

Final Consistency Review Report



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD
KĪA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Baking (Generalist) (Level 4)

Qualification number: 1842

Date of review: 15 March 2021

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification between: **1 January 2016 – 31 December 2020**

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 that graduates will produce a range of bakery goods, demonstrating safe work practices and will:

- Apply the principles of bakery science and quality management.
- Manage self and/or team to meet production target.
- Safely operate and manage a range of equipment and machinery.
- Apply a range of effective communication and interpersonal skills required in the baking industry.
- Monitor and report on quality and production targets.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
6006	Ara Institute of Canterbury	Sufficient
6007	Eastern Institute of Technology	Sufficient
6025	Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology	Sufficient
6010	Manukau Institute of Technology	Sufficient
6008	Wellington Institute of Technology	Sufficient
8661	New Zealand Management Academies Limited	Sufficient

Introduction

This 120-credit Level 4 programme is designed to provide the baking sector with graduates who are able to produce a range of baking products under broad guidance. Graduates of this qualification will be able to work in introductory roles in craft bakeries, cake shops, cafe or factory (plant) operations.

This qualification can build on the New Zealand Certificate in Food Processing (Level 2) [Ref 2735] or the New Zealand Certificate in Trade Baking (Level 3) with strands in Craft Baking,

Final Consistency Review Report

and Plant Baking [Ref 2696]. Graduates of this qualification may progress to the New Zealand Diploma in Baking (Level 5) [Ref 1844].

Six education organisations have graduates over the period under review, with a total of 828.

Evidence

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

Overall, the evidence provided covered most areas under consideration, but employer and next-level tutor feedback was weak, as was analysis and self-assessment based on the evidence provided.

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?

In all cases evidence was provided in terms of programme rigour and alignment to the qualification and in most cases, employer and next-level tutor evidence was included as was graduate feedback. The latter two areas were weak and solicited limited data or analysis.

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

Special Focus

None

Examples of good practice

Some education organisations included photographs of the learning context and students at work, evidencing the real-world practical nature of the programme.

Issues and concerns

Self-assessment using the evidence submitted is weak, and where it is provided, tends to focus on stating what is rather than why and 'so what'. Employer and next-level tutor feedback

Final Consistency Review Report

was weak, with limited effort made to rectify this by changing the approach to collecting the evidence. Thus, the value of employer feedback is limited.

Where data is presented, the response rate and date of completion needs to be clear. It is also important to clarify whether the summarised data includes all or one cohort. Collated data over multiple years needs to be disaggregated and analysed on an annual/cohort basis to identify trends over time. Collating all data together does not support effective self-assessment.

While all education organisations aligned the programme components with the GPOs, the practical components were not identified. In a programme of this nature it is important to identify how the practical components align with the nature and intent of the programme and supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and GPOs.

For some, end of course surveys are being considered 'graduate surveys'. While these are very useful, they are not a substitute for evaluating graduate effectiveness in the workplace or in further study.

There is also a tendency to include documentation not mentioned in the self-assessment submitted and that did not contribute to the evidence of consistency. Education organisations need to ask themselves how the evidence appended adds strength to the assertion that graduates have achieved the GPOs.

Education organisations need to identify what information is important in terms of their self-assessment of consistency and provide a clear and detailed summary and analysis of this.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

There are various terms within the qualification document that can be interpreted differently. These include 'basic' principles; work in 'introductory roles' and 'under broad guidance'. It was questioned whether the first two should relate to a Level 3 qualification rather than a Level 4.

It was recommended that such terminology be reviewed and, if required, clarified.