrix where applicable, two letters of support and GPO related feedback from employers, as well as destination data and graduate feedback.

There was good evidence from the work-based mode of delivery that the programme was aligned to the qualification and assessment requirements either by a process of Qual Link alignment or through a quality assurance process.

The organisation provided good evidence that moderation formed an effective part of the quality assurance process. The self-assessment described the moderation process, programme review, and evaluation of resources, including the professional development of staff to ensure effective implementation. The moderation feedback was generally robust, with clear and thorough evaluative comment of good practice, and of areas to improve. Providing an example of how this information is tracked and followed up would strengthen this evidence.

Graduate feedback evidence was weak and not representative of the graduate cohort. The difficulties faced in gathering feedback from graduates negatively impacted the strength of other stakeholder feedback evidence.

Destination evidence was of mixed quality. There were indicators that there had been successful outcomes in terms of graduates retaining employment in the sector. However, the destination data was incomplete and did not cover graduates during the full reporting period of this review. This will need supplementary information.

Following the further evidence provided, the organisation was able to demonstrate further feedback from the major employers confirming that the graduates (and their employees)

Final Consistency Review Report

were meeting the Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPOs) in the workplace. Further analysis or evaluative comment on these findings would be beneficial in informing the programme delivery and improvement.

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

Special Focus

None

Issues and concerns

None

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

None