Final consistency review report

**Qualification Titles:** New Zealand Certificate in English Language (Level 1) 1880

**Qualification number:** 1880

**Date of review:** 18 June and 19th June 2015

**Final decision on consistency** National Consistency is confirmed

The evidence confirms that for the majority of programmes graduate outcomes are being achieved to a consistent and appropriate threshold.

**Threshold**

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

Graduates demonstrating that they have achieved mastery of the language skills outlined in the graduate profile at a level comparable to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) high A1 – low A2, with the ability to study at the NZCEL (Level 2) or operate at an equivalent level. This is evidenced by:

- Alignment of the curriculum, including core texts and assessments to the specified CEFR levels and other relevant points of reference.
- Moderation of programmes’ activities and assessments with other NZCEL programme providers
- Analysis of achievement data

Learner, graduate and destination data showing preparedness for higher level, including next user feedback, for example teachers, employers or other community stakeholders.

**Tertiary Education Organisations with sufficient evidence**

Final decision on sufficiency of TEO’s evidence will be updated as other TEOs show sufficient evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Education Organisation</th>
<th>Final rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Polytechnic</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSL Training Ltd</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiariki Polytechnic</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitireia</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language Partners</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction**

This 60 credit programme is intended for learners who have a minimal command of English and is aligned to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) high A1 to low A2 level. These qualifications were developed by NZQA National Qualifications Services (NQS)
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and listed on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF) in 2012. The qualification states that its purpose is to allow the Aotearoa New Zealand community, employers and educational institutions to recognise the level at which the graduate can use English for general purposes.

This qualification is one of six New Zealand Certificates in English from level 1 (Foundation) to level 5. Graduates from the New Zealand Certificate in English (Level 1) are at the required level for entry into the New Zealand Certificate in English (Level 2). This is the first consistency review.

Background and special focus
The qualification outlines a graduate profile, with suggested credit values and possible unit standards that can be used to assess the graduate outcomes.

At the time of the review five Tertiary Education Organisations (TEOs) who attended the review had graduated learners from this qualification. Seven TEO attended as observers, as they were yet to graduate students from their programmes.

The review of this qualification was held in conjunction with a review of 1879 and 1881.

Although well signalled, it is important to recognise that consistency reviews are new for TEOs and NZQA and therefore determining sufficiency and thresholds of evidence is to some extent a collaborative, formative and iterative process. The reviewer noted that those who had participated in an earlier review were better prepared with evidence.

Evidence

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

TEOs supplied a range of evidence to demonstrate that their graduates met the outcomes. In assessing the sufficiency of the evidence provided by each education organisation, the reviewer was mindful of the criteria outlined on page 10 of the guidelines. The criteria used to judge the evaluation question for each organisation are:

- the nature, quality and integrity of the evidence presented
- 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 tertiary 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 design: alignment and benchmarking

A number of TEOs submitted evidence to demonstrate how their programme had been designed to align with the graduate outcomes. This included the use of curriculum alignment frameworks to ensure assessment and learning outcomes aligned with the graduate profile and use of the CEFR descriptors.
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Robust moderation

Most TEOs presented evidence of moderation processes that gave them assurance they were assessing at the right level for the qualification. Moderation plans and responses to moderation feedback were also supplied to demonstrate good practice. The reviewer noted strong practice occurring when external moderation was happening between a range of providers offering the qualification. This cross programme moderation gives assurance that providers are assessing at a consistent level.

Analysis of Achievement Data

TEO supplied the reviewer with results from the programmes, showing course and qualification achievement data. An analysis of results gives good information to programmes about how well learners are achieving the qualification and component parts of the programme.

Graduate Destination Data

Most organisations supplied data that outlined where graduates had gone on completion of their qualification. Many had moved to study English at the next level and evidence that they were succeeding was also presented. Many providers also had feedback from teachers at the higher level, attesting to the language level of graduates. Some providers had feedback from graduates who self-assessed themselves against the graduate profile.

Many TEOs noted that they were putting in place processes to ensure the systematic collection of this data.

In addition to the minimal threshold evidence TEO also supplied a range other documents to support their analysis. This included evidence of ongoing self-assessment including programme review documents, and evidence of stakeholder feedback, including learners.

Special Focus

No special focus

Examples of good practice

Good practice highlighted during the review included:

- referencing core texts and assessments to the relevant CEFR levels and other useful points of reference
- curriculum alignment templates demonstrates how graduate outcomes link to the programmes learning outcomes and how they are formatively and summatively assessed during the course of a programme
- text analysis to ensure alignment with the right degree of complexity
- TEO fora where texts and assessments were shared to judge consistency of levels
- engaging with stakeholders to plan and check ‘real-world’ context for programme development and review
- gaining graduate and other key stakeholder feedback on how well they match the graduate profile.
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**Issues and concerns**
- Some providers noted the high level of assessment required when using the recommended unit standards
- Progression levels indicated a gap between the attainment of this qualification and the entry to the level 2

**Recommendations to Qualification Developer**
Address the issue for gaps between levels and attaining enough knowledge and skills to move to next level