Qualification Title: New Zealand Diploma in Screen Production (Level 5)

Qualification number: 3212

Date of review: 2 December 2019

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification prior to: **31 December 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 can, with supervision, collaboratively apply creative and technical processes and problem solve, in range of applicable contexts, taking into consideration of health and safety and business practices in screen production industries in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MoE	Education Organisation	Final rating
6007	Eastern Institute of Technology (EIT)	Sufficient
9324	Yoobee Colleges Limited	Sufficient

Introduction

This Level 5, 120 credit diploma is designed for people who are new to the screen production industry or considering a career in film, video or other related industries.

Graduates will have the skills, knowledge and attributes to operate with supervision as useful contributors in the screen production industry, in areas such as camera operation, sound operation, continuity, art department, production, lighting, production administration, data wrangling and technical production editorial. This includes the attributes necessary to contribute to a bi- and multi-cultural environment in Aotearoa New Zealand.

This qualification leads to the New Zealand Diploma in Screen Production (Level 6), or to related degree programmes.

Competenz is the qualification developer for this qualification, and a representative attended the consistency review. The consistency review for this qualification was held in conjunction with the review for the New Zealand Diploma in Screen Production (Level 6) [ref:3213].

Two education organisations had a total of 143 graduates during the review period. Representatives from these organisations participated in the consistency review, along with an observer from another education organisation who has a programme of study, but no graduates.

Evidence

The education organisations provided a range of evidence to demonstrate that 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.

Programme evidence

The two submissions provided evidence showing the mapping of module learning outcomes against the seven graduate profile outcomes (GPOs). One of the organisations introduced specialisations in the second semester of their programme, however it was not clear how this impacted on the assessment of the outcomes.

Good evidence was provided by both organisations illustrating how they used real world projects to teach and assess the outcomes, providing the learners with beneficial opportunities to practice the skills required at the level of the qualification in industry, or in preparation for the next-level of study.

The evidence of moderation was mixed, with evidence of internal moderation processes and results provided by both organisations, however the sample of student work moderated in one case was not representative of the number of student assessments. External moderation was a weakness in both submissions. One organisation had used an industry person to moderate one assessment, and the other organisation had not commenced external moderation.

Evidence of internal self-assessment activities, such as annual programme reviews, showed that ongoing improvements were being made to programmes and delivery, and that learner feedback was responded to.

Graduate feedback and destination evidence

One organisation had conducted a well-designed survey with questions directly relating to the GPOs. The response rate was high and results clearly indicated the graduates were confident in their capabilities in the GPOs. The other education organisation had some informal feedback from a small number of graduates and is in the process of developing systematic processes for collecting feedback from their graduates.

Destination evidence was provided for most graduates and reflective of the pathways available. In one organisation 90% of graduates progressed to the degree programme, or a related programme, and in the other about 70% went onto industry related employment, as this has been the traditional route for graduates from the previous programme offered by this organisation. Whilst this latter organisation does offer a higher-level programme in Screen Production (Level 6) there is no clear pathway to further education offered to graduates at this stage.

Evidence from employers or next-level tutors

Where graduates had enrolled in the degree programme, feedback from the tutors, whilst not directly linked to the GPOs, indicated graduates were well prepared for entering the degree and had a 'stronger understanding of the connection with real world practice'. Some informal feedback from two employers was offered as evidence from the other organisation, along with plans for how they are formalising the collection of evidence from stakeholders, including 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 strongest evidence was that showing that most graduates had progressed to higher-level study or relevant employment in the screen production industry. One of the submissions provided GPO related feedback from graduates and some from the higher-level tutors to triangulate with their strong destination data. Whilst the other organisation had some informal feedback from its graduates and several employers, this evidence was not representative of the cohort of graduates.

Programme evidence showed that learning outcomes were mapped to GPOs and that real-world learning experiences, based on projects, provided learners with opportunities to apply their skills and knowledge as they worked towards achieving the outcomes. Moderation evidence provided a level of confidence in the quality of assessment, although external moderation was a weakness for both organisations. Given that these programmes have only been offered for one year, this is not a serious gap and is being managed by the organisations.

The analysis of the evidence was mixed. This was the weakest element and was the most challenging task; combing the evidence and analysis to make a convincing case that the graduate cohort was capable in all of the graduate profile outcomes. Overall, the self-assessment and supporting evidence supplied by the education organisations demonstrates that graduates meet the graduate outcomes at the determined threshold.

Issues and concerns

The introduction of specialisations (in semester two) by one education organisation, when the qualification is not designed to have specialisations/strands, and the potential for this to limit the graduates' opportunities in further study or employment.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

The qualification developer attended the consistency review meeting and noted the issues discussed.