

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in English Language (Academic)
(Level 4)

Qualification number: 1883

Date of review: 24 November 2020

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification prior to: **Between 1 February 2015 and 31 December 2019**

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:

Version 1: Evidence of graduates who demonstrate the language skills required to communicate independently and fluently in familiar, and unfamiliar situations in everyday, workplace and/or academic settings.

Version 2: Evidence of graduates who demonstrate the language skills required to communicate independently and fluently in familiar, and unfamiliar situations in an academic setting.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
6004	Unitec New Zealand Ltd	Sufficient
6006	Ara Institute of Canterbury Ltd	Sufficient
6007	Eastern Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6008	Wellington Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6009	Universal College of Learning Ltd	Sufficient
6010	Manukau Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6011	Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6012	Northland Polytechnic Ltd	Sufficient
6013	Otago Polytechnic Ltd	Sufficient
6014	Whitireia Community Polytechnic Ltd	Sufficient
6017	Western Institute of Technology at Taranaki Ltd	Sufficient
6019	Waikato Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6025	Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
7282	New Zealand College of Chinese Medicine Ltd	Sufficient
7488	International College of Auckland Ltd	Sufficient

Final Consistency Review Report

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
7548	ICL Education Ltd T/A ICL Graduate Business School	Sufficient
7608	North Shore Language School Ltd	Sufficient
7647	New Zealand School of Education Ltd T/A New Zealand Skills and Education College	Sufficient
7653	New Zealand College of Business Ltd	Sufficient
7805	Communications International Education Ltd (T/A Tasman International Academies)	Sufficient
7820	New Zealand Institute of Studies	Sufficient
7850	New Zealand Institute of Education 2007 Ltd T/A New Zealand Institute of Education	Sufficient
8297	International Education Group (NZ) Ltd (T/A Waikato Institute of Education)	Sufficient
8325	Eastwest College of Intercultural Studies Ltd	Sufficient
8524	ALI Education Ltd	Sufficient
8530	Auckland Institute of Studies Ltd	Sufficient
8550	Soshi Gakuen New Zealand Incorporated T/A IPU New Zealand (Institute of the Pacific United New Zealand)	Sufficient
8552	Seafield School of English Ltd	Sufficient
8630	Te Wānanga o Aotearoa	Sufficient
9290	Education and Training Consultants New Zealand Ltd T/A English Teaching College	Sufficient
9328	Skills Update Ltd (T/A Skills Update Training and Education Group, Marsden Technical Institute, and Skills Update Training Institute)	Sufficient

Introduction

This Level 4 qualification is intended for learners of English, who wish to pursue further English language study in an academic context.

Graduates will have the language skills required to communicate independently and effectively in familiar and some less familiar situations with fluency and flexibility in academic settings.

This qualification is at a level comparable to the Common European Framework of reference (CEFR) mid B2 (6 levels define 'can-do' descriptors of proficiency).

This certificate builds on the New Zealand Certificate in English Language (Applied) (Level 3) [Ref:3667] and can lead to the New Zealand Certificate in English Language (Academic) (Level 5) [Ref: 1884].

Version 2 of this qualification was published in 2017 the last date for assessment of version 1 of this qualification was 31 December 2015.

Version 2 of this qualification is at a level comparable to the Common European Framework of reference (CEFR) mid B2. Version 1 was at a level comparable to CEFR B2.

NZQA is the qualification developer, and representatives attended the Zoom sessions.

Final Consistency Review Report

33 education organisations gave presentations during the review. One organisation with a small number of graduates (fewer than 5) submitted a self-assessment report and supporting evidence and was not required to make a presentation.

Graduate numbers per education organisation for this qualification ranged from over 9 graduates to over one thousand. There was a total of 5574 graduates reported across all organisations.

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.

Evidence provided for this review included:

- Confirmation of which qualification version graduates completed.
- Confirmation that the education organisation had a coherent, approved programme of study which ensured that programme components led to the graduate profile outcomes.
- Graduate and next-level tutor surveys which confirmed that graduates had gained, and were using, the skills and knowledge outlined in the graduate profile.
- Confirmation that graduates were progressing to, and being successful in, further study or employment requiring the application of skills and knowledge described by the graduate profile.

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?

Education organisations submitted a range of evidence that could be triangulated to support confidence that their graduates have achieved the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold for version 1 and 2 of the qualification. This included programme assessment and moderation evidence, programme matrices, graduate feedback, next-user feedback, and destination data.

Most organisations provided good programme evidence that aligned their programme of study with the GPOs. Included in this information was evidence to support the general and sufficiency assessment requirements for the NZCEL Level 4 Academic. Those organisations that had reported graduates over the two versions were mostly able to differentiate the significant differences between the versions and evidence how they had transitioned into the later version. Strong submissions described the moderation process, programme review and evaluation of resources, including professional development of staff to ensure effective implementation.

Moderation evidence was mixed, most organisations were able to provide evidence of moderation planning and delivery. Most provided evidence of national moderation results by

Final Consistency Review Report

the qualification developer of their assessments. Some organisations went further and provided evidence of arrangements with a variety of external moderation partners and were able to describe the action plans and improvements that resulted from that activity. There was still some evidence of weakness with managing compliance with conditions of assessment as outlined in the 2020 Monitoring Summary Report by NZQA. These included some inconsistencies with assessor decisions, and issues with developing assessment tasks to meet the graduate profile outcomes. Most organisations were able to describe, and evidence improved processes being implemented as a result.

Many organisations had struggled with reaching representative samples of feedback from graduates and next level tutors that aligned to the language skills in the GPOs. Some organisations represented the data very clearly and were able to talk to the information that emanated from the statistics. There was a lot of discussion around survey methodology, its purpose, design and delivery. While this avenue of evidence was generally a bit weak, the reviewers felt confident that most organisations were working on how best to improve this evidence.

Confirmation that graduates were continuing to successfully study in higher-level programmes, was viewed as strong evidence. While most education organisations submitted evidence that graduates had progressed to further study, not many supported this with further data on the level of programme enrolled, or on success and /or retention in that chosen programme.

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

Clear transition plans to meet the requirements of version 2 of the qualification. These included the moderation activities, programme review and evaluation of resources, including professional development of staff to ensure effective implementation.

Evidence of continuing to improve moderation, including upskilling assessors and changes made as a result of the moderation activities.

Well-timed surveys undertaken post-graduation for each cohort leading to higher survey response rates. A few surveys provided an example or narrative, for the graduate or other stakeholder, to use as an indicator / proxy for each GPO, to authentically benchmark and then rate the skill at Level 4. Some organisations conducted focus groups to good effect.

Survey information aggregated meaningfully – that is, provides the organisation with information that either confirms programme delivery decisions or leads to further improvements.

Destination data that details next level programme, success rates and employment.

Issues and concerns

There are some issues with survey design and delivery. Some survey questionnaires yielded only 'yes / no' responses resulting in limited information for review and poor quality analysis.

Final Consistency Review Report

It was not always clear to the reviewers how the surveys contributed to the organisation's analysis of outcomes.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

Feedback received about the NZCEL Level 4 Academic qualification and the Guiding Document was generally favourable. However, there were suggestions that:

- programmes leading to the qualification are demanding for learners, and that consideration should be given to reducing the amount of learner evidence required
- other types of evidence for consistency be included in the list of evidence featured in the qualification document
- the guiding document include clarification of expectations around test conditions, and online delivery and offshore delivery.

These suggestions will be considered at the next NZCEL qualifications review in 2022.