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Final decision on consistency of qualification: National Consistency confirmed

Threshold

The threshold to determine sufficiency with the graduate profile was determined as evidence that graduates:

- Were competently prepared to progress to and within the level 3 cuisine programme and also:
  - Meet the requirements for the licensing arrangement which shows:
  - evidence of Le Cordon Bleu France requirements being met in accordance with the qualification being offered through a licensing arrangement with Le Cordon Bleu France
  - evidence that the quality requirements outlined in the licensing arrangement with Le Cordon Bleu are being met to maintain the graduate outcomes at the level of the qualification.

Tertiary Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Education Organisation</th>
<th>Final rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Institute of Technology</td>
<td>sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

The Le Cordon Bleu New Zealand Institute (LCB), in partnership with and under the accreditation of Wellington Institute of Technology, offers 1891 NZ Certificate in French Cuisine (Basic) (Level 2) as the Level 2 foundation programme in French Cuisine. Students complete this qualification usually prior to progressing through to the Level 3 (Intermediate) and Level 4 (Superior) certificates in French Cuisine.

The purpose of this qualification is to provide the hospitality industry with individuals who have attained sufficient knowledge, practices and technical skills in classical French cuisine to enter into employment and/or for further hospitality study. Graduates of the qualification will gain the Le Cordon Bleu Certificate in Basic Cuisine which is an international qualification.

In order to meet all of the outcomes of the graduate profile, a programme of study leading to the award of this qualification can only be offered through a licensing arrangement with Le Cordon Bleu. Trainees only train at this one site. To date there have been 75 graduates over 2 years.
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Evidence

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

The criteria used to judge the above evaluation question were (p10 NZQA consistency guidelines):

- The nature, quality and integrity of the evidence presented by TEO
- 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 TEO 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 Submitted

A range of evidence was submitted showing quality processes in the design and delivery of the programme although the required consistency of graduate outcome evidence was not provided in the first instance. The evidence presented and discussed at the review included:

- A self assessment summary report outlining the number of graduates and aspects around teaching and learning across each graduate outcome without giving evidence of what the graduate can know, be and do at a real world level above level 1 and different from the level above.
- A comprehensive and professionally presented workbook which provides an overview of the programme, and includes learning materials, a workplace diary/task record used to record evidence of tasks completed, assessment guidelines and employer verification forms. The workbook provides guidance for each trainee and is being used effectively to record skills, knowledge and progress. Assessments are directly related to the skills, knowledge and characteristics of the graduate profile.

Rationale for rating/Justification

The initial evidence provided by WelTec did not demonstrate that its graduates matched the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

Evidence gaps identified are:

- attestation that graduates of this (Level 2) qualification have achieved the graduate profile to a consistent and appropriate threshold
- benchmarking data of the level 2 graduates showing the preparedness to go onto the level 3 programme or employment data showing preparedness to work at this level in employment
- formal employer feedback – stakeholder feedback (being the monitoring of the LCB international monitor) outlining the evidence of Le Cordon Bleu France requirements being met in accordance with the qualification being offered through a licensing arrangement with Le Cordon Bleu France
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- appropriate mechanisms for delivery and assessment involving LCB required delivery and assessment monitoring processes including ongoing judging and acceptably qualified tutors
- feedback via the monitoring of the LCB international monitor.

With further discussion it was outlined that WelTec would need to gather progression data and information as a result of the mandatory ongoing monitoring undertaken by the Cordon Bleu School in France to be able supply sufficient evidence to demonstrate the capability of graduate outcomes at this level. Evidence from Le Cordon Bleu (France) that the licensing requirements are being met and that aspects within the graduate profile are met are both required.

These gaps have now been met.

Special Focus

There was no special focus for this review although it was noted that this was the basic strand of a three part learning pathway for most learners.

Examples of good practice

- Tutors having to be Le Cordon Bleu qualified.
- Qualification developer has outlined clear requirements as a result of licensing requirement.
- Daily demonstration assessment and feedback for continuity of learning.

Issues and concerns

During the discussion it was noted that the collection of relevant evidence of consistency of outcomes from the Cordon Bleu School in France was not being collected and collated to be included within the quality processes of the Polytechnic.

A second point was raised and that was that the destination of the student is not typically employment, it is to go on to the next level and complete the whole qualification therefore there was some discussion around the need for a discussion with the qualification developer regarding the employment pathway statement.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

Review of the qualification should include clarification of the evidence requirements for managing consistency

See above re discussion regarding the employment pathway statement.