

Te Ingoa o te Tohu | Qualification Title: Te Pōkaitahi Reo (Rumaki, Reo Rua) (Te Kaupae 1)

Te nama o te tohu | Qualification number: 3043

Te rā o te wānanga | Date of review: 24 August 2020

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification between: 1 January 2016 – 31 December 2019

Te whakataunga whakamutunga | Final decision on consistency of the qualification:
 National consistency is confirmed

Te pae | Threshold:

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

Graduates have the basic language skills required to communicate in te reo, with support, and are able to contribute positively to the development of te reo in personal and/or professional everyday contexts.

Graduates are able to use their foundation te reo as expression of *mana tangata*, *mana whenua*, *mana reo*, *mana ao tūroa*.

Ko ngā Wānanga, ngā Whare Ako rānei nā rātou anō i eke | Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
6014	Whitireia Community Polytechnic Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6011	Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6015	Southern Institute of Technology	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6017	Western Institute of Technology	He Pounamu Kahurangi
8630	Te Wānanga o Aotearoa	He Pounamu Kahurangi

Hei Tīmatanga | Introduction

Te Pōkaitahi Reo (Kaupae 1) is a 60-credit qualification designed for learners who want to gain language foundation level te reo Māori skills that support their desire to contribute positively to the development of te reo or to fulfil a personal or professional interest.

There were six educational organisations with approximately 10,471 graduates between 2017 and 2019. Representatives from each organisation with graduates participated in the virtual consistency review meeting over two days. NZQA is the qualification developer and two representatives took part in the review meetings. The qualification is due for review in 2021.

Te paearu arotake | Evaluative criteria

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.

He kōrero taunakitanga | Evidence provided

Most of the organisations provided statements linking their organisation or programmes kaupapa to Te Hono o Te Kahurangi. This set the foundation of Te Hono o Te Kahurangi consistency review.

The education organisations also provided a range of programme evidence. This included evidence of programme learning outcomes, examples of assessments, internal moderation plans, and moderation policies. Some providers also provided evidence of programme reviews, along with programme approval documents. Although a few providers linked the learning outcomes to the GPOs and their assessments, a further triangulation to moderation plans to the GPOs was not always evident.

Moderation plans were focused on internal moderation with a number of providers engaging recently with external moderation activities. Organisations that had engaged in external moderation, had moderated against the learning outcomes that had been linked to the GPO's. Where suggestions had been made by the external moderator, evidence was provided that amendments to the programme assessments, had occurred, in response. Providers with recent engagement with external moderation of their programmes provided evidence of implemented plans and revised processes.

Graduate data submitted consisted of graduate survey, employer and next-user feedback. Some surveys were conducted online in 2020 and had very low response rates. This may have been due to a lack of graduate interest in the programme three years after graduating, the short time frames given to graduates to respond and the lack of correct graduate contact details. Subsequently, providers sort further feedback post-review to improve response data to be mostly representative of graduates. The data that was attained from the graduates, was triangulated against the programme data and destination evidence.

Destination evidence was gathered predominantly by surveying subsequent tutors. This evidence too was mostly gathered online with generally low responses. The survey data captured general responses against whole cohorts rather than individual graduate's attainment of the GPOs. This had impact on the rigour of the evidence.

Some providers also submitted evidence from local iwi, who were in support of the delivery of programmes, further evidence provided good evidence of the graduate attainment of the GPOs and therein strengthened an argument for graduate consistency.

Initially providers did not take into consideration the aims of the programme when selecting stakeholders from whom they might gather destination evidence. Evidence was often sought by employers with low response rates. Further evidence shows feedback was being sort from a broader range of stakeholders and it was recognised by some organisations that going

Final Wānanga Whakataurite Report

forward graduate whānau hapū marae and hāpori may be better positioned to assess graduate achievement.

Overall, after further evidence was submitted, the organisations found 'He Pounamu Kahurangi' had provided enough supporting evidence and sound self-assessment to demonstrate that their graduates meet the graduate outcomes at the determined threshold.

Te pātai arotake | The evaluative question

Mā te āta whakaputa i te kaupapa, me pēhea e tutuki pai ai te whakairinga kōrero me ngā taunaki a te whare ako e taurite anō ai te taumata tika o ngā whāinga putanga tauira, ki ōna anō putanga tauira?

Education providers who achieved "He Pounamu Kahurangi" provided evidence of internal and external moderation that was supported by graduate and destination evidence.

The self-assessment and supporting evidence provided post review by the majority of educational organisations was strong enough to support the graduates had achieved the GPOs. Most providers had gathered by way of surveys, in 2020, graduate and destination evidence for the purposes of the consistency review.

Moderation of assessment is valuable programme evidence. Education organisations had conducted external moderation since their programmes were offered to assure themselves of quality assessment and assessment practice. Evidence of actions taken as a result of an external moderation and internal moderation suggested changes, however how these changes were enacted was not always evident. GPO maps, rubrics or diagrams, triangulating programme evidence with graduate evidence and destination evidence, was helpful as part of providers' consistency analysis process.

Graduate feedback overall was initially minimal, with feedback from 632 (6%) of total graduates provided across the qualification however further evidence was provided post review to provide further confidence. The amount of feedback gathered varied by organisation. Organisations presented clearly on their strong relationships with graduates and the communities. Utilising these relationships to gain greater graduate feedback on their attainment of the GPOs would strengthen submissions. Providers discussed within the review using graduate hui, phone calls, social networking platforms and utilising graduation events to gather better evidence. Ideally organisations should set internal benchmarks (or criteria) for what is considered a good graduate response rate in order to determine what can be justified, or not, as a reasonable and representative sample of graduations from which the organisation can draw valid conclusions about consistency.

Analysis of the information could be strengthened by:

- Analysing data across the GPOs to identify areas of strength and weakness and what this means for programme improvement
- Inquiring into areas where graduates felt they did not meet the GPO to understand why and where the provider can strengthen the programme
- Analysing the range graduate feedback between and across the GPOs to understand why and where the provider can strengthen the programme.
- Analysing graduate outcomes across priority groups, by year, by locations and by delivery methods
- Analysing the data against the context in which the graduate is using their reo.

Final Wānanga Whakataurite Report

There were weaknesses in destination evidence across providers (e.g. sufficient breadth and depth of feedback from employers, whānau, hapu and community stakeholders and next level tutors). Graduate destinations were mostly ascertained for graduates who had continued onto further the study within the same institution. Rarely was graduate destination data gathered for those who may have been enrolled in further study with other organisations, nor was data gathered from subsequent tutors at other organisations. For those graduates who remained enrolled with the same provider, graduate success and staircasing evidence could have added to submissions. Subsequently, tutor feedback was highly valuable evidence in ascertaining graduate's achievement and transitions between programmes.

This qualification is designed for learners who want to gain language at a foundation level. The emphasis of this qualification is to extend the capacity te reo Māori, both for the student and their community. Given that this is a foundation qualification it is most likely that the demonstration of new skills happens most often within whānau and marae context. These skills may or may not be displayed within the workplace. Therein, capturing whānau feedback on graduate's demonstration of the GPO's is highly valuable. A very small amount of evidence was also sought from employers who were not necessarily best placed to ascertain the graduate's achievement.

Organisations indicated that they have established stakeholder groups and strong relationships with Iwi. When gathering evidence from these groups it is important that the focus be on graduate attainment of the GPOs for the qualification.

Ngā take | Issues

Education organisation had delayed seeking feedback and engagement with graduates and stakeholders until the Consistency Review date approached, leading to difficulty in contacting graduates and other stakeholders and limited value from the feedback they provided. Engagement with graduates, and stakeholders, should not be left until the next Consistency Review but rather be done as a part of normal business each year and for each cohort completion and then used to inform ongoing improvements to programme design and delivery.

Ngā taunakitanga ki te Kaiwhakawhanake Tohu | Recommendations to Qualification Developer

None