

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in English Language (General) (Level 3)

Qualification number: 1882

Date of review: 11 - 14 November 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 will have the general English language skills required to communicate independently in familiar situations
- This qualification is at a level comparable to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) B1.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

Education Organisation	Final rating
MSL Training Limited	Sufficient
Abacus Institute of Studies	Sufficient
Premier Institute of Education	Sufficient
North Shore Language School	Sufficient
Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Manukau Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Northland Polytechnic	Sufficient
Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Target Education	Sufficient
Bay Learning Academy	Sufficient
IPU New Zealand	Sufficient
Universal College of Learning (UCOL)	Sufficient
Otago Polytechnic	Sufficient
English Teaching College	Sufficient
Eastern Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Waikato Institute of Education	Sufficient
Eastwest College of Intercultural Studies	Sufficient

Final Consistency Review Report

Polyethnic Institute of Studies (Skill New Zealand Limited)	Sufficient
Unitec Institute of Technology	Sufficient
International College of Auckland Limited	Sufficient
New Zealand Institute of Education	Sufficient
Ara Institute of Canterbury	Sufficient
Western Institute of Technology Taranaki	Sufficient
Wellington Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Whitireia Community Polytechnic	Sufficient
Waikato Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Kingston Institute of Business & Technology	Sufficient
Te Wananga O Aotearoa	Sufficient

Introduction

This 60 credit, Level 3 qualification is intended for learners of English as an additional language, and its purpose is to provide graduates with the language skills to communicate independently in situations that are familiar to them. The qualification is at a level comparable to the Common European Framework Reference (CEFR) B1.

Version one of the qualification was listed on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework in 2013, and the first Consistency Review was conducted in 2015 with a sufficient consistency rating given.

The qualification was updated and republished as version 2 in 2018. Whilst education organisations have already, or are in the process of implementing their new programmes of study against version 2 of the qualification, the majority of the 5547 graduates reported during the period for this Consistency Review completed version one of the qualification.

NZQA is the qualification developer for this qualification, and representatives participated in the review meetings. There were 30 education organisations with graduates, and most of these had representatives participating in the Consistency Review meetings, held over 4 days in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch. Representatives from organisations with approved programmes of study, but with no graduates, attended the review meetings as observers.

Version one of the qualification pathways to the New Zealand Certificate in English (Level 4). In response to feedback from education organisations about the significant step up required in language skills for graduates from this qualification to Level 4, the New Zealand Certificate in English Language (Applied) (Level 3) was developed. This qualification is a new educational pathway for version 2 of this qualification.

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.

Final Consistency Review Report

Programme evidence

Most submissions mapped the course/module learning outcomes, or unit standards where used, and assessments against the graduate profile outcomes (GPOs).

Good evidence was provided of programmes creating opportunities for learners to practice their language skills in real world contexts outside of the classroom.

The evidence of moderation (internal and external) presented, was mixed. The robustness of internal moderation processes was mostly sound, and some were of high quality. Assessment material had been pre-assessment moderated, and strategies such as co-marking added to the validity of internal moderation. There was considerable variability with external moderation, with some organisations not having undertaken any moderation external to the organisation during the period, and others having some plans in place or were in the process of establishing MOUs with partner organisations. Those organisations assessing against NZQA unit standards provided evidence of their submissions and positive results; however there were not many of the unit standards used in the Level 3 programmes scheduled during this period. The reporting on moderation coverage of assessment activity varied considerably, and where evidence was provided this generally showed assessment judgements were confirmed. However the proportion of the overall assessment confirmed was not indicated

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 evidence:

This area presented the most challenge for the education organisations, as the language capability of Level 3 graduates for making reliable judgements using the GPOs (verbatim) is a limiting factor. Some organisations had surveyed their graduates; however the survey design, the graduate response rates and the analysis of the findings varied considerably. Some of the stronger submissions provided findings from the next-level tutors, using similar survey questions, which made for more convincing triangulated evidence and provided useful input into programme adjustments.

Destination evidence:

Most submissions provided clear evidence of graduate's pathways, with the majority progressing to the next level English language programme - NZCEL Level 4 for version 1 and NZCEL (Level 3) Applied for version 2, or into other foundation or vocational programmes at the organisation or with other education institutions. In some cases this evidence was supported by the graduates success at this next level.

Some evidence showed graduates had gained employment or, established businesses, and/or were generally more confident in their communications with family, and in their communities.

Next-users evidence:

Most submissions provided some feedback from next-level tutors. However, as this was not generally linked to the GPOs, often related to groups of graduates, rather than individuals, it was not the strongest source of evidence.

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?

Programmes had been well designed and delivered to develop the graduates profile outcomes in the learners. Moderation evidence generally attested to the validity of assessment, and showed that improvements had been made to assessment material as a result of moderation

Final Consistency Review Report

feedback. Absence of external moderation activity was a major weakness for a few organisations.

The strongest and most commonly presented evidence and analysis was that showing most graduates had progressed to the next level English language programme or taken another educational pathway. Some had evidence that graduates had succeeded at this next level. A smaller percentage of graduates had moved into employment, or improved their employment opportunities, and most had improved their personal communication and engagement levels.

Feedback from graduates relating to the GPOs was often not convincing evidence, as their language level limited their capability to reliably respond to surveys. The feedback from next-level tutors, whilst not always directly linked to the GPOs, generally provided confidence in the graduate's readiness for the further study, and provided evidence by proxy that they had met the graduate profile outcomes.

The analysis and interpretation of the evidence was not a strong element in the submissions, The most challenging task of combining the evidence and analysis to create a justification that the graduates had demonstrated they were capable in the graduate profile outcomes of the qualification, was absent in many submissions. Some organisations had identified their gaps and areas of weaknesses; however most organisations had not gone as far as rating the seriousness of these, and in some cases how these were being addressed.

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 (includes special focus on a strand or outcome)

Examples of good practice

- Benchmarking exercises against other English language assessment tools, i.e. Cambridge test to confirm alignment the expected CERF level - B1
- Contextual analysis used to map graduate comments against the GPOs, rather than designing a survey that altered the GPO language to suit the language capabilities of the graduates (this links to the issue below)
- Recording student's goals they want to achieve by doing the programme of study (upon enrolment), and aligning these to the graduate outcomes as evidence for consistency
- Moderation reports that clearly illustrated the activity (both internal and external), percent of learner scripts moderated, coverage of learning outcomes, confirmation of judgements and actions taken.

Issues and concerns

- Feedback from graduates relating to the GPOs was often not convincing evidence in this context, as the review meetings agreed the language level of the graduates limited their capability to reliably respond to GPO related surveys
- Absence of external moderation was a serious gap particularly given the absence of employment evidence and graduate feedback being less reliable in this foundation-level ESOL context.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

The qualification developer was represented at the Consistency Review meetings and took note of feedback on version 2 of the qualification and the supporting Guiding Document republished in May 2019. The Reviewers have no further recommendations.