Qualification Title: New Zealand Diploma in Forest Management (Level 6)

Qualification number: 2329

Date of review: 16 October 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 who can apply a blend of management skills and forest knowledge to enable them to contribute to the medium and long-term planning and management of forest operations within a technical or management role. They have a broad range of skills including the use of a wide range of industry specific software, forest planning, harvesting, supply chain management, log product logistics, commercial and financial analysis, contract management, and health, safety and environmental management.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

Education Organisation	Final rating
Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology	Sufficient

Introduction

The purpose of this 240-credit qualification is to provide the forest industry with individuals who have the skills and knowledge required to carry out technical or management roles within the forest growing and harvesting sectors.

Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology was the only education organisation providing a programme of study that leads to the award of this qualification. A Toi Ohomai representative presented at the review meeting an explanation and evidence of how their graduates matched the graduate outcomes.

Competenz, the Industry Training Organisation (ITO) is the developer of the qualification and a Competenz representative participated in the review, in this role.

There were 12 graduates in the review period from 2015- 2017.

Evidence

The education organisation provided a range of evidence to demonstrate that their graduates met the graduate outcomes. The evidence provided related to the robustness of the programme and its alignment with the graduate profile; feedback from graduates and employers; and graduate destination data.

The criteria used to judge the evaluation question were:

2329 - New Zealand Diploma in Forest Management (Level 6)

- The nature, quality and integrity of the evidence presented by the education organisation
- How well the education 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 from the education organisation included:

Programme-related evidence

- The programme structure showing how programme content and learning outcomes mapped against the qualification's graduate profile outcomes.
- Samples of internal and external pre- and post-assessment moderation.
- Examples of programme changes made in response to stakeholder feedback and moderation activities, supporting self-assessment practices.

Stakeholder feedback evidence

Surveys of the graduates and their employers were undertaken in September 2018.

Destination evidence

Evidence was provided that 92% of graduates were in forestry-related work after graduating, aligning with the expected employment pathways for this qualification.

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

The programme of study maps clearly to the graduate outcomes. Evidence of pre- and post-moderation activities, and the analysis of resulting feedback to inform updates to programme content, support that the education organisation is engaged in self-assessment that results in ongoing improvements.

The destination evidence supports that graduates are following expected employment pathways for this qualification.

Data given in relation to stakeholder evidence is less convincing as the graduates and employers that were surveyed in September 2018 included graduate cohorts from 2014 to 2017. Only the 2017 cohort were graduates of this qualification, as earlier cohorts graduated from previously registered qualifications. This meant that the analysis of data could not be clearly attributed to the 12 graduates of this qualification.

Additional evidence was provided that showed the individual survey responses specifically related to the 2017 graduates; however no further analysis was undertaken by the education organisation to draw conclusions about how well these graduates met the qualification outcomes.

The additional raw data provided showed that nine of the 12 graduates responded to the survey, with 100% feeling that they could do most or all of the outcomes described in the qualification.

Four employers responded, with 50% stating that their graduate could undertake most of the outcomes.

Overall the combined evidence provided a sufficiently convincing case that the graduates match the graduate profile outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

Examples of good practice

The education organisation provided evidence of robust processes to ensure programme quality, particularly in terms of alignment of content to the graduate outcomes, as well as evidence of graduate destination data. The evidence provided was well organised and directed the reviewer to pertinent aspects of the submission. Evidence of self-assessment practices were included, using the consistency review as an opportunity to reflect on areas for improvement.

General observations

The questions in the surveys focussed on the quality of the programme rather than mapping specifically to the individual graduate outcomes. Only one question was directly related to the outcomes, and covered all seven outcomes together.

The evidence provided was often related to programme review and student feedback, rather than directly supporting the case for how well graduates are meeting the qualification's graduate outcomes.

Undertaking further regular external post-moderation will strengthen the evidence that can be provided at consistency review.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

There were no recommendations to the qualification developer.