

**TO: Chief Executive Officers
NZQA Liaison Officers**

**ATTENTION: NZDipBus Programme Managers
Heads of Business and related departments
Lecturers of NZDipBus papers
NZDipBus Local Advisory Committees (LACs)**

**Report on the 25 March 2009 meeting of the National Advisory
Committee for Business Studies**

This circular reports on matters of interest to Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs) from the meeting of the National Advisory Committee for Business Studies (NACBS) held on 25 March 2009.

Matters reported include:

- changes in NACBS membership
- NACBS strategies regarding the direction of the New Zealand Diploma in Business (NZDipBus)
- updates on the semester 1 and semester 2 national external moderation rounds
- endorsement of proposals arising from the review of the NZDipBus national external moderation system
- Academic Committee business
- use of the NZDipBus logo
- 2009 NACBS meeting dates.

Please bring this circular to the attention of any local advisory committee(s) that has an interest in the NZDipBus.

Please note that submissions for the next NACBS meeting, scheduled for 24 June 2009, must be with the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) by **Monday, 1 June 2009**. Contact details are on page 5.

NACBS membership

New member Sue Boys (Graduate representative) was welcomed to the NACBS. Nicola Young's (New Zealand Institute of Chartered Accountants) resignation was received.

NACBS strategies for 2009

The committee discussed the future direction of the NZDipBus, with reference to a paper presented by Chair John Horsley. There was discussion on whether the qualification was meeting current market needs, and what steps might be taken to update it if necessary. It was agreed that TAM would distribute a tertiary circular requesting a SWOT analysis on the NZDipBus from TEOs, their local advisory committees and graduates.

A draft of a survey of Human Resources Institute of New Zealand (HRINZ) members was presented to the committee. This survey related to HRINZ members' understanding of and perspectives on the NZDipBus.

Michel Norrish, National Qualifications Service, NZQA, presented an update and related documents on the proposed reviewed National Diplomas in Business. The qualifications are proposed at level five and six respectively on the National Qualifications Framework. It is hoped to register the reviewed diplomas this year.

The committee agreed that, in the light of proposals for the National Diplomas in Business, communication between the NACBS and the National Qualifications Service Business and Management Advisory Steering Group (ASG) would be beneficial to business education in general and that the NACBS should take steps to open dialogue with the ASG.

Moderation

The committee considered a draft tertiary circular, intended to survey the resit/resubmission practices of TEOs. It was agreed that a consistent approach to reassessment was important and that, in consultation with the sector, a set of guidelines might be created following the survey.

Results for the semester 1, 2008 moderation round were presented to the NACBS.

Tertiary Assessment and Moderation (TAM) reported on the progress of the semester 2 2008 moderation round. TEOs had been required to submit assessment materials relating to the 400-600 prescriptions only, as it was considered unproductive to provide feedback on materials for prescriptions that would never be used again.

Prescriptions 560 and 630 were being moderated using the current moderation report format, while prescriptions 580, 602, and 644 were being moderated using a proposed new moderation report format, which had been developed as part of the 2007-2008 national external moderation system review.

The committee endorsed the final version for the moderation report format for full implementation from July 2009, subject to any further minor modifications arising out of its use in the semester 2, 2008 moderation round. The NACBS also endorsed the approach to exemplars and changes to moderator roles proposed by TAM. These changes will also be implemented from July 2009 onwards and are as follows:

Proposed modifications to current approach

Exemplars

- Terminology will change from “exemplar” to “good practice assessment samples”.
- TAM to make it clear to moderators that they are looking for examples of good assessment practice and/or innovative approaches that meet requirements well.
- Such examples may still be able to be improved – if not “exemplary”, areas for improvement may be noted (or TEOs will be asked to improve materials before publication).
- Identification of materials will not be limited to full sets of tasks with schedules – e.g. where the task might be innovative but the marking schedules do not have an appropriate breakdown of marks, only the particular task will be distributed, or a single question with the mark breakdown.
- Explanation will be provided with the assessment item stating why materials have been selected as good assessment practice or are innovative.

Moderator roles

Lead moderator will:

- Typically, be the most experienced moderation team member (in relation to prescription, moderation and industry practice)
- have an increased quality assurance role in relation to all moderation reports for a prescription
- have increased responsibilities in relation to the national external moderation report (i.e. increased guidance to TEOs)
- have a reduced role as a second moderator for TEO submissions.

Moderators will:

- have an increased role as a second moderator of TEO submissions (i.e., both moderators will moderate all submissions)
- not be distinguished as “industry” or “academic” moderators – currency with industry/business practice will be a team selection issue, rather than an individual team member’s responsibility.

Academic Committee

John West, Chair of the Academic Committee, reported on the meeting held in the morning before the NACBS meeting. The Academic Committee planned to take a greater lead in curriculum development. Following an informal review of the core prescriptions by members, the sub-committee had recommended that a generic statement be added to prescriptions to make it explicit that assessment should be in line with current industry practice.

The Academic Committee had endorsed a document clarifying the prescription format and its placement on the NZQA website (refer Appendix I), and had suggested a survey should be conducted to identify the extent of different modes of delivery and assessment. The Academic Committee agreed that a statement should be added to the NZQA website clarifying that the 100-200 prescriptions were available on request from TAM, as they are no longer on the NZQA website.

Use of NZDipBus logo

TAM asked the NACBS whether the NZDipBus should continue to have a separate logo, how the current logo was used in the sector, whether NZQA should provide the logo to people who request it, and if any further protocols were needed for the logo. The committee agreed to seek feedback from Business Coordination Forum and New Zealand Association of Private Education Providers members regarding these four matters, and to make a recommendation regarding the NZDipBus logo at the 24 June NACBS meeting.

2009 NACBS meetings

The next meeting of the NACBS will be on 24 June 2009.

Submissions for this meeting are due to NZQA, attention Thomas Pilott, by **Monday, 1 June 2009**. Contact details are below.

A further meeting is scheduled for 2 December 2009.

A meeting may also be held, subject to available budget, in conjunction with the next New Zealand Applied Business Education Conference, which will be held in Rotorua in the last week of September 2009.

Linda Glogau
Manager
Qualifications Development and Tertiary Moderation

Enquiries

Any enquiries relating to the contents of this circular should be directed to:

Thomas Pilott
Tertiary Assessment and Moderation
New Zealand Qualifications Authority
PO Box 160
Wellington 6140
Phone: 04 463 3372
Fax: 04 463 3114
E-mail: tam@nzqa.govt.nz

All circulars are published on the NZQA website at
<http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/publications/circulars/tertiary.do>

Appendix 1

Prescription format: New Zealand Diploma in Business (NZDipBus) 400-600 prescriptions

The 400-600 prescriptions focus on assessment requirements. This differs from the 100-200 prescriptions, which included teaching guidance as well as assessment requirements.

General guidance for prescriptions follows

Context – graduate profile

The context for the 400-600 prescriptions is the New Zealand Diploma in Business (Level 6) qualification. The **graduate profile** (available on the NZQA website at <http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications/tertqual/dipbus/versiontwo.html#profile>) is the overall expected outcome for an NZDipBus graduate and should underpin understanding of the prescriptions, especially those at level 6.

Level

The level of a prescription defines the *complexity* of learning, which is categorised as the process capability, learning demand and amount of responsibility that could be expected of a learner at that level. Level descriptors are available at <http://www.kiwiquals.govt.nz/about/levels/leveldescriptors.html>

NZDipBus prescriptions are developed at level 4, 5 or 6.

Aim

The aim of a prescription specifies the intent, or overall outcome, of the prescription.

Prerequisites

Sometimes a prescription may specify recommended prerequisites. Although it is not mandatory for learners intending to study towards a particular prescription to have prior credit for any prerequisites recommended, having the underpinning knowledge and skills equivalent to those outlined in the prerequisite(s) is deemed important for the achievement of the prescription outcomes.

Assessment notes

Prescriptions may include assessment notes. These may relate to all, or specific, learning outcomes in a prescription. They may specify assessment requirements or provide additional clarification and guidance for assessors regarding aspects of the prescription, so should be heeded by assessors.

Weightings

Each learning outcome in a prescription is given a percentage weighting. A 10% aggregate variance is allowed in assessment weightings. That is, the percentage variation in total across all learning outcomes should not be more than 10%. Refer to the table at the end of this document for some examples of acceptable variations.

Learning outcomes

Learning outcomes specify what a learner needs to know and be able to do. Assessment should be based on the learning outcomes. A particular assessment activity may integrate assessment for more than one learning outcome. The verbs used in learning outcomes signal to assessors and learners the type of assessment required (e.g. theoretical or practical; explanation, application or problem-solving) and, along with the relevant level descriptor, indicate the processes, learning demand and amount of responsibility expected of learners. The following learning outcome examples highlight differences in verbs used, and therefore the different types of assessment activity required. Note that the second example uses a phrase (underlined) that also signals application of processes to a particular situation is required.

Students will **follow** academic conventions and **create** an original document through the process of planning, drafting and editing (469 *Academic Skills for Business Studies*).

Students will **understand** the purpose of planning and control and **apply** processes to a given situation (530 *Organisation and Management*).

Students will **apply** capital budgeting techniques and **evaluate** investment decisions (603 *Business Finance*).

Key elements

All learning outcomes must be evidenced in the assessment activities for that prescription.

Key elements indicate assessment coverage and specify how the related learning outcome must be evidenced. Key element assessment evidence must be provided in the context of the learning outcomes, not in isolation.

10 % Aggregate variance - examples

Learning outcomes	Assessment weighting %	Variation A	Variation B	Variation C	Variation D	Variation E
1. Students will demonstrate...	10	1 (-9)	5 (-5)	9 (-1)	9 (-1)	10
2.	10	19 (+9)	10	11 (+1)	10	9 (-1)
3.	20	20	25 (+5)	16 (-4)	22 (+2)	19 (-1)
4	40	40	40	44 (+4)	39 (-1)	43 (+3)
5	20	20	20	20	20	19 (-1)
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100
Aggregate		18	10	10	4	6

Variation A – not acceptable

The difference in the prescription weightings: $9 + 9 = 18\%$.

Variation B - acceptable

The difference in the prescription weightings: $5 + 5 = 10\%$.

Variation C - acceptable

The difference in the prescription weightings: $1 + 1 + 4 + 4 = 10\%$.

Variation D - acceptable

The difference in the prescription weightings: $1 + 2 + 1 = 4\%$.

Variation E - acceptable

The difference in the prescription weightings: $1 + 1 + 3 + 1 = 6\%$.